9 Arthur's Hall and the inner bailey during the Middle Ages

Allan Brodie

Introduction

The inner bailey of Dover Castle is dominated by the Great Tower, a potent symbol of military and political power.[1] This monumental building was created by Henry II to form the heart of a powerful castle, but the complete absence of original fireplaces, or any late 12th-century supporting services, suggest the tower was only intended for short ceremonial occasions, rather than as longer-term lodgings.[2] Henry's grandson, Henry III, established a suite of buildings around the inside of the inner bailey, tucked mostly beneath the height of the curtain wall (Fig 6.1). Their completion would have allowed the king to use Dover Castle as an occasional royal palace, as well as a military fortress and a place of ceremony. In the event, a good deal of the fabric of these early to mid-13th-century buildings survives within the inner bailey, but needs to be unpicked from later modifications, notably those of the mid-18th century.[3] The buildings include Arthur's Hall, completed in 1240 as the centrepiece of Henry III's domestic accommodation (Fig 9.1).[4] Around this hall, there existed a complex set of royal chambers, service buildings and connecting pentices (Fig 9.2).

This paper reviews documentary, archaeological and architectural evidence to describe the development of the inner bailey and its buildings over the course of the Middle Ages. New investigation has revealed that prior to Henry III's major construction campaign, there were already several structures on the site.[5] The buildings of the 1240s were erected largely along the eastern and southern faces of the inner bailey. After the mid-13th century,

these structures were maintained through to the end of the Middle Ages, proof of their ongoing role at the heart of the castle's life.

Documentary evidence

By the beginning of the reign of Richard I (1189−99) the Great Tower stood essentially complete, and construction of the inner curtain wall had been underway since at least 1185−6.[6] Nevertheless, Richard devoted considerable sums early in his reign to the completion of certain aspects of his father's work. Moreover, King John spent at least £1,000 on Dover Castle between 1208 and 1215. Much of this money was spent on the completion of the outer curtain wall on the north and west sides of the castle (Fig 1.2), but some of it was clearly invested in several new domestic buildings.[7] Prior to the 1180s the royal accommodation is thought to have been concentrated in buildings around St Mary de Castro, and these survived at least until the late 13th century when they were occupied by chaplains of the church.[8] The topography in this area suggests that any domestic accommodation must have been arranged in quite a compact fashion compared with the spread of the 13th-century buildings. In 1207–8 lead was brought from London to roof 'houses' within the castle, and in 1214 timber from Sussex was acquired 'to build our new hall'.[9] Coad says that this reference might relate to a building reputed to have been in the north-western part of the outer bailey, and suggests that the rectangular Godsfoe Tower may have been an accompanying chamber block (Fig 1.2).[10] Given its description as 'our new hall', however, it is far more likely to have been within the contemporary heart of the castle, namely the inner bailey.[11] In 1284−5 repairs took place to the king's garderobe next to the old hall and also to the king's chamber next to the old hall.[12] When these descriptions of its location are combined with references to the position of the new hall (see below), itself completed in 1240, the most obvious

interpretation is that the king's chamber and the old hall constructed *c* 1208–15 lay to the north-west of Arthur's Hall, beyond its upper end.

The siege of 1216–7 prompted a programme of essential repairs and measures to strengthen the castle, with some £2,655 spent on these works between 1217 and 1225.[13] In 1224 and 1226 orders were given for the supply of lead to Dover, and in May 1229 a further 20 fothers of lead were to be acquired 'to roof the houses and towers' in the castle.[14] But the best documented campaign of construction began in the late 1230s, when Henry III began a series of major works to improve the royal accommodation at the castle after his marriage to Eleanor of Provence in 1236. At many other royal houses, Eleanor was provided with her own suite of new chambers, but at Dover the king himself moved into the new buildings, apparently leaving the queen to occupy rooms within the Great Tower, if ever she visited Dover. In fact, the earliest reference to specific accommodation for the queen dates from the early years of Edward I's reign, in the 1270s and 1280s, and at the end of the Middle Ages her chambers still appear to have been in the Great Tower.[15]

Until the 1230s, the documents are usually far too imprecise for us to identify particular construction programmes, but by the end of that decade it is often possible to identify the individual buildings referred to in the sources. Thus, 'the king's chamber at the end of his new hall', and 'an oratory over the porch of the [new] hall', were both mentioned in June 1239.[16] From March 1240, we read that 'the king's new chamber … and the king's chapel … [were] to be wainscoted … and in like manner the king's old chamber'. In addition, 'all the houses of the castle that were injured by the late tempest [were] to be repaied'[17] In July of that year, presumably following damage in the earlier storm, the sheriff of Kent was ordered to arrange for the repair of the 'glass windows in the king's chapel and of his chamber'. Also, 'the new hall of the castle was to be filled with poor people' who were to be fed for one day prior to the king's arrival, suggesting that the hall was complete by this

time.[18]

The new hall, known as Arthur's Hall since the 14th century,[19] was at the heart of this new complex of domestic buildings and was the focal point for the circulation around the inner bailey. On 13 July 1240, the castle constable was ordered '… to cause the penthouse (*appenticium*) between the king's hall and the chapel to be repaired and renewed', implying a pre-existing structure which may have required work following the storm earlier in the year.[20] On 29 August 1240 work was to be carried out '… to cause a passage (*aleam*) to be made from the king's new hall of the castle to his chamber'.[21] The king's chamber seems to have been to the north-west of the hall, whereas the chapel was still located in the forebuilding of the Great Tower. In other words we appear to have references to at least two separate passages. An updated version of one of these passageways is shown in John Bereblock's depiction of the castle in *c* 1570 (Fig 9.3).[22] Indeed, this is presumably the 80ft- (24.4m) long passage referred to in a document of 1586, leading from Arthur's Hall and the privy kitchen to the Great Tower and the porch or entrance to the queen's lodging.[23]

Once the new hall and passages were complete, attention turned to the kitchen 'belonging to the king's new hall'.[24] This description would place it close to the hall, and following conventional medieval planning we might expect it to be located to the south-east of Arthur's Hall, with service rooms between. In the 1586 document referred to above, the passage linked the hall and privy kitchen to the Great Tower,[25] implying that the kitchen was still closely associated with the hall in the late Tudor period. In 1814 Lyon wrote that: 'The whole space between the old magazine and the eastern angle of the saxon keep, was occupied by a kitchen and offices, for the use of the King, when he visited the castle'.[26] The 'old magazine' may well be that which can be identified to the north-west of Arthur's Hall in the early 18th century.[27] In other words, Lyon's assertion would locate the kitchen somewhere in the south-east corner of the inner bailey, though not with any great precision.

On 19 February 1246, the constable of Dover was ordered 'to have as much money as he needs out of the issues of the county to make a chamber at the end of the great hall in Dover castle'.[28] Earlier references had used the term 'king's chamber' rather than 'a chamber', suggesting separate rooms, even though the primary structure was just a few years old. Both could have been at the upper end of the hall, but alternatively the second 'chamber' may have been at the lower end, above the services, where it was convenient for the oratory above the porch, replicating an arrangement found in Westminster Palace.[29] Interestingly, in the Bereblock view (Fig 9.3), the upper storey of the porch is shown with a three-light window, whereas the other windows in the hall and associated buildings are depicted with just two lights.

In sum, by the mid-1240s Henry III's suite of royal apartments within the inner baily seems to have been completed, with the associated service buildings also established. Arthur's Hall stood at the centre of the complex. At its lower end, that is to the south-east end of the hall, there was a porch with an oratory above. From here, there was access by way of a pentice to the king's chapel, which remained in the forebuilding of the Great Tower. Attached to the lower end of the hall were the services, perhaps with a chamber above, adjacent to the oratory. Beyond the services lay the kitchen, in the south-eastern corner of the inner bailey. At the upper end of the hall were the king's chamber and possibly the old hall, linked to Arthur's Hall by a second pentice (Fig 6.1). Later in this paper architectural evidence to support these identifications will be reviewed.

In addition to the buildings that made up the immediate royal accommodation, documentary evidence suggests that the inner bailey also contained a wide range of ancillary structures. Although Bereblock's view of *c* 1570 clearly depicts 'Arthur's Hall' (Fig 9.3), if the same level of compression applied to the Great Tower was used elsewhere in the drawing, then the artist is probably showing all of the domestic buildings along the north-east face of

the inner bailey. Along the south-east side of the bailey, Bereblock shows the old armoury and the Duke of Suffolk's palace immediately to the east of Palace Gate, both probably representing earlier structures. Indeed, in May 1247 the sheriff of Kent was ordered to make two new chambers with fireplaces and privies 'over the new work beyond the cistern'.[30] A plan of 1756 shows a cistern in the inner bailey yard, just to the south-east of the Great Tower (Fig 13.7). If this is the same cistern as that mentioned in 1247, then the new works referred to would have been along the south-east side of the inner bailey.[31] This is the location of the buildings presently known as Keep Yard 8 and 9 (Fig 9.1), themselves representing the old armoury and the Duke of Suffolk's palace. From 1372–5 and 1426–37 there are references to 'The House of Arms or the King's Artillery House'.[32] No location was specified, but Keep Yard 8 still retains some medieval fabric.

Bereblock also depicts 'Arthur's Lesser Hall', which appears directly to the west of Palace Gate (Fig 9.3).[33] The 14th-century documents refer to '*la Plathalle*' and the '*Prynceshalle*', while in 1426–37 there are references to a '*Flandrishalle*'.[34] It is unclear whether these references are to Arthur's Lesser Hall, Arthur's Hall, or another building that no longer survives.

Other structures which can be identified from medieval sources as lying within the inner bailey include the bakehouse near the kitchen, and a larder house and brewhouse which may have been beside it.[35] In addition there was a well-house with a thatched roof, and cisterns inside the Great Tower itself, and in the inner bailey yard, all supplied the castle with water.[36] There was also a granary, a forge, a stable next to the forge, and an exchequer or counting house.[37] None of these can be firmly located, although the stables appear to have been near a gate. Finally, there is mention of storage, but this could refer to the ground floor of the Great Tower.[38]

From the late 13th century onwards there is much less reference to brand new

building in the inner bailey, with expenditure primarily devoted to the repair of existing structures. This implies that most of the accommodation was still considered adequate and worth maintaining. An almost continuous programme of repairs ran through the last decades of the 13th century, including £500 spent on the royal apartments in 1278.[39] It is possible, however, that this particular sum was not entirely for repairs. As noted earlier, before the 1270s there is no firm documentary evidence to suggest any distinct accommodation for the queen outside the Great Tower. But references to the queen's chamber in 1277−8, 1283−4, and 1287−8 suggest that this situation may have changed.[40] In other words, we may just speculate that a proportion of the very substantial figure of £500 may have been allocated to the creation of an appropriate suite for Edward I's queen, Eleanor of Castile (d 1290), albeit perhaps within existing buildings in the inner bailey.

In 1284−5 repairs were carried out to the king's garderobe next to the old hall, and to the king's chamber next to the old hall, and in April 1292 the roof of the hall porch was repaired.[41] Notwithstanding these works, an inquiry of 1324 recorded the poor state of the buildings and fortifications in the castle generally, and it was estimated that as much as £2,060 was needed to put things in order.[42] Between 1361 and 1364, £222 was spent on repairs to the hall and other buildings in the inner bailey.[43] In 1382 the roof of Arthur's Hall was mended and in 1426–37 repairs were carried out to the windows and roof of the hall, and two new windows and a door were created in the kitchen.[44]

The sums mentioned in these documents all seem modest when compared to the cost of the work reportedly undertaken for Edward IV (d. 1483). Unfortunately official documents from his reign have largely disappeared, but William Lambarde, writing in 1570, said that: 'Onely I reade in Iohn Rosse, that King Edwarde the Fourth, to his great expence, which others recken to have been ten thousande poundes, amended it [Dover Castle] throughout'.[45] The fireplaces in the Great Tower provide some indication of where the money was spent, but

it is unclear whether Edward also turned his attention to the inner bailey. With such a large overall sum invested, however, there must at least be a chance that every building of note was affected.[46]

The site before Arthur's Hall: the architectural evidence

Aside from the undoubted military and symbolic roles of the Great Tower, it clearly provided a number of large domestic spaces which in turn must have been dependent on separate service buildings within the inner bailey.[47] As noted above, our earliest documentary evidence for such services dates from the 1240s, but from its first construction the Great Tower could surely not have functioned without nearby ancillary buildings. Nothing specific is recorded, although the hall under construction for King John in 1214,[48] if completed, might be expected to have had an accompanying kitchen and other services.

Within the fabric of Arthur's Hall, there is evidence for some form of structure in the inner bailey prior to the 1240s, though this is too fragmentary to reconstruct any coherent building. In the south-east wall of the hall, which contains three service doorways dating from the 1238–40 campaign, there is clear evidence of an earlier arch (Fig 9.4). Between the left and the central service doorways, in the wall above, there are seven voussoirs of this arch. In addition, the rubble over the central doorway has clearly been disturbed, presumably when the doorway itself was inserted into the existing walling. The early opening represented by the voussoirs is aligned with a similar blocked arch found on the inner face of the south wall of Keep Yard 6 (Fig 9.1); the two are also of approximately the same height and width.

Further early evidence was found in Trench C of Tom Cromwell's 2008 excavations within Arthur's Hall. He located several features beneath the medieval floor, including a large curved-wall structure that predated the hall, and possibly the south-east wall.[49]

On the floor at the north-east corner of Arthur's Hall, there is a rough patch of stonework with a drainage channel around it. This seems to have been the base for a stair up to the ramparts of the inner bailey curtain wall, but it is not certain this was ever built. Above the same patch of stonework there is a disturbed area of masonry in the north-east wall, up to the base of the inserted window, as if something has been removed. On the other side of the hall, excavations have revealed a wall running into the inner bailey yard.[50] Part of this projected a short distance into Arthur's Hall, and it seemed to predate the construction of the main facade. This stub was only one or two courses high, however, and the impression of antiquity may be a result of the relative laying out of the two walls in the 1230s.

Together, this admittedly limited evidence does indeed suggest that a number of pre-Henry III structures lay within the inner bailey, and accords with the assertion that John's 'new hall' was located in this area.[51] The south-eastern part of Keep Yard 5 (Fig 9.1) looks like a hall, but its external fabric seems entirely mid-18th century in character.[52] One might ask if the 18th-century military builder was mindful to reflect the form of an early building, one that he was now obliged to alter dramatically for new purposes? Within the building, there is one section of exposed wall with a painted masonry pattern on its plastered surface, an indicator of a building of some status, though of course it does not serve to prove whether in origin it was a hall or a chamber. The fabric of the northern section of Keep Yard 5 suggests that until the 18th century it was a single-storied structure. In the front wall we can identify three distinct phases. The ground floor of the main facade features irregular rubble, and in the north-western and south-eastern walls there is some rubble rising to just above ground floor level, suggesting the shape of gables. Above this fabric, it is clear that the building was raised during the mid-18th-century barracks phase. Finally, the top part of the facade was, on stylistic grounds, probably added around 1900.

Henry III's hall and related buildings

Henry III's great hall, later known as Arthur's Hall (Fig 9.2), was the centrepiece of the suite of king's lodgings established at Dover in the 1230s and 1240s. The building is roughly rectangular in plan with an overall internal length of around 21.90m (72ft) and a width of about 8.70m (28ft 6in). Inside, the original floor level is some 1.60m (5ft 3in) below the modern ground surface. The difference may reflect, approximately at least, the fact that a raised floor was possibly inserted later in the Middle Ages. The upper end of the hall was at the north-west end of the building, with the cross-passage and service doors at the south-east end.

The upper end of Arthur's Hall, heating and lighting

There is clear evidence for a dais in the fabric at the upper end of the hall. At the northern end of the courtyard-facing (south-west) wall, there is a slight thickening in the fabric beneath a thirteenth-century blocked doorway (Fig 9.5). This setback is also found along the front wall of the hall, running from a short distance to the south-east of the blocked doorway around to the north-west wall of the building. There is no obvious projection on the opposite side, since this is part of the curtain wall and predates the construction of the hall. The base of the blocked doorway, and the level of the setback, suggest that the dais stood some 0.48m (1ft 7in) above the current floor level, and approximately 0.60m (2ft) above the probable 13th-century floor level.

Given this evidence, if we accept the apparent relationship between the blocked doorway and the dais, then we must also acknowledge that access on to the front edge of a dais in this way is a rather unusual feature. Nevertheless, excavations in the 1960s revealed

the stub end of a medieval wall projecting out from the courtyard side of Arthur's Hall, just beyond the position of the doorway on to the dais. It may represent the end of the pentice known to have linked the hall to the king's chamber.[53] Indeed, this same fragment of wall may well have been located in the 2008 excavations within the hall, in which case it appears to have projected slightly into the building and supported the front of the dais. Although the courtyard front of the hall seems to overlie this transverse wall, its location at the front of the dais suggests it belongs to the *c* 1240 phase and is probably contemporary with the creation of the hall. In support of this view, one might list: the feature is the putative end wall of the pentice; there is no evidence for the wall continuing across the hall; and the lack of any purpose for a wall in this location without the existence of the hall.[54] Furthermore, the location of the proposed pentice would seem to match the 1240 reference to the construction of a passage linking the 'king's new hall of the castle to his chamber'.[55] Finally, among the works carried out in 1361, certain doors were to be blocked, probably in the small chamber next to the king's chamber.[56] The chamber in question was apparently on the west side of the king's chamber, and they were both described as at the end of the hall, providing further support for the location of the pentice.

A medieval hall required lighting and heating, but there is little original evidence in the fabric of Arthur's Hall for either. That said, a degree of speculation is not unreasonable. Although the current windows facing towards the inner bailey are of 18th-century origin, the principal medieval fenestration must also have been located on this side. Given the adjacent buildings, there was little opportunity to place windows in the lower parts of the end walls. One fairly common pattern used in 13th-century halls, as at Stokesay Castle in Shropshire, the Old Deanery at Salisbury in Wiltshire, at Winchester Castle in Hampshire, and even the archbishop's grand aisled hall at Canterbury, involved arrangements of plate-traceried windows set within gablets rising to form the equivalent of dormer windows.[57] At Dover, in

October 1287 a plumber and his boy were paid for two days for replacing a great part of the lead on the 'porches of the windows' of the great hall on the west side and similar work was done in July/August 1288.[58] The reference to 'porches of the windows' may be a 13th-century attempt to describe the gabled form, as found in other contemporary halls. In 1426–37 repairs were carried out to the windows of the hall and the roof, and so it is of interest to note that there may have been a single late-medieval window opening in the south-east gable of Arthur's Hall, above the gable of the current roof.[59]

The commonest way of heating a hall in the 13th century was with an open hearth, located towards its upper end.[60] It is possible, however, that Arthur's Hall featured a mural fireplace from the beginning. At the northern end of its north-west wall, there is evidence of a low, wide arch. Here, the seven crude voussoirs could be the remains of a wide fireplace. We know, too, from inventories of the 1350s and 1361 that a screen existed in front of the chimney in the hall,[61] indicating that a fireplace had certainly been introduced by then, if not earlier.

The lower end of Arthur's Hall

At the south-east end of the Arthur's Hall there is clear evidence for the services and cross-passage. As we have seen, in the south-east wall there are the remains of three arched doorways opening from the hall to the services, themselves located on part of the site of Keep Yard 5 (Figs 9.1, 9.4). The outer doorways are likely to correspond with the buttery and pantry, whereas the wider central doorway presumably led to a passage giving access to the kitchen.[62]

At the south-eastern end of the courtyard facing wall, there are the remains of a doorway at the level of the 13th-century floor. It is situated immediately below a later and

higher doorway. The 13th-century doorway would have provided access into the cross-passage from the porch in front (Fig 9.?). The entrance to Keep Yard 5 has a 13th-century moulded arch set on 18th-century jambs. It is interesting to speculate whether this could be the reset arch of the main door into Arthur's Hall.

Bereblock's view proves that the cross-passage and the porch in front of it were at the heart of the circulation around the inner bailey (Fig 9.3). By the time he produced his Dover drawing in *c* 1570, access to Arthur's Hall from the Great Tower was by way of a long pentice running towards the western end of the building, much as it had been in 1240. Bereblock's view is a challenging source to use, but there is evidence to support his depiction, at least in general terms. The most obvious observation is that the pentice was tall. Bereblock's command of perspective is clumsy, but in the fabric of the Great Tower there is evidence to confirm the height of the pentice Along the south-west face of the forebuilding there is a long, horizontal patch of flints between 4.2m (13ft 9in) and 4.5m (14ft 9in) above the present ground level (Fig 9.6). This repair was necessitated by the removal of a horizontal structure, perhaps where the roof of the pentice was attached to the forebuilding. Extending this line towards Arthur's Hall, the level equates roughly with the top of a buttress, which is in turn the remains of a wall that projected from the north-west wall of Keep Yard 5. There is a blocked doorway in this wall, where people using the pentice entered the side of the porch before turning into the cross-passage within the hall. This dog-legged arrangement is clearly shown in Bereblock's view, though admittedly there is no evidence that it existed as early as the mid-13th century.

The kitchen

As noted above, the central doorway in the south-east wall of Arthur's Hall probably led to

the kitchen. This may have been completed *c* 1244,[63] and a close reading of the documentary evidence places it in the south-east corner of the inner bailey, convenient for the hall, as well as for a possible range of buildings along the southern wall of the courtyard. In the corner of the north-west wall of this proposed kitchen area, which is the southern wall of Keep Yard 5, there are the remains of arches set at the original level of the 13th-century floor in Arthur' Hall. The chamfer on the wider arch suggests that this is the direction from which servants approached this doorway, as if it is the end of the passage running from the kitchen to the hall.

The northern wall of Keep Yard 7 (Fig 9.1) in the south-east corner of the inner bailey is between 0.90m (3ft) and 1m (3ft 3in) thick, that is 0.20–0.30m (8−12in) thicker than the walls in the other barrack blocks, all of which were adapted or purpose-built in the mid-18th century. This particular wall contains a wealth of archaeological evidence but it relates to the current ground level, and not to the lower, 13th-century floor level of Arthur's Hall. Indeed, if this represents the south wall of the kitchen, we must envisage a rather small, wedge-shaped structure. It is more likely, however, that the kitchen was further away. In fact, if the wedge-shaped building existed at all in the Middle Ages, it may have been a service building between the main body of the kitchen and the immediate service rooms of Arthur's Hall. A similar intermediate structure occurred between the service rooms and the king's kitchen at Clarendon Palace.[64]

Identifying medieval fabric in the inner bailey

At first sight, there appears to be considerable harmony in fabric of the external walls of the buildings around the inner bailey. A closer examination, however, reveals that some of this external fabric is indeed medieval, while other sections date from the 18th century. Writing in

1814, Lyon stated that: 'In the year 1745, barracks were built upon the scite of these offices; and if the fronts of them were not carried up new from the ground, they were cased over, for they have a modern appearance, when compared with the ancient masonry'.[65] The mid-18th century fabric consists of regular courses of stone with galleting made of flint chips set into the mortar, but the surface of the medieval walling is treated with more irregular rubble, predominantly consisting of smaller stones. Examination of the buildings around the inner bailey suggest that, apart from Arthur's Hall, Keep Yard 5 (Regimental Museum), Keep Yard 8 (The Old Armoury), Keep Yard 9 (the Duke of Suffolk's Palace), and the current shop building (Arthur's Lesser Hall) (Fig 9.1), all contain substantial amounts of medieval, probably mid-13th century fabric, predominantly in the lower parts of their walls.

The main facade of Arthur's Hall provides a good example of the complexity of trying to comprehend the detailed phasing of individual buildings, and also provides some insight into the main phases of construction and repair in the inner bailey. Externally, this facade has a patch of irregular rubble corresponding with the position of the 13th-century dais doorway inside (Fig 9.5), The remainder of the facade is finished with the distinctive mid-18th century treatment (Fig 9.7). Internally the picture is more complicated, and we find that the floor level of Arthur's Hall was raised at least once, probably in the late Middle Ages. To the south-east of the blocked dais doorway there is a slight change in wall thickness, 1.3m (4ft 3in) above the 13th-century floor level. This set back runs from near the 13th-century door, approximately 4m (13ft) from the north-west wall, for around 14.4m (47ft 3in) along the inside of the south-west wall. Thereafter the setback ends, but the lower parts of the wall still seems to date from the 13th century.

The style of the facade of Arthur's Hall in Bereblock's view is generically late medieval (Fig 9.3), but today most of the exterior of the wall seems to date from the mid-18th century barracks phase. Internally, however, it is clear that the two Georgian sash windows

have been inserted into an existing wall. One has rough jambs, patched in brick, and both have patches of masonry beneath their sills, representing the necessary infill after the openings had been gouged out of the earlier wall. Given this evidence, the top section of the main facade must predate the mid-18th century, while the bottom part belongs to the 13th century. In the level between, there are traces of another phase of construction, dating from between the late Middle Ages and the pre-18th century upper part of the facade. This is most obvious to the right of the central doorway, just below the modern floor level. A short stretch of wall, three courses high, is slightly thicker than the later walling above. It is tantalising to suggest that this might now be the only trace of the raised floor level from the late Middle Ages, a survival from Edward IV's work at Dover Castle. More intriguing still, perhaps Bereblock captures the form, albeit with significant artistic licence, of the Arthur's Hall after King Edward's intervention.

An initial inspection, of Bereblock's *c* 1570 view might suggest that the hall featured two large bay windows (Fig 9.3). Yet, as mentioned earlier, a more likely interpretation is that his depiction shows the entire apartment range, with Arthur's Hall only accounting for the right-hand part of the drawing. Throughout, we see that the lower parts of the chambers were lit by narrow vertical windows, many in bay windows, whereas the upper levels of both the bays and the main wall usually have two-light windows. Reset examples of the narrow, vertical windows have been inserted into the blockage of the arch in the north-west wall of the Keep Yard 5, and in the eastern end of Arthur's Lesser Hall. The lowest section of the south-west wall of Arthur's Hall shows no interruption for any type of windows, and therefore Bereblock's view seems to depict the arrangement after the floor had been raised. His drawing does not contain any topographical detail to confirm this, though his naïve perspective does seem to suggest that the land was relatively flat between the Great Tower and Arthur's Hall.

By the late 15th century the floor of Arthur's Hall may already have been raised to the position of the slight internal setback, and the new pentice must have been introduced. Among the works carried out in the 1620s were repairs to the 'the timbers that runeth under the Caves of Arthurs Hall'.[66] There are no formal cellars beneath Arthur's Hall, but we may suggest that this refers to the space between the original 13th-century floor level and the raised late medieval floor, itself located at the approximate height of the current walkway.

The later development of the inner bailey

In the 1530s John Leland visited Dover, but he only provides the briefest of descriptions: 'The mayne, strong, and famose castel of Dovar stondeth on the toppe of a hille almost a quarter of a myle of fro the towne on the lyft side, and withyn the castel is a chapel, yn the sides wherof appere sum greate Briton brykes'.[67] A number of 16th-century drawings in the British Library and other archives depict Dover Harbour, and on the hillside above there are distant views of the castle (Fig 3.5).[68] Due to the low viewpoints adopted by the artists and mapmakers, however, the curtain walls of the castle usually obscure the buildings within the inner bailey. Frustratingly, although one of these British Library manuscripts provides an aerial view of the castle, the artist regrettably chose to omit all the internal buildings, apart from the Great Tower.[69] It is fortuitous, then, that a 16th-century drawing at Hatfield House shows the inner bailey buildings as a line of structures clustered around the south-east and south-west walls, including a building that may be Arthur's Hall (Fig 9.8).[70] John Bereblock, who is best known for his illustrations of Oxford colleges in 1566, drew the castle as it existed around 1570 (Fig 9.3).[71] Just why Bereblock left Oxford to visit Dover to produce this drawing is not entirely clear, but it would make sense were he drawn to Kent to commemorate some event. Among the more obvious candidates in this regard are the

preparation of a manuscript on Kent's castles by William Darell in the 1560s and the visit to the castle by Queen Elizabeth I in 1573.[72]

In the 1620s, various works were undertaken in the Great Tower and also in the area of Keep Yard 9. These works were for George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, a programme undoubtedly cut short by his early death in 1628. A major feature of this campaign was the 'great Rusticke dore of the Portche', located at the foot of the stairs into the forebuilding.[73] This grandiose structure continued to provide an imposing entrance to the Great Tower in the early 18th century, even if the role of the building had by then been reduced to that of a prison for war captives.[74] The doorway was dismantled in the 1740s, during the creation of the barrack buildings for officers and ordinary soldiers around the inside of the inner bailey. As Lyon observed in 1814, this was achieved through a mixture of new building and adapting existing buildings, whereas Statham writing at the end of the 19th century concluded, erroneously, that: 'These buildings were converted into barracks in 1745, and the alterations then made were so extensive as to amount to an entirely new construction'.[75] Officer's accommodation can be identified by the new round-headed windows, reflecting the shape of the windows created in the 1620s for the possible Duke of Buckingham's residence. The buildings for other ranks have rectangular or pointed windows and doors, and their jambs often include reset pieces of Portland stone, material perhaps reused from the dismantled 'great Rusticke dore'.[76]

Conclusion

Before the reign of Henry III, documentary references to buildings in the inner bailey of Dover Castle are imprecise. Fabric evidence for earlier construction work is also too fragmentary to interpret, beyond stating that structures do indeed appear to have existed and

they were perhaps associated with King John's hall.

In the first years of Henry III's reign, the priority was to restore the walls of a broken fortresses and to strengthen the defences where they had proved vulnerable. With Henry III assuming his personal rule in 1227, however, and particularly after his marriage to Eleanor of Provence in 1236, he embarked on an ambitious and costly building programme.[77] During his reign, Henry spent at least £113,000 on royal castles and houses, roughly 10 per cent of the recorded receipts of his government, with Westminster Abbey absorbing perhaps another £40–50,000.[78] The Tower of London, Westminster Palace, and Winchester Castle each accounted for nearly £10,000,[79] and even though Dover was only a secondary residence, the works here still cost around £7,500.[80]

In general, Henry III's main concern was with the provision of comfortable, not to say lavish, accommodation for himself and his wife at all their principal residences. He would provide a hall for himself, and sometimes his wife, and these main structures would be accompanied by a chamber or chambers, a chapel and services. Henry often provided a grandiose entrance to the new complex, and many sites, including Dover Castle, featured a porch worthy of separate mention from the building to which it was attached.[81]

The Dover programme and its layout are consistent with the other major projects of Henry's reign. At Windsor Castle the king's new lodgings were ranged around an open cloister and their neat, compact plan meant that the blocks interconnected directly.[82] In general terms, the form harks back to several greater houses of the 12th century, such as at Old Sarum, where a quadrangle was at the heart of the design.[83] Windsor's formality and coherence also echoes the near-contemporary arrangements found in the new royal accommodation at the Tower of London.[84] At Clarendon Palace in the depths of the Wiltshire countryside, however, we find almost the antithesis in terms of the formality of its planning.[85] At a cost of some £3,600, Henry provided himself with a suite of rooms by adapting a series

of buildings first constructed by Henry II, though he added new apartments for his wife. To connect all of these disparate structures, an elaborate series of pentices were required.

In terms of the formality of its planning, Dover Castle lies somewhere between these two extremes. But in looking at the provision of specific accommodation, Dover differs from most of Henry's other palatial construction programmes in the apparent absence of any specific new rooms set aside for Queen Eleanor. If this was a matter of thrift, it seems uncharacteristic of a king with otherwise lavish tastes. There again, we might remember that apparently Eleanor rarely visited the site. Henry's accommodation at Dover also differs from some of his other major programmes in that it was firmly rooted to the ground, rather than being placed at first-floor level, even if this was perhaps the result of military necessity rather than purely taste.

Both from documentary evidence, and from a few surviving fragments from palaces such as Westminster and Clarendon, it is clear that Henry and his new wife had expensive tastes, ranging from fine floor tiles to elaborate wall paintings.[86] Paul Binski and Elizabeth Eames respectively have pieced together complex, lavish and highly personal decorative schemes at these two palaces.[87] Today Arthur's Hall has a sadly barren interior, devoid of all historic decoration. It is most unlikely, however, that King Henry III would have invested such a large sum on his accommodation at Dover without providing himself with the comfortable surroundings he was accustomed to at other favoured palaces and castles. We know, for instance, that some of the king's chambers were wainscoted in 1240,[88] though no further detail is provided. Finally, given that Henry was only an occasional visitor to Dover, it might be reasonable to assume that the mid-13th-century royal lodgings were not quite so well appointed as those at some of the other main residences favoured by the king and his new queen.

9 Arthur's Hall and the inner bailey during the Middle Ages

Allan Brodie

1 I would like to thank Kevin Booth, Tom Cromwell and Gordon Higgott for helpful discussions on site, and for generously sharing the findings of their own research with me. The late Chris Phillpotts provided valuable detailed documentary research for the entire Great Tower project (see his chapter in this volume) and I have drawn extensively on his expertise.

2 For further views on this theme, see the chapter by Steven Brindle and Philip Dixon in this volume.

3 For a summary of the development of the inner bailey, see Brodie and Higgott 2011.

4 For earlier considerations of Arthur's Hall, see Brodie 2009; Brodie 2011.

5 See below and, for further detail, the chapter by Tom Cromwell in this volume.

6 In the pipe roll for 1185−6 there is a clear reference to the construction of the inner bailey wall, described there as 'the girdle around the tower': *PR 32 Henry II (1185−6)*, 187. In any case, all major authorities agree that the Great Tower was to all intents and purposes finished by *c* 1190, along with the full inner bailey wall, and a stretch of the outer curtain wall on the north-east side of the castle, known as the Avranches traverse: Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, 630−33; Brown 1966−85 (1985), 9−11, 28−40; Brown 1969a, 207−08; Renn 1969; Coad 1995, 23−37; Goodall 2011, 139−44. For a cautionary note, however, see Kevin Booth's chapter on the inner bailey in this volume.

7 Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, II, 632–3; Brown 1966−85 (1985), 11−12.

8 TNA: E 101/462/11.

9 Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, II, 633, quoting *PR 10 John (1207−8)*, 171; *Rotuli*

Clausarum, I, 142.

10 Coad 1995, 36–7.

11 Brodie 2011, 3; Brodie and Higgott 2011, 6. This conclusion is also supported in Cook, Mynard and Rigold 1969, 61.

12 TNA: E 101/3/25 m 5.

13 Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, II, 633–4.

14 Colvin 1971, 25, 27; *Cal Lib Rolls*, I, 133.

15 TNA: E 352/72 m 18. Gordon Higgott offers some comment on the late medieval situation in his chapter in this volume.

16 *Cal Lib Rolls*, I, 391.

17 *Cal Lib Rolls*, I, 456.

18 *Cal Lib Rolls*, I, 477.

19 Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, II, 640. See, also, the chapter by Chris Phillpotts in this volume.

20 *Cal Lib Rolls*, I, 482.

21 *Cal Lib Rolls*, I, 491.

22 London, College of Arms: MS Philipot, P.b 47.

23 Colvin, Ransome and Summerson 1975, 245−6, quoting BL: MS Lansdowne 48, no 35.

24 *Cal Lib Rolls*, II, 176. According to Brown, Colvin and Taylor (1963, II, 636) it was built in 1244.

25 Colvin, Ransome and Summerson 1975, 245−6.

26 Lyon 1813−14, II, 67.

27 The catalogue entry to an early 18th-century plan in Historic England's archive suggests that one magazine was located in the building immediately to the north-west

of Arthur's Hall: HEA: MP/DOV0025. See, also, the chapter by Paul Pattison in this volume.

28 *Cal Lib Rolls*, III, 27.

29 Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, I, 124, 497–8; Emery 1996−2006, III, 257−8. There was also a similar arrangement at Woodstock, for which, see ibid, II, 1013.

30 *Cal Lib Rolls*, III, 120. Brown, Colvin and Taylor (1963, II, 637) say 'above the cistern'. From the 14th century there is a reference to the Cistern Chamber or chamber beyond the cistern: TNA: E 101/13/22; E 101/462/23 m 3.

31 On the 1746 plan (Fig 13.7), the cistern is marked 'S'. The original plan is HEA: MP/DOV0030, also reproduced in Brodie and Higgott 2011, 25. The suggestion that the cistern survived from 1247 is of course speculative, and 'S' might equally be the new cistern known to have been completed within the inner bailey in the 1740s: see chapter by Paul Pattison in this volume. Rigold suggested the 1247 cistern may well be represented by the barrel-vaulted 'basement' beneath Keep Yard 8: Cook, Mynard and Rigold 1969, 57.

32 TNA: E 101/462/23 m 1; E 101/462/27 m 2.

33 It is labelled 3 on the drawing. Today the building houses one of the site shops.

34 TNA: E 101/462/16 fols 6v, 8v; E 101/462/27 m 2; E 372/208 m 43; E 101/462/23 mm 1, 3.

35 TNA: E 101/462/15 m 5; E 101/462/12 m 1; E 101/13/22.

36 TNA: E 101/3/25 mm 4, 5, 6d; E 101/462/9; E 101/462/13 m 1, E 101/462/10 m 2, E 352/72 m 18.

37 TNA: E 101/462/11; E 101/462/23 m 3; E 101/462/16 fol 6v; E 101/462/12 m 1; E 101/462/13 m 2.

38 TNA: E 101/462/9. Although interpreted as a kitchen in the Great Tower project,

Steven Brindle and Philip Dixon (chapter in this volume) acknowledge that the ground floor of the tower could have been put to other uses.

39 Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, II, 638, quoting *Cal Pat Rolls*, 1272−81, 259.

40 TNA: E 101/462/9; E 101/462/12 m 1; E 352/72 m 18; E 372/123 m 21.

41 TNA: E 101/3/25 m 5; E 101/462/13 m 2.

42 Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, II, 638, citing TNA: C 145/92/9.

43 Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, II, 639.

44 Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, II, 640; TNA: E 101/39/21; E 101/462/27 m 2.

45 Lambarde 1970 (1576), 142.

46 For further insight, see the chapter by Gordon Higgott in this volume.

47 For further views on the service arrangements, see the chapters by Chris Phillpotts and by Steven Brindle and Philip Dixon in this volume.

48 *Rotuli Clausarum*, I, 142.

49 See Tom Cromwell's chapter in this volume.

50 Cook, Mynard and Rigold 1969, 65, fig 5, 73−4.

51 See above, 00, and n 11. Of course, John's 'new hall' is the 'old hall' of later documents.

52 This building is now the Princess of Wales's Royal Regiment & Queen's *Regiment Museum. The inner face of its courtyard facade is not visible for inspection.*

53 *For the wall, see* Cook, Mynard and Rigold 1969, 65, fig 5, 73−4. For an alternative interpretation, see the chapter by Tom Cromwell in this volume.

54 *Again, see Tom Cromwell's chapter for a different interpretation.*

55 *Cal Lib Rolls*, I, 491.

56 TNA: E 101/462/20969.

57 *In general, see Wood 1965, 49−51; for Stokesay, Emery 1996−2006, II, 574−6; for*

Winchester, Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, II, 858−60; for Canterbury, Emery 1996−2006, III, 320−22.

58 TNA: E 101/462/12 mm 1, 2.

59 *My colleagues Steven Brindle and Richard Lea are less convinced that this feature is quite so late.*

60 *As shown, for instance, in Terry Ball's reconstruction of Arthur's Hall in Coad 1995, colour plate 11.*

61 TNA: E 101/531/22; E 101/67/18.

62 *These doorways, incidentally, are of fine Reigate ashlar, which is not otherwise found at Dover.*

63 *Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, II, 636; Coad 1995, 46.*

64 James and Robinson 1988, 63–7.

65 Lyon 1813−14, II, 68; and see Paul Pattison's chapter in this volume.

66 TNA: E 351/3259 (2).

67 *Leland, IV, 50.*

68 See, for example, BL: MS Cotton Augustus I. i. 19; I. i. 22, 23; I. i. 45; I. ii. 10; MS Additional 11,815A.

69 BL: MS Cotton Augustus I. ii. 9.

70 Hatfield House: MS CPM II/34.

71 For Bereblock, see Tyack 2004. His drawing of Dover is mistakenly dated to 1626 in Coad 1995, 32.

72 Lockyer 2004; Statham 1899, 286–7; Colvin, Ransome and Summerson 1975, 245. On Darell's manuscript, see Jonathan Coad's chapter in this volume, n 16.

73 *For more detail on this, see the chapter by Gordon Higgott in this volume.*

74 For further detail, see the chapter by Paul Pattison in this volume.

75 Lyon 1813−14, II, 68; Statham 1899, 252–3.

76 *As Gordon Higgott notes in his chapter in this volume, the Portland stone doorway appears to have been dismantled in 1746. It is difficult to explain the use of Portland in the new barrack buildings unless it came from this now redundant feature. Even rusticated fragments may have been reused, in which case the stones have been turned around. My former colleague, Gordon Higgott, is less convinced.*

77 Howell 1998, 15–16; Howell 2004.

78 Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, I, 109.

79 *Ibid, 113, 120.*

80 *In sum, see Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, II, 633*–8.

81 Aside from Dover, the list of other sites where separately mentioned porches featured in the 1240s includes Clarendon, Havering, Ludgershall, Oxford and Woodstock. See Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, II, 730, 957, 987, 1011. James and Robinson 1988, 11, 93.

82 Jansen 2002, 96, 100–5.

83 Stalley 1971, 68; RCHME 1980, 8; Montague 2006.

84 Thurley 1995, 43.

85 Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, II, 910−18, with a plan at 913; James and Robinson 1988, 63–7.

86 Brown, Colvin and Taylor 1963, I, 494–504.

87 Binski 1986; Eames 1965; also Borenius 1943.

88 *Cal Lib Rolls*, I, 456.