THE CATHEDRAL LANDSCAPE OF YORK

The Minster Close c. 1500-1642

2 Volumes: volume 1

Stefania Merlo Perring, MA

PhD

Medieval Studies

September 2010

Abstract

This thesis is an interdisciplinary study of the York Minster Close between c.1500 and 1642. It seeks to develop a contextual understanding of the topographical and morphological development of York cathedral Close between the late fifteenth and the mid seventeenth century. The cathedral settlement represented a rare concentration of economic, temporal and spiritual power within medieval society. This study aims to establish the impact on the cathedral landscape of contemporary social, political and religious changes. It will explore the growing tensions between the Archbishop and Dean and Chapter and between the cathedral and the city. It will also try to understand how the heterogeneous communities who inhabited and frequented the Close were connected to ideas of landscape and environment. Finally it will be concerned with the Close as an urban space and will question how processes of urban change, such as decay and improvement affected it.

Although the sources used for investigating the material culture of the Close are in great part documentary, the theoretical approach taken is drawn from post-processualist archaeology, interpretative anthropology and new history. The overall aim is to provide a narrative as a "thick description", moving through the different cultural layers that composed this landscape. York escaped large-scale institutional change, but the concepts of 'sacred space' which had so dominated its medieval character, was transformed. Outward conformity masked the deliberate concealment of precious objects such as St. William's shrine, whilst liturgy and literacy became closely entwined with the growth of the print and bookselling trades around the Minster. The presence of the Council of the North enhanced the role of the ecclesiastical and civil courts. New communities of lawyers, shopkeepers and tradesmen appropriated, subdivided and sub-let the Close buildings and the later sixteenth and early seventeenth century were characterised by a period of large-scale investment and modernisation of medieval mansions, including Sir Arthur Ingram's conversion of the former Archiepiscopal Palace to an urban residence and gardens.

Table of Contents

VOLUME 1

VOLUME 2

List of Illustrations

FIGURES

Fig. 13 Precentor's Court from north-east. The site of the Office of the Secretary on the foreground and the Wright House.

Fig. 14 The former hall of the Mansion of Fenton, now 10 Precentors' Court, from the north, showing medieval walls, a 16th C phase in bricks and 17th C gables.

Fig. 15 Details of northern face of the house, showing two phases of brick construction.

Fig. 16 Precentors' Court. The former brewery and stable.

Fig. 17 E. Ridsdale Tate, The Minster from Precentors' Court, 1912, private collection (published in York Civic Trust, York Minster Revealed, p. 27). Showing the Subdeanery and its medieval latrine from the west.

Fig. 18 The Subdeanery from the south-east, being demolished in advance of construction of Purey Cust hospital, 1913 (YAYAS published in Buttery, *Vanished Buildings*, p. 10). Showing the great chamber, the hall range (however, the portico or stair tower had been demolished) and the service end with a fireplace.

Fig. 19 Daniel King, Houses and shops on both sides of York Minster south door, 1656.

Fig. 20 Daniel King, 1656, details of bookshops, showing the counter and shelves of Foster's bookshop on the left.

Fig. 21 Limestone wall of the bookshops to the east of the cathedral south door, facing south (in Dean, 'Minster Yard and Minster Gates', p. 17).

Fig. 22 The house in Petergate to the west of the demolished South Minster Gate. The 18th C brick front is a veneer, the interior preserves the 15th C timber-framed house.

Fig. 23 Minster Gates from the south.

Fig. 24 12 Minster Yard. Magnesian limestone foundations of the Archbishop's Exchequer (in Dean, '12 Minster Yard', p. 17).

Fig. 25 The interior of the "Old Wills Office", c. 1810 (YAYAS photographic collection YML, D 584, reproduced by kind permission of the Dean and Chapter.

Fig. 26 St Michael-le-Belfrey east wall, showing the chases for the purlins and the roof scar (Masinton, 'Sacred Space', Vol. 2, p. 230)

Fig. 27 N. 52 Petergate. The Deanery Back Gate and the medieval path are still commemorated by a blocked arch on front and back of this 18th C building.

Fig. 28 Minster Yard. The site of the Deanery from west. The medieval path is still commemorated by a modern path and gate. The building to the right occupies the area of the service outbuildings of the Deanery.

Fig. 29 The Deanery from the north-west, c. 1820 (YML, Green Photographic Collection, Miscellanea Folder. Reproduced with permission of the Dean and Chapter of York Minster). Showing the crenellated wall and a doorway commemorating the medieval path.

Fig. 30 W. Monkhouse, The Deanery from the south-east, before 1831 (published in Buttery, *Vanished Buildings*, p. 2). The picture suggests that a link between the wings may have been added in the eighteenth century in place of the 17th C garden.

Fig. 31 Roof and mortice scars on the western face of the third buttress of the Chapter House.

MAPS

Map 1   Street plan of York (VCH, 1961).
Map 2   OS 1852 with boundaries of the extra parrochial area of Minster Yard.
Map 3   OS 1852 with boundaries of Minster Close from 16th and 17thC leases.
Map 4   The Archbishop's Palace, early 16th C.
Map 4a Minster Yard c. 1550.
Map 5   York Minster Close c. 1642.
Map 5a Minster Yard c. 1720.
Map 6   Estate of th.e Dean and Chapter in the Close , early 17th C.
Map 7   Estate of the Vicars Choral in the Close , early 17th C.
Map 8   Location of Prebendal Mansions and Deanery.
Map 9   The Archbishop's estate in the Close.
Map 10 West Minster Yard 16th and 17th C.
Map 11 Precentors' Court late 16th early 17thC.
Map 12 South side of the cathedral and Minster Gates.
Map 13 The Deanery, Warthill and the Mansion of Strensall.
Map 14 College Street and Ogleforth, early 17 th C.
Map 15 The eastern part of the Close: Minster Court early 17th C.
Map 16 Ingram's Mansion early 17th C.
Map 17 Buildings with conjectural form or dimensions.
Map 18 Map of York, 1545.
Map 19 John Speed, Map of York, c. 1611.
Map 20 Benedict Horsley, Map of York, 1697.
Map 21 Francis Drake, Map of the City of York, 1736.
Map 22 John Cossin New and Exact Plan of the City of York, 1726.
Map 23 Pierre Chassereau, Map of York, 1750.
Map 24 Thomas Atkinson, Map of York Minster Close, c. 1780.
          (BIHR, CC. Ab. 9).
Map 25 Map of York Minster Close, BIHR, Map, 24.
Map 26 Plan of Ingram Mansion and grounds 1782 (WYL, TN/YO).
Map 27 Plan of Cambhall Garth, York, 1833 (BIHR, CC, VC 11 1S).
Map 28 Plan of ground floor of 2, 3, 4 and 4 a Precentor's Court.
Map 29 Measured survey of cellars in 2 and 3 Precentors' Court.

Abbreviations

Cal. Pat. Rolls	Calendar of Patent Rolls
BAR	Britich Archaeological Records
BIHR	Borthwich Institute of Historical Research
CVMA	Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi
L & P	Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic
PRO	Public Record Office
RCHME	Royal Commission Historic Monuments England
TNA	The National Archives
VCH	Victoria County History
WYL	West Yorkshire Archives Leeds
YCA	York Civic Records
YMA	York Minster Archives
YML	York Minster Library

Acknowledgements

Arts & Humanities Research Council

Author's Declaration

I declare that this thesis is a presentation of original work and I am the sole author. This work has not previously been presented for an award at this, or any other, University. It does not contain previously published material by me or by others. All sources are acknowledged as References. All pictures and drawings are the work of the author unless otherwise specified; permission for reproduction and references are given in the captions.

CHAPTER 1. Introduction

This thesis is an interdisciplinary study of the York Minster Close between c.1500 and 1642. It seeks to develop a contextual understanding of the topographical and morphological development of York cathedral close between the late fifteenth and the mid seventeenth century. The cathedral settlement represented a rare concentration of economic, temporal and spiritual power within medieval society. This study aims to establish the impact on the cathedral landscape of contemporary social, political and religious changes. It will explore the growing tensions between the Archbishop and Dean and Chapter and between the cathedral and the city. It will also try to understand how the heterogeneous communities who inhabited and frequented the Close were connected to ideas of landscape and environment. Finally it will be concerned with the Close as an urban space and will question how processes of urban change, such as decay and improvement affected it.

The Cathedral settlement

The cathedral settlement is an important part of the historic landscape of cities. However, in many cases its boundaries and standing buildings have been obliterated by successive clearance and redevelopment. The need for archaeological study of these sites was recognised in France, where a general survey of the topography and development of cathedral closes in relation with their cities was produced in 1992, followed by a series of monographs.[1] The need to develop a more coherent and contextual understanding of the English cathedral landscape was identified as a research priority nearly a decade ago.[2] Studies have traditionally been concerned mainly with cathedral buildings or

---

[1] J.C Picard, *The Chanoines Dans la Ville. Recherche sur la Topographie des Quartiers Canoniaux en France* (Paris, 1994); Y. Esquieu, *Autour des Nos Cathédrales. Quartieres Canoniaux du Sillon Rhodanien et du Littoral Méditerranéen* (Paris, 1992); Q. Casez, *Le Quartier Canonial de la Cathédrales Saint- Étienne de Toulouse*, Archéologie du Midi Médiéval 2 (Carcasonne, 1998).

[2] R. Morris, 'The Archaeological Study of Cathedrals in England, 1800-2000. A Review and Speculation', in T. Tatton-Brown and J. Munby (eds), *The Archaeology of Cathedrals,* Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph 42 (1996), pp. 4-5.

with complexes such as bishop's palaces.[3] Surveys, such as the ones by the RCHME in Salisbury and in York, have concentrated on architectural and stylistic development of standing buildings in the precincts.[4] A more coherent development of the topography of closes has been considered within chapters in historical monographs of single cathedrals, or with regard to particular historical periods.[5] More recently interdisciplinary studies with an anthropological outlook have been concerned with communities within cathedral closes, such as Vicars Choral.[6] The potential for a contextual study of the monastic cathedral landscape has been demonstrated by Roberta Gilchrist for the Norwich Cathedral Close. However, Gilchrist's study has considered change in the context of evolution of the cathedral landscape in the *longue durée*. It relies mainly on the abundant standing and archaeological evidence, but it does not look at the historical data in detail. This thesis will provide important comparative evidence of the development of a secular, rather than monastic, cathedral landscape, but it will take a different approach. It will be an in-depth analysis of the landscape of the Close for a period including the three decades preceding the onset of the Reformation and up to 1642, when the Parliamentarians dissolved the Chapter and appropriated the Close.[7]

The archaeology of the Reformation of secular cathedrals precincts has been largely unexplored. Historical and archaeological studies concerned with material culture have mainly concentrated on changes to the interior of the

---

[3] M.W Thompson, *Medieval Bishops' Houses in England and Wales* (Aldershot, 1998); T. Tatton-Brown and J. Munby, *The Archaeology of Cathedrals,* Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph 42 (1996); A. Richardson, 'Corridors of Power: A Case Study in Access Analysis from Medieval Salisbury, England', *Antiquity* 77: 296 (2003): 373-384.

[4] RCHME, *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the City of York; Volume 5, The Central Area* (London, 1981); RCHME, *Salisbury. The Houses of the Close* (London, 1993).

[5] T. Tatton-Brown, 'The Buildings of the Bishop's Palace and the Close', in M. Hobbs (ed.), *Chichester Cathedral. An Historical Survey* (Chichester, 1994), pp. 225-246; C. Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral at York and the Topography of the Anglian City', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 151 (1998): 1-42; R. Horrox, *Beverley Minster. An Illustrate History* (Cambridge, 2000).

[6] R. Hall, and D. Stocker, *Vicars Choral at English Cathedrals. Cantate Domino. History, Architecture and Archaeology* (Oxford, 2005).

[7] G.E. Aylmer and R. Cant, *A History of York Minster* (Oxford, 1977).

cathedral and on the disappearance of chantry chapels.[8] Part of this lack of
interest may have been due to the lack of archaeological visibility of buildings
and the evidence of processes such as iconoclasm. Yet investment and pressure
for development are still visible in the documentary sources, as well as other
themes such as urban regeneration and more subtle evidence of adaptation. The
impact of the Reformation on English cathedrals, not only with regard to
institutional changes but also in the practices of the cathedral communities, has
been studied by Lehmberg. This historical study brings together information
from historical monographs of several monastic and secular English cathedrals,
but it is not concerned with the material culture of the closes.[9] The potential for
using documentary sources to reconstruct the appearance of vanished
Reformation landscapes has been demonstrated by the historian Paul Blaney.[10] In
order to study the early book trade he reconstructed the sixteenth-century
topography of St Paul's cathedral churchyard in London from leases and later
maps. He was able to trace the line of the boundary wall and locate gates and
buildings within the precincts. However, his aim was to identify bookshops and
their occupiers and he did not discuss other themes concerning the Reformation
of secular cathedrals.

In this section I will first present a historiography of the York Minster Close
followed by a brief summary on the early history of the area. Lastly I will give
background information on the administrative structure of the cathedral.

Historiography of York Minster Close

In York a large amount of scholarship has been dedicated to art historical and
archaeological aspects of the cathedral building. The precincts, however, have
received comparatively little attention. Early antiquarians were not interested in
the history or architecture of the Close. Glover (1585) and Dugdale (1665-6), in

---

[8] Tatton-Brown and Munby, *Archaeology of Cathedrals*.

[9] S. E. Lehmberg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals: Cathedrals in English Society, 1485-1603* (Princeton, 1988).

[10] P. W. M. Blaney, *The Bookshops in St Paul's Cross Churchyard*, The Bibliographical Society, London, Occasional Papers, 5 (1990).

their respective *Visitations of Yorkshire* were mainly interested in copying heraldry from windows and funerary monuments within churches. Roger Dodsworth (1585-1654) wrote 161 volumes of manuscripts kept in the Oxford Bodeleian Library. His records are important because they pre-date the Civil War. Some of his books contain collections of documents and notes about York copied from several archives, but he was mainly interested in the affairs of the Dioceses of York.

Later antiquarians' works, such as Henry Keepe's *Monumenta Eboracensia* (1680), Matthew Hutton's *Antiquities of Yorkshire* (1659) and Henry Johnston (1669-70), were concerned with monuments such as the churches in the city, the cathedral and the Roman origins of York. James Torre wrote a history on the *Antiquities* (1691) of the Church of York, collecting documents and describing the material evidence. His manuscripts are a source for the appearance of the interior of the cathedral and its fabric but not for the Close. He was interested in the development of the jurisdiction of the Liberty of St Peter, in the lives of the Archbishops and clergy and in religious buildings such as the parish churches within the Close. Also Samuel Gale, in his *A Brief Historical View of the Severall Foundations and Buildings of the Cathedral Church of York* (1699), is only concerned with the cathedral building. William Drake in *Eboracum* (1736) was interested in describing the location of the gates of the Close and of prominent buildings such as St William College and the Treasurer's house. He commented briefly on the prebendal mansion leased to lay people and complained about the state of decay of the former Ingram Mansion. Other antiquarians such as Halfpenny and Hargrove were developing an interest on the style of buildings and turned their attention to the Archbishop's Chapel, debating whether or not this was the St Sepulchre chapel.[11]

---

[11] J. Halfpenny, *Fragmenta Vetusta, or the Remains of Ancient Buildings in York, Drawn and Etched* (York, 1807), pl. 18-19; W. Hargrove, *History and Description of the Ancient City of York*, 2 Vols. (York, 1818), pp. 121, 126-30; F. Drake, *Eboracum, or the History and Antiquities of the City of York* (London, 1736), pp. 570-573. See Chapter 2. 6. 2 pp. 127-31, for the chapel. This debate is significant because the antiquarians were still in the process of developing a chronology of architectural style

Late antiquarians such as Browne and Raine, who published a selection of
documents from the Dean and Chapter archives, followed on the same line.[12] If
antiquarians did not consider the built environment and topography of the Close
interesting, lawyers did. A lawsuit of the 1770s concerning the lease of the
Archbishop's Palace shows how lawyers were trying to establish the phases of
development of the place, with the help of documents and of expert witnesses
such as the cathedral's carpenter and architect.[13] The technologies of historical
enquiry were originally developed for the need of the legal profession: Jean
Mabillon published De *Re Diplomatica* in 1681 to help lawyers establish
property rights. It is interesting that in this instance the lawyers were also
interested in dating the fabric of buildings. Other antiquarian sources are
comments by seventeenth-century visitors writing about the landscape of the
Close.[14]

Only in the past three decades has the history of the close been the subject of
systematic studies. The volume by Aylmer and Cant on the history of York
Minster is a starting point for the history of the cathedral and its communities.
However, it does not engage with the buildings and material culture of the
Close.[15] The buildings in the Close have been recorded by the RCHME survey
on the central area of York.[16] Only the surviving ones have been considered;
plans and elevation drawings have been produced, with an analysis of
architectural features. Primary historical research, however, was limited to
eighteenth and nineteenth-century sources and earlier phases of the buildings,
even if recognised, were not investigated. Above all the buildings were
considered individually, dispersed in a gazetteer for the city and not as part of a
group representing the Close.

---

[12] J. Raine (ed.), *Fabric Rolls of York Minster with an Appendix of Illustrative Documents*,
Surtees Society 35 (1859); J. Browne, ed. *Fabrics Rolls and Documents of York Minster; or, a
Defence of the History of the Metropolitan Church of St Peter* (York, 1836).

[13] BIHR, CC. Ab. 9, York.

[14] D. Palliser and M. Palliser, *York As They Saw It - from Alcuin to Lord Esher* (York, 1979).

[15] Aylmer and Cant, *A History of York Minster*.

[16] RCHME, *York. The Central Area.*

The early medieval topography of the Close has been studied by Christopher Norton.[17] The formation of the Dean and Chapter estate and the medieval topography of the Close have been studied by Sarah Rees Jones on the basis of medieval documents and later maps.[18] Background information from these works will be further discussed below. In two articles Ron Butler has shown the potential of the written sources for the study of the seventeenth-century redevelopment of the Archbishop's Palace by Arthur Ingram and the Close.[19] However, he focused on the Ingram Mansion and its features rather than on other buildings within the Close; he located earlier structures but did not discuss them. Major changes in the landscape of the Close, such as the re-ordering of the Close at the beginning of the nineteenth century and the installation of a water tank in the 1940s, which resulted in the destruction of archaeological stratification, were not recorded.[20]Major archaeological excavations in the 1960s and 1970s recorded only material from the Roman barracks blocks.[21]More recently excavations to selected areas and geophysical surveys have been carried out in advance of redevelopment of the Minster Library.[22] The area to the south of the cathedral was also the object of a series of archaeological watching briefs.[23]

---

[17] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral'.

[18] S. R. Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents: Some Aspects of the Topography and Economy of Medieval York', Unpublished DPhil Thesis (University of York, 1987).

[19] Butler, R.M. 'York Palace, a Vanished Jacobean Mansion', *York Historian* 8 (1988): 25-45; R. M. Butler, 'Notes on the Minster Close at York', *York Historian* 14 (1997): 10-25.

[20] BIHR, AP 1813/1; Ap 1825/1, Parliamentary Acts for enlarging and improving the Minster Yard.

[21] D. Phillips and B. Haywood, *Excavations at York Minster, Vol I: From Roman Fortress to Norman Cathedral* (London, 1995).

[22] Field Archaeology Specialists, 'Archaeological Excavation and Survey, York Minster Library', Field Report (York, 2000).

[23] G. Dean, '12 Mister Yard, York. A Report of an Archaeological Watching Brief', York Archaeological Trust, Report 49 (2003); G. Dean, 'Minster Yard and Minster Gates. Excavations and Watching Brief Report', York Archaeological Trust, Report 11 (2008).

York Minster in context

Topography

The Minster Close is located on the northern corner of the medieval city of York, on the site of the north-east quarter of the Roman Forteress of Eboracum. (Map 1) It occupied an area of about 40,000 square meters, lying between the medieval city walls, which preserve the line of the Roman walls, Petergate, that is the Roman cardo maximum, and Goodramgate. The "Close" of York Minster is mentioned in medieval and later documents and I will discuss the nature and location its boundaries in chapter 3.1. The cathedral occupies the centre of this area and stands isolated from the rest of the city by squares and parks. This is the result of a process of clearance carried out between the eighteenth and the twentieth centuries, culminating in 1903 with the opening of Deangate, a road joining the Railway Station and Moonkgate.[24] In addition the remaining buildings in the Close were extensively redeveloped during the same period. This means that the form of the medieval and early modern settlement can only be reconstructed archaeologically.[25]

The earlier topography of the site had a long lasting influence on the cathedral settlement. (Fig. 1) This topic has been already discussed by many authors, therefore only some points important for the understanding of the late and post-medieval Close will be highlighted.[26] There was a bishop in York as early as 314, when he attended the Council of Arles. However, the site of the late antique cathedral is not known.[27] The Anglo-Saxon cathedral was founded in 627 on the north-east corner of the Roman Forteress of Eboracum, on the site of the present cathedral precinct. Christopher Norton suggests that the Anglo-Saxon cathedral

---

[24] P. M. Tillott,*VCH of the County of Yorkshire. The City of York* (Oxford, 1961), p. 308.

[25] BIHR, AP 1813/1; Ap 1825/1, Parliamentary Acts for enlarging and improving the Minster Yard.

[26] Phillips and Haywood, *Excavations at York Minster*; Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral'; S. Brown, *York Minster. An Architectural History c1220-1500* (Swindon, 2003), pp. 1-3.

[27] R.M.T Hill and C.N.L. Brooke, 'From 627 until the Early Thirteenth Century', in G.E. Aylmer and R. Cant (eds), *A History of York Minster* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 1-3.

may have been located in the centre of a square enclosure, the alignment of which has been preserved by the ranges of the Archbishop's Palace and by the prebendal houses in Minster Court.[28]. The Episcopal complex therefore would have been enclosed by the Roman defences to the north-east and north-west and it would have been in proximity of one of the Roman gates and of a main road. This was the *via Principalis*, which was the *cardo maximus* of the Roman Fortress.[29] The location of an early medieval cathedral complex in the corner of a Roman town, on a major road axis leaving toward the countryside and in proximity of a gate, is commonly found in European and British contexts.[30] This explains the frequent association between cathedral complexes and city walls, which remained an important feature in post-Reformation closes.

The marginality of the cathedral complex was traditionally explained with the late arrival of Christianity in the antique city and thus with the availability of urban space. However, more recently Maureen Miller has argued that the role of the bishop had been the fundamental reason for this location. The cathedral belonged to the dioceses and not only to the city. The main concern of the early medieval bishops was to establish Christianity.[31] They were missionaries civilising the unruly countryside from the edge of a walled city. The connection of cathedral complexes with main road axes and gates was therefore symbolically important. In York, Paulinus was in charge of converting pagans living in the Deiran countryside.[32] Some of the cathedrals such as Milan and

---

[28] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral', pp. 15-7.

[29] P. Ottaway, *Excavations and Observations on the Defences and Adjacent Sites, 1971-90*, The Archaeology of York 3 (1996), p. 98.

[30] M.C. Miller, *The Bishop's Palace* (Ithaca and London 2000), pp 17-8; among the best Italian examples are Milan, Ravenna, Florence, Pisa and Turin. Picard, *The Chanoines dans la Ville*, pp. 27, 135, 163, 223, 317, 343, 365. In both Italy and France the authors consider also the effect of rivers and high places within the city in the choice of sites. Best examples in France are found in Arles, Autun, Langres, Narbonne, Toulouse and Valence.

[31] Miller, *The Bishop's Palace,* pp. 17-9, notes with archaeological bibliography.

[32] D. Rollason, D. Gore and G. Fellow-Jensen, *Sources for York History to AD 1100* , The Archaeology of York 1 (1998), pp.127-9, 134-5. Hill and Brooke, 'From 627', p. 4. The location of Anglo-Saxon cathedrals in respect to the Roman defences and roads seems to follow the continental pattern. This was the case for example also in Winchester, Canterbury and London, which were also Gregorian missions. D. Perring, *Roman London* (London, 1991), pp. 130-1 suggested that in London the establishment of the cathedral within the Roman walls, on the site

Paris became centred in the late medieval period.[33] But others such as York
Minster had maintained their marginality with respect to the city. The cathedral
settlement therefore, maintained its connection with both the city and the
hinterland. This remained a feature through the centuries and will be explored
throughout this thesis.

Norton has provided a useful account of the early topography of the Close and
the architecture of the cathedral.[34] Following the Norman Conquest a new
cathedral was built on the site of the present one by the Archbishop Thomas of
Bayeux (1070-1100). One of his successors, Roger of Pont-l'-Évêque (1154-81)
built the choir and other areas of the cathedral. He also built the Archbishop's
Palace and the chapel of St Mary and the Holy Angels, connected with the
cathedral.[35] Christopher Norton suggests that the Anglo-Saxon cathedral may
have been located in the centre of a square enclosure, the alignment of which was
rotated with respect to both the alignment of the Roman Fortress and that of the
Norman cathedral. (Fig. 2) This alignment has been preserved by the remains of
the Archbishop's Palace to the north of the Close and by the prebendal houses in
Minster Court.[36] There has been continuity in the ownership of this area. When
the chapter was reformed by Thomas of Bayeux, archiepiscopal land around the
Minster was given to the Dean and Chapter. However, this area to the north of
the cathedral remained the estate of the Archbishop. This was the origin of
different areas of jurisdiction in the Close, which continued until the nineteenth
century and will be discussed in more detail below. The Gothic Minster was built
between c. 1225 and c. 1500 and major domestic buildings were also completed

---

of the present St Paul's, rather than representing a continuity of the idea and of the role of the
antique city as a civic and administrative centre, may have derived from contemporary
continental practices.

[33] Miller, *The Bishop's Palace,* pp. 137-9. Other cathedrals like Pisa and Turin remained on the
margins. Paris, Musee Carnavalet, Matthieu Merian, Plan de Paris, 1615.

[34] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon cathedral'.

[35] C. Norton, *Archbishop Thomas of Bayeux and the Norman Cathedral of York*, Borthwick
Institute of Historical Research Borthwick Papers 100 (2001); D. Phillips, *Excavations at York
Minster, Vol II. The Cathedral of Thomas of Bayeux* (London, 1985).

[36] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral', pp. 15-7.

by this date. [37] Indeed some of them were going out of regular use, such as the Archbishop's Palace. [38]

The secular cathedral of York: administrative structure and jurisdictions.

To understand continuity and change in the sixteenth-century Close it is necessary to explain the organisation of the cathedral administration. Since the eleventh century the canons in York Minster were secularised, meaning that they did not follow a rule prescribing communal life and seclusion. Archbishop Thomas of Bayeux introduced the prebendal system shortly after his arrival in York in 1070.[39] The canons by 1086 had already abandoned a common life and they may have been already living in independent residences, most of them located in the area around the cathedral. Therefore, in contrast with monastic cathedrals the late medieval precincts were not structured for a clergy leading a communal life.[40] For instance in York there was not a cloister to segregate holy people from the rest of the community. The chapter was reformed by Archbishop De Grey (1215-1255), who gave more autonomy to the Dean and Chapter, built a new large chapel in the Archbishop's Palace, now the Minster Library, and moved out of York to Bishopsthorpe. This was a pattern which occurred in twelfth-century Italian cathedrals, for instance, and appears to be common at a slightly later date in English cathedrals.[41] This was a consequence of the Gregorian reform, requiring the bishops to withdraw from secular power and to construct their authority as spiritual. By the end of the thirteenth century the

---

[37] Brown, *York Minster*.

[38] See Chapter 2. 7. 1.

[39] S. Brown , *The Medieval Courts of the York Minster Peculiar,* Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 66 (1984), pp. 1-3.

[40] R. Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close. The Evolution of the English Cathedral Landscape* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 44-45. Esquieu, *Autour des Nos Cathédrales,* pp. 133-7.

[41] Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close*, pp. 144-5; Thompson, *Medieval Bishops' Houses.*

Chapter was composed of 36 canon prebendaries, four dignitaries and the Dean.[42]

The prebendaries of York were amongst the richest magnates of the north of England. This wealth allowed them to maintain great households, fund chantries, and also contribute to the rebuilding of the Minster.[43] The documentation of the maintenance and building of prebendal town houses belongs to the private archive of each prebend. The Prebendal Records were in great part lost when the Ecclesiastical Commissioner took them to London in 1840 and then returned them to the archives of the Borthwick Institute.[44] Sarah Rees Jones has explained the formation and growth of the Chapter estate. Prebends were created by endowments of land from the Archbishop's estate, both within the city and outside. The dignitaries and some of the earliest prebends had their mansions in the cathedral precincts, in the area comprised between Petergate and Goodramgate. Other prebends were located on the east side of Goodramgate, to the south of Petergate and along Stonegate.[45] A separate Fabric Fund was created at some point but is only sparsely documented before the mid thirteenth century.[46] This served to finance the administration and construction of the Minster.

In addition to the prebendal estates there was the Chapter Common Fund, which served to support the liturgical activities of the cathedral. It was endowed with the tithes from several parish churches and with the best estate in the city and the hinterland.[47] This fund continued to grow with the donation of lands for obits and chantries. The canons in York were mainly absentees, some holding offices in other cathedrals, others working for the King and others living in Italy. To

---

[42] B. Dobson, 'The Later Middle Ages 1215-1500', in G.E. Aylmer and R. Cant (eds), *A History of York Minster* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 50-2.

[43] Dobson, 'The Later Middle Ages', pp. 50-4.

[44] BIHR, CC. P.

[45] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 1, p. 101.

[46] Dobson, 'The Later Middle Ages', pp. 59-61 and YMA, E3.

[47] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 1, pp. 110-116.

administer the cathedral the Dean and Chapter founded the College of the Vicars Choral in the 1240s. They were substites for the absentee canons in the liturgy and administration of the cathedral and lived a communal life in their College, the Bedern.[48] This new body attracted further donations of land.[49] In conclusion in the second half of the thirteenth century the Dean and Chapter estate was expanding, incorporating new lands.[50]

The Jurisdictions of York Minster.

With new acquisition of land the Dean and Chapter were not only accumulating wealth but also extending their jurisdiction. The Dean and Chapter had two kinds of jurisdiction, one based on privilege of exemption and the other on privileges of immunity. Barbara Rosenwein has explained the formation of the jurisdictions of immunity and exemption from late Antiquity and I will return on this subject in Chapter 4.[51] Exemptions were given by Popes or more infrequently bishops and were liberties on matters of spiritual authority. The Peculiar Jurisdiction of the Dean and Chapter was an exempt jurisdiction, responsible for administering ecclesiastical law.[52] When land was acquired by the Dean and Chapter estate, the tenants became subject to their spiritual jurisdiction. This meant that they became also exempt from that of the bishops and archbishop. Sandra Brown argues that "The Capitular Peculiar jurisdiction formed an enclave within the dioceses" within which the Archbishop had no responsibility. With the expansion of the Dean and Chapter estate their spiritual jurisdiction was also expanding. At the peak of its development the Peculiar jurisdiction was found in 134 parishes and

---

[48] Hall and Stocker, *Vicars Choral*; F. Harrison, *Life in a Medieval College. The History of the Vicar Choral of York* (London, 1952); J. D. Richard, *The Vicars Choral of York Minster: The College at the Bedern* (York, 2001).

[49] B. Dobson, 'The Later Middle Ages', pp. 44-110. On absenteeism in the Chapter. S. Rees Jones 'God and Mammon: the Role of the City Estate of the Vicar Choral', in R. Hall and D. Stocker (eds) *Vicars Choral at English Cathedrals. Cantate Domino. History, Architecture and Archaeology* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 192-199.

[50] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 1, pp. 90-91.

[51] B.H. Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space. Power, Restraint and Privilege of Immunity in Early Medieval Europe* (Ithaca, 1999).

[52] Brown , *The Medieval Courts.*

townships. The great majority of these were within 20 miles of York. However, there were properties as far away as Exeter. [53] Towards the end of the thirteenth century there were conflicts about the extent of the authority of the Dean and Chapter Peculiar jurisdiction. The final confrontation happened in 1336-8 in a dispute with Archbishop Melton. The Chapter obtained full jurisdiction over its tenants and parishioners. The Archbishop with respect to the Dean and Chapter subjects, was still responsible for appeals and tuition as a papal delegate.[54]

The secular jurisdiction of the Dean and Chapter was the Liberty of St Peter. Matters of criminal and civil law of the tenants of the Dean and Chapter were the responsibility of this jurisdiction. Privileges of immunity from interference of secular powers were established during the middle ages by a series of royal charters to the Archbishop.[55] During the reform of the chapter, as the estate of the Archbishop was transferred to the Dean and Chapter, this jurisdiction was transferred also. Moreover, when new lands were donated, their jurisdiction was growing at the expenses of other jurisdictions. This created conflicts with competing authorities, especially the Mayor and the Communality of York. During the second half of the thirteenth century the jurisdiction of the Liberty was still being contested. In 1250 the King's justices were forbidden to hear pleas from the Dean and Chapter tenants. In 1260 there were complaints that a prisoner of the Dean and Chapter had been arrested and killed before being tried in the Liberty of St Peter court. In 1275 St Mary's Abbey and the Dean and Chapter complained to the Parliament to have their exempt jurisdiction confirmed. In 1276 there was a quarrel with the Mayor and Communality that the Dean and Chapter tenants were privileged and that the Dean and Chapter also had jurisdiction also in spiritual matters on some York citizens.[56]

---

[53] Brown , *The Medieval Courts,* p. 16.

[54] Brown , *The Medieval Courts*, p 17.

[55] A. Leak, *The Liberty of St Peter of York 1800-1838*, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 77 (1990), p. 3.

[56] Leak, *The Liberty*, p. 3; Tillott, *VCH York*, pp. 38-39.

The territorial extension of the Liberty of St Peter and of the Peculiar Jurisdiction was not limited to the cathedral precincts but extended across the regional hinterland and beyond. The Close was not only the seat of the Dean and Chapter jurisdictions but also the seat of the spiritual jurisdiction of the Archbishop over the territory of the second of the two Archdioceses of England. The jurisdiction of the Archbishop as the secular lord of his estate, however, was administered from Bishopsthorpe and other palaces.[57] Despite the institutional changes of the Reformation the Peculiar jurisdiction, the Liberty of St Peter and the Archbishop's ecclesiastical jurisdiction continued until their abolition in the nineteenth century.

Material Culture

Previous scholarship has focussed mainly on the institutional and economic history of York Minster. However, the anthropological approach advocated by Morris in 1995 for the study of cathedral communities, has been applied to the material culture of the Vicars Choral.[58] The focus therefore has been on the Bedern rather than on the Close. The period between the Reformation and the Civil War has been addressed by historians focussing on institutional changes, political events and biographies of people.[59] However, so far there is not an accurate reconstruction of the Close as it appeared at the eve of the Reformation, nor an understanding of how it changed.

The discussions about institutions, jurisdictions and people to date have not considered the materiality of the Close. In order to explore these issues further it

---

[57] BIHR, C, Ab, Archbishops' Registers.

[58] Morris, 'The Archaeological Study of Cathedrals in England, 1800-2000', pp.4-5; Richards, *The Vicars Choral of York Minster*; Hall and Stocker, *Vicars Choral*.

[59] C. Cross, 'From the Reformation to the Restoration', in G.E.Aylmer, and R.Cant (eds*), A History of York Minster* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 192-232; C. Cross, 'Priests into Ministers: The Establishment of Protestant Practice in the City of York 1530-1630', in P. Newman Brooks (ed.), *Reformation Principles and Practice,* (London, 1980), pp. 205-25; C. Cross, 'Exemplary Wives and Godly Matrons: Women's Contribution to the Life of York Minster between the Reformation and the Civil War', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, Vol. 77 (2005), pp. 169-79.

should be possible to create a chronological descriptive analysis of the evidence from the record and to map it. However, I want to understand not only how the landscape changed but also how the transformation of the landscape itself was a means of structuring change. The sources I will use are in great part documentary, but I will interpret them in the way archaeologists think about material culture. In order to do this it is necessary to create a useful theoretical framework for interpreting landscape and buildings from a variety of disciplines.

1. 2 Theoretical and interpretative approaches

Landscape

The terms landscape and environment have multiple and complex meanings. There is not one fixed definition of what a landscape is, but ideas of landscape include both the material reality of a geographical portion of land and the ways, in which people represent, understand and use it. [60] Ideas of place, space and landscape have been explored in a wide range of contexts and within several academic traditions. How might one research and write about a place? The studies and approaches that have influenced my interpretation of a settlement are the ones bringing together archaeology, history, ethnography and anthropology. These were first developed in the 1970s and 1980s at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, especially by archaeologist Jean-Marie Pesez and his collaborators and have influenced the development of a European historical archaeology with an anthropological outlook. [61] Another study that has inspired my research is *Montaillou* by Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie. [62] This examines in detail the material and mental world of the inhabitants of the medieval village, describing their houses, environment, practices and beliefs. This kind of writing

---

[60] M. Johnson, *Ideas of Landscape* (Malden and Oxford, 2007) ; AHRC, *Landscape and Environment Research Programme Specification* (2005).

[61] J. M. Pesez, 'Histoire de la Culture Matérielle', in J. Le Goff (ed.), *La Nouvelle Histoire* (Paris, 1978), pp. 98-130; J. M. Pesez, *Brucato: Histoire et Archéologie d'un Habitat Médiéval en Sicile*, Collections de École Française de Rome 78 (1984); J. M. Pesez, *Archéologie du Village et de la Maison Rurale au Moyen Âge* (Lyon, 1998) ; Collectif, *Le Village Médiéval et Son Environnement. Études Offertes à Jean-Marie Pesez* (Paris, 1998).

[62] E. Le Roy Ladurie, *Montaillou, Village Occitan de 1294 a 1324* (Paris, 1975).

emerges from the *Annales* school and influenced micro-historians such as Carlo Ginsburg and more recently Reformation studies such as Duffy's *The Voices of Morebath*.[63] But as Johnson has observed this tradition goes back to E. P. Thompson, who was a direct inspiration for the Italian movement of micro-history.[64] It also resonates with anthropological approaches such as Geertz's "thick description".[65] This is a narrative, which acknowledges the fact that the author and his or her audience belongs to a different cultural context from the one of the stories being told. More importantly it recognizes that the narrator, in order to construct his or her interpretation, may have to rely on accounts of previous narrators who were themselves outsiders to the culture that is being studied. "Thick description" therefore is not merely a complex description, as the name may suggest, but it is a cross-cultural contextualisation of second or third level.[66] In the field of landscape archaeology scholars such as Mark Edmonds and Jon Finch have developed narratives of historical landscapes attempting a deeper understanding of past human experience, while taking into account the cultural differences between the present and the past. Edmonds uses the device of alternating creative writing and academic writing to keep his own experience separate from that of people of the past in a prehistoric context.[67] Finch suggests a narrative constructed around events at a specific moment in a specific place. He has shown how fine grained detail of everyday life can be weaved into larger themes when the context is highly literate.[68] My aim is to develop a

---

[63] C. Ginzburg, *Il Formaggio e i Vermi. Il Cosmo di un Mugnaio del '500* (Torino, 1976); E. Duffy, *The Voices of Morebath. Reformation and Rebellion in an English Village* (New Heaven and London, 2001).

[64] E. P. Thompson, 'Anthropology and the Discipline of Historical Context', *Midland History* 1: 3 (1972); E. P. Thompson, 'Patrician Society Plebeian Culture', *Journal of Social History* 7 (1974); Jonhson, *Ideas of Landscape*, p. 26.

[65] C. Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York, 1973).

[66] C. Geertz, 'Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture', in *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York, 1973), pp. 3-30 ; K. A. Appiah, 'Thick Translation', in L. Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (London, 2000), pp. 417-29, further discuss Geertz's "thick description" in the context of cross-cultural studies; see also K. Sturge, *Representing Others: Translation, Ethnography and the Museum* (Manchester, 2007).

[67] M. Edmonds, *Ancestral Geographies: Landscape Monuments and Memory* (London, 1999).

[68] J. Finch, 'Three Men in a Boat: Biographies and Narrative in the Historic Landscape', in *Landscape Research* 33 n. 5 (2008): 511-30, 528.

methodology, which allows not only a description of the Close, but a "thick description" of the different experiences of its inhabitants.

A landscape approach which has been much debated and criticised, is the "phenomenology" pioneered by Christopher Tilley for prehistoric landscapes.[69] He suggests that the subjective experience of people of the past can be accessed in some measure by archaeologists walking and working in the same landscape today. However, this empathy is problematic. In presuming an identity of experience between the past and the present, it denies the peoples of the past their difference or "otherness". [70] However, in contrast with Prehistory, in historical archaeology, especially because of the written sources, there is a wealth of information on past sensorial perceptions. Scholars are increasingly attempting a phenomenological interpretation of subjective experience, engaging not only with vision but with other sensorial experiences, such as smell and sound.[71] This study will discuss specific documentary information and what it can tell us about sensorial experience of places, such as views and smells, and concerns with hygiene and the environment. The approach I have adopted, however, will not attempt a phenomenological understanding of embodied experience of people of the past, but rather will be a cross-cultural understanding such as Geerts's "thick description".

Landscape in this study encompasses both the built environment and open areas. Landscape is not a thing to be observed but consists of material culture that is manipulated to structure senses of community, identity, power and control. I will consider buildings and areas in the Close as *locales*. These, according to Giddens notion, are physical places that are structured as settings for social interactions.[72] The same *locales* can provide the setting for a multiciplity of performances

---

[69] C. Tilley, *A Phenomenology of Landscape* (London, 1994).

[70] J. Barrett and I. Ko, 'A Phenomenology of Landscape. A Crisis in British Landscape Archaeology?', *Journal Social Archaeology* 9 (2009): 275-94

[71] P. Graves, 'Sensing and Believing: Exploring Worlds of Difference in Pre-Modern England: a Contribution to the Debate Opened by Kate Giles', *World Archaeology* 39:4 (2007): 515-31.

[72] A. Giddens, *Central Problems in Social Theory* (Basingstoke, 1979), pp. 206-7; A. Giddens, Constitution of Society: Outline of a Theory of Structuration (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 118-9.

taking place between different people at different times. For instance the cathedral and the Minster Yard are *locales* where different practices are carried out at different times. Also for Michel de Certeau "space is a place practiced".[73] In this thesis I will tend to use the word place to indicate the physical place and space to indicate the several kinds of social practices which are performed in a place. The landscape of the Close as a *locale* will be described in chapter 2, whilst in chapter 3, 4, 5 and 6 it will be discussed how the *locale* was manipulated to structure a number of social practices.

An archaeology of social practice

To move forward from the description of a physical place is necessary to develop a coherent approach to understanding how communities, behaviours, ways of life and social practices were structured trough the landscape. The most useful concept is Bourdieu's idea of *habitus*.[74] This can be defined as the cultural background that influences the ways in which people structure and understand the material world in their daily life. *Habitus* can itself be adapted and redefined by changes in social practices. The practices and uses of space construct and reinforce ideas that people have of themselves. I am interested in understanding whether there are distinctive ways of behaving within and between different communities in the Close. I will observe how people moves through space and how space is manipulated to facilitate or discourage certain behaviours.

One way to analyse this behaviour is the notion of *field of discourse*. For Foucault discourse is the way in which power and control is exercised over human and material resources, this discourse can be expressed by space. Dialectics of power are present in all human relations and therefore the study of space is the study of power.[75] Barrett has elaborated the idea of archaeological *field of discourse* to define the areas in time and space occupied by certain social

---

[73] M. De Certeau, *L'Invention du Quotidien. 1 Arts de Faire* (Paris, 1990), p. 173.

[74] P. Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge, 1977).

[75] M. Foucault ' The Eye of Power', in C. Gordon (ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* (New York, 1980), p. 149.

practices.[76] For instance the cathedral is a *locale* which is occupied by several *fields of discourse* relating to religion, law, literacy and aesthetics. All of these are manifested in the material culture. Since power is so pervasive in society, commercial, educational and domestic spaces are also *field of discourse*. These overlapping areas are defined by social practices; therefore *fields of discourse* can even spill out of the boundaries of the Close into the geography of the city and the hinterland. In chapter 3, 4, 5 and 6, I will try to discuss different *fields of discourse* operating in the *locales* of the Minster Close.

Reformation, continuity and change

Underpinning the whole thesis is the idea that the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were a period of rapid and considerable change. This was not only religious but also a political, socio-economic and cultural change. The debate on the archaeology of this period has been stimulated by two edited volumes on *The Age of Transition* between 1400 and 1600 and on the *Archaeology of Reformation*.[77] New fields of enquiry for the redefinition of sacred space during religious reforms have been opened by two edited volumes with an interdisciplinary approach: *Defining the Holy* and *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe*.[78] Andrew Spicer has discussed the destruction and rebuilding of the sacred landscape of Orléans, during religious conflicts in sixteenth-century France.[79] This is particularly relevant to the study of the Reformation of a cathedral landscape.

---

[76] J. Barrett, 'Fields of Discourse: Reconstituting a Social Archaeology'*, Critique of Anthropology* 7 (1988): 5-16, re-printed in J. Thomas (ed.) *Interpretive Archaeology: A Reader* (London, 2000), pp. 23-32.

[77] D. Gaimster and P. Stamper, *The Age of Transition. The Archaeology of English Culture 1400-1600*, The Society for Medieval Archaeology, Monograph 15, Oxbow Monograph 98 (1997); D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist, *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology, Monograph 1 (2003).

[78] W. Coster, A. Spicer, *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2005); A. Spicer, S. Hamilton, *Defining the Holy. Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2005).

[79] A. Spicer, '(Re)Building the Sacred Landscape: Orléans, 1560-1610', *French History*, 21 (2007): 247-68.

Archaeological evidence for continuity and change in this period is often characterised by a process of destruction, iconoclasm, decay or complete rebuilding, sometimes interpreted as evidence of Renaissance.[80] However, in the Close the transformation of the built environment was much more subtle than this: old structures were re-made and re-fashioned, rather than destroyed, gaining new meanings in the process. Moreover documentary sources provide information on slight alterations now invisible, insertions of partition, changes in the use of space and in the pattern of tenancies, which are keys to understanding how continuity and change were structured and what this might mean. Therefore methods to analyse the meanings of the form and use of space need to be found.

Interpretation of social space in plan and in elevation has been first developed by buildings archaeologists such as Roberta Gilchrist, Pam Graves and Jane Grenville.[81] The use of space has been analysed by looking at the movement of people within the buildings. The application of Hillier and Hanson's access analysis, considering the pathways into a building and the relative depth in space of rooms, had been used to study institutional buildings, gendered and domestic space.[82] It is a tool used by designers to determine the depth in space of a particular room, in order to detect circulation patterns; therefore it has limits in its application in archaeology. It concentrates only on movement from an entrance through a vector or carrier space and moreover it sees space as flat plan, not as tri-dimensional. Thus other elements need to be considered and one way is to create a contextual interpretation of space, including visual perception and sensorial experience.

Another way to understand the impact of social changes on the material culture of the Close is to look for evidence of the dynamic between tradition and

---

[80] Gaimster and Stamper, *The Age of Transition*; D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist, *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology, Monograph 1 (2003).

[81] R. Gilchrist, *Contemplation and Action. The Other Monasticism* (Leicester, 1995); P. Graves, *The Form and Fabric of Belief an Archaeology of the Lay Experience of Religion in Medieval Norfolk and Devon,* British Archaeological Reports, British Series No. 311 (2000); J. Grenville, *Medieval Housing* (Leicester, 1997).

[82] G. Fairclough, 'Meaningful Construction. Spatial and Functional Analysis of Medieval Buildings', *Antiquity* 66 (1992): 348-66; Gilchrist, *Contemplation and Action;* Richardson, 'Corridors of Power'; A. Richardson, 'Gender and Space in English Royal Palaces, c.1160-1540: A Study in Access Analysis and Imagery', *Medieval Archaeology* 47 (2003): 131-65.

innovation, continuity and change. The dynamic between tradition and innovation has been explored by several authors. For Gadamer the ability to understand a text requires for new information to be built on the familiar.[83] These ideas have been explored in the post-modern semiotic theory of architecture. To communicate effectively architecture needs to be accepted and comprehended, so it will produce objects that are in some measure conventional for the time and society. But also it will have informative, heuristic (meaning in this case "discovery" or "learning" rather than "empirical solutions") aspects that communicate something new. If the building forms are completely new and do not refer to the familiar past in some measure, the message is rejected or not understood. [84] Moreover, buildings and artefacts are polysemous; they carry information that can be interpreted by different groups of people according to a multiciplity of codes. These are specific and embedded in a cultural context, thus the need for a contextual interpretation of material culture.[85]

Conclusion

In this chapter so far I have explained the background for the study and the theoretical framework for an understanding of the landscape the Close. A narrative of landscape inspired by anthropological approach requires the consideration of a wide cultural context and therefore it is necessary to develop an interdisciplinary methodology and a research agenda focused on archaeological questions.

---

[83] H. G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (London, 2004), passim and pp. 110-9, 295.

[84] U. Eco, 'Function and Sign: The Semiotics of Architecture' in G. Broadbent, R. Bunt and C. Jenks (eds), *Sign, Symbols and Architecture* (Chichester, 1980), pp. 11-70; G. Broadbent, 'The Deep Structures of Architecture' Architecture' in G. Broadbent, R. Bunt and C. Jenks (eds), *Sign, Symbols and Architecture* (Chichester, 1980), pp. 119-69; R. Venturi, D. Scott Brown and S. Izenour, *Learning from Las Vegas. The Forgotten Symbolism of Architectural Form* (Cambridge Ma, 1986); T.A. Markus, *Buildings and Power. Freedom and Control in the Origin of Modern Building Types* (London and New York, 1993).

[85] C. Jenks, C, 'The Architectural Sign', in G. Broadbent, R. Bunt and C. Jenks (eds), *Sign, Symbols and Architecture* (Chichester, 1980), pp. 71-118. I. Hodder, *The Archaeology of Contextual Meanings* (Cambridge, 1987).

1.3 Research agenda and methodology

Interdisciplinarity

Although the subject of this thesis is the material culture of the Close, few primary data have been recovered through either new or published archaeological investigation. Surviving evidence from standing buildings was not enough to explain change in the sixteenth and seventeenth-century landscape. Instead a wide range of documentary and iconographic sources have been gathered and interpreted within an archaeological research agenda, meaning a focus on the material culture. The need for interdisciplinary research to be driven by archaeological research questions has been discussed by Kate Giles.[86] More recently Matthew Johnson has suggested an archaeological agenda for interdisciplinary landscape studies.[87] He argues for the integrity and independence of archaeology within interdisciplinary research, stressing that archaeology should not be limited to answering "questions defined in advance by the documentary records".[88] He further argues that similarly to material culture, text is active in constructing social relations. It is a technology of power and as such it should not be read as a mere recording of events but interpreted as active in creating and maintaining the social order.[89] The relationship between archaeology and text has been discussed by John Moreland first in 2001 and then reviewed and improved in 2006. Some of his conclusions are relevant to this study.[90] Writing about land management and building construction is a practice of space, because it consolidates speech into an idea of space.[91] A good example of this is to be found in Chapter 3.1, explaining how the boundaries of the Close, previously defined by the performance of rituals, became consolidated in the

---

[86] K. Giles, *An Archaeology of Social Identity: Guildhalls in York c. 1350-1630*, BAR British Series: 315 (Oxford, 2000), pp. 2-4.

[87] Johnson, *Ideas of Landscape*.

[88] Johnson, *Ideas of Landscape*, pp. 134-6.

[89] M. Johnson, *An Archaeology of Capitalism* (Oxford, 1996); J. Goody, *The Domestication of Savage Mind* (Cambridge, 1977) pp. 18, 36; W. J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy* (London, 2002) pp. 82-4.

[90] J. Moreland, *Archaeology and Text* (London, 2001).

[91] Ong, *Orality and Literacy*, pp. 82-4.

legal narrative of the leases. A second issue concerning archaeology and text is the fact that archival sources were produced by institutions and by literate people; powerless or illiterate people could not have produced documentation in person. This bias of the written sources made American historical archaeologist, such as John Deetz, think that ordinary lives are not fairly represented in the written record.[92] Thus they have argued that artefacts are a more objective representation of people of the past. However, I have already discussed how from a post-modern and post-processualist development, interpreting the connection between things and their meanings in the past is problematic rather than objective. Moreover, the "voiceless" people have not been excluded by the written sources, because their presence is inscribed in the text, as micro-historians, social historians and new historians have demonstrated in their work.[93] John Moreland concludes that boundaries between archaeology and text can be transcended by adopting a wide contextual approach.[94]

In this study I have attempted to connect archaeology and text at the methodological level, inspired by Bruno Latour's ideas on human agency, interdisciplinarity and technology.[95] Recent theoretical approaches in archaeology have paid attention to the transformative nature of the archaeological process, in which material evidence of the past during excavation is transformed, with the use of tools and technologies, into text, images or other media.[96] The archives produced are not always backed by material preserved in repositories or by standing evidence.[97] Moreover, these interpretations produced by archaeological process, rather than preserving the past by record, become new

---

[92] J. Deetz, *In Small Things Forgotten. An Archaeology of Early American Life*, 2nd edition (New York, 1996), pp. 258-9.

[93] P. Burke, *What is Cultural History?,* 2nd edition (Cambridge, 2008).

[94] J. Moreland, 'Archaeology and Text: Subservience or Enlightenment', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35 (2006): 135-51.

[95] B. Latour, *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory* (Oxford, 2005).

[96] C. L. Witmore, 'Symmetrical Archaeology', *World Archaeology*, 39:4 (2007): 589-96.

[97] Witmore, 'Symmetrical Archaeology', pp. 550-1, 553-4.

cultural objects in their own right.[98] Symmetrical archaeology is a theoretical development inspired by Latour actor-network-theory. Its aim is to recompose an understanding of the world and of human experience that had became too fragmented and specialised. The principle of symmetry allows to overcome the fragmentation between scientific and intellectual traditions and to recognise relationships and entanglements, without compromising the integrity of each one.[99] In this thesis I will practice interdishiplinarity not only by collating and giving equal weight to information obtained with different established historical and archaeological epistemologies, but also I will attempt to apply to the written sources methods elaborated in field archaeology for the interpretation of archaeological excavations. [100] For instance the primary sources relating to the Close have been approached in a similar way as they were the archives produced by archaeological excavations. Building accounts give information on the nature and quantity of building material and on activity carried out on construction or maintenance project. Leases and estate maps allow locating these activities topographically and give an indication of phases of use of buildings and open spaces. Both archives of archaeological excavations and estate documents represent the systematic recording of events, according to established epistemologies: the one of the Clerk of the Works recording construction and the one of the field archaeologist recording deconstruction (meaning dismantling) in the second. In interpreting the vanished material culture of the past, both the post-excavation analyst and the analysts of the documentary sources are not engaging directly with the physical evidence, but hermeneutically with records produced in a particular cultural context. Thus it could be argued that in the study of material culture there is symmetry between the practice of archaeology and the one of historical research. Text from historical sources could be interpreted with

---

[98] For a discussion see I. Hodder, 'Archaeological Reflexivity and the "Local" Voice', *Anthropological Quarterly*, 76, No. 1 (2003), pp. 55-69.

[99] Witmore, 'Symmetrical Archaeology' ; B. Latour, 'An Attempt at Writing a"Compositionist Manifesto"', in *New Literary History*, forthcoming, http://www.bruno-latour.fr/articles/article/120-COMPO-MANIFESTO.pdf

[100] Theoretical implications for archaeology and history will be discussed in a separate article, in preparation.

approaches first developed in urban excavations.[101] Sequences of events can be identified, grouped and phased. Building materials and objects recorder in the written sources can be studied with an archaeological approach.

Research questions

Three main research questions have guided from the start the gathering and analysis of data and their interpretation. The first question is to investigate the relationship between political, cultural and religious changes and the transformation of landscape. It will be argued that the changes in the landscape are not simply a reflection of wider changes in society but that the transformation of landscape is a mechanism through which change is structured.

The second question concerns the landscape as a means of structuring community. Living in the Close does not simply entitle people to a series of privileges. Rather the experience of living in the Close creates certain kinds of behaviour, identities and social relations. A "habitus" that can be recognised. Moreover I am interested in how links and conflicts with the city and with visitors were structured.

The third question is about the Close as urban space. The Close is often described as an enclave or a distinct space within the city, with a separate jurisdiction. But does this make it a non urban space? And whatever the answer, how do the wider processes of urban change, such as decay and urban regeneration, affect it?

The sources and methodology selected to answer these questions will be discussed in the following section.

---

[101] S. Roskams, *Excavation* (Cambridge, 2001).

The Sources.

Clearance of buildings was carried out in the York Minster Close from the late seventeenth to the eighteenth century, followed by road building and landscaping in the twentieth century.[102] The remaining standing secular buildings were extensively redeveloped in the same period.[103] Therefore for understanding the morphology of the sixteenth and seventeenth-century Close it is necessary to use a variety of sources and to develop a multidisciplinary methodology.

Data for standing building evidence were collected from the RCHME survey of the houses in the central area of York.[104] A limited number of hand-measured and TST surveys, with rectified photography, have been carried out to solve specific questions in Precentors' Court. Other evidence was provided by building surveys carried out by Anthony Masinton on the church of St Michael-le-Belfrey and by Jayne Rimmer's research on the houses in College Street.[105]

Excavations carried out in the 1970s in the cathedral and in the Minster Yard have been published in part.[106] Part of the archive is still being studied and the post- medieval period may have not been recorded in a systematic way. Some of the archive pictures showing stratigraphical sections occasionally can be correlated to the written sources.[107] This study however, was not concerned with post-excavation analysis of archives from 1970s excavations in the Minster Yard. More recently excavations and magnetic resistivity surveys have been carried out

---

[102] YML, The Proposed New Road Through Minster Yard : Correspondence and Data on the Subject (1901); BIHR CC.D/C 9, York/MY 1-3(7395a) An Act for enlarging and improving the Mister Yard of York Cathedral (1814).

[103] RCHME, *York, The Central Area*, passim.

[104] RCHME, *York, The Central Area*.

[105] A.W. Masinton, 'Sacred Space: Priorities, Perceptions and the Presence of God in Late Medieval Yorkshire Parish Churche's, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of York (2006); J. Rimmer, 'Small Houses in Medieval York and Norwich', Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of York (2007).

[106] Phillips and Heywood, *Excavations at York Minster*.

[107] YMA, YC Green Photographic Collection.

in the Dean Park.[108] Archaeological excavations in Deangate have provided useful information on the location of some of the sixteenth-century buildings.[109] In addition a particular kind of archaeological interventions is represented by nineteenth-century museum accession files, mapping and describing the retrieval of sculptural material in the Close during the nineteenth century.[110] (Fig. 70)

The second main group of evidence is represented by archival sources. These consist of estate documents of the Dean and Chapter and by legal documents. The building accounts of York Minster Fabric Fund for the year between 1500 and 1642 consist of 33 parchment rolls.[111] The lacunae in the chronological sequence and the reliability of information due to bad preservation will be discussed at the relevant points within the chapters of this thesis. The Fabric Accounts for this period are unedited, they are written in Latin until 1552 and then in English. A selection of information regarding the cathedral building and occasionally public buildings has been published by Raine and by Browne.[112] Anthony Masinton has examined information regarding the construction of St Michael-le-Belfrey.[113]However, information on domestic buildings, environmental practices and on the resident communities has been largely left unexplored. It is not the purpose of this study to give an edition of the Fabric Accounts, however, an indication of the physical dimension of their writing material gives an idea of the kind of labour involved in extracting the data. The rolls are on average between 0.80 and 1.0 m long and between 0.28 and 0.35 cm wide. They are written on both recto and verso. They contain the income and expenses of the cathedral's fabric written, usually in person, by the Keeper of the Fabric, who from 1535 is called the Clerk of the Works. Information is organised under a list of headings. The structure remained constant and continued the one

---

[108] Field Archaeology Specialists, 'York Minster Library'; Field Archaeology Specialists, 'York Minster and Minster Precincts, York: Conservation Management Plan' (York, 2008).

[109] Dean, '12 Mister Yard'; Dean, 'Minster Yard and Minster Gates'.

[110] Yorkshire Museum Trust, Yorkshire Museum.

[111] YMA, E3/33-64, rolls 1-3.

[112] Raine, *Fabric Rolls*; Browne, *Fabrics Rolls*.

[113] Masinton, 'Sacred Space'.

established in the first surviving roll E3/1 of c.1350. One of the headings useful for the purpose of this study is a list of tenants and rents for properties in the Close. Another one lists properties in Petergate. This information is useful to integrate the more accurate one from the leases, especially for the early sixteenth century when leases were still not used. However, the most valuable information in the rolls is the one on construction projects and maintenance of the environment. In contrast with the fourteenth-century rolls of the Vicars Choral recently analysed by Jayne Rimmer, these are not orderly accounts of building works managed week by week.[114] Information in the Fabric Rolls is dispersed under several headings and sub headings. Wages are structured by types of crafts, types of materials purchased and small expenses. The latter often contain information about a variety of odd jobs made by labourers or small purchases of various natures. Environmental practices that would have been impossible to retrieve from other sources are found under in this heading, as well as evidence of participation to the running of the cathedral by members of the resident community. Building accounts have been used by Salzman and by Aires to study working practices in the medieval period and in the sixteenth and seventeenth-century country houses.[115] More recently Masinton and Rimmer have discussed building practices and materials within the context of the York Minster Close.[116] This study will engage with their work in Chapter 6.3 by looking at the changes in the cathedral's craft community and in sourcing and uses of materials.

The larger group of sources is represented by the leases of the Dean and Chapter estate. The *Lease Registers* continue from the *Appropriation Register* which date from 1340-1507.[117] There are six volumes of bound parchment sheets for the period 1508-1728. They contain the leases of the Dean and Chapter common estate, of the Fabric Fund, of prebendal property, the deeds of the Archbishop Estate and granting of appointment of staff. They are written in Latin until 1558

---

[114] Rimmer, 'Small Houses', YMA, VC, b, 6-9.

[115] L. F. Salzman, *Building in England Down to 1540. A Documentary History* (Oxford, 1967); M. Airs, *The Tudor and Jacobean Country House: A Building History* (Stroud, 1995).

[116] Masinton, 'Sacred Space'; Rimmer, 'Small Houses'.

[117] YMA, M2/5.

and then in English. At the time of my research there was not a calendar and previous indexes in the volumes, when existing, were incomplete. A total of 1835 folios, written on recto and verso, have been examined to select at total of 95 documents. Late seventeenth and eighteenth-century leases until 1728 have been examined as later documents provide further accurate information such as dimensions. Moreover they can contain copies of previous leases which were not recorded in previous books. The leases are legal documents with formulaic clauses some of which are always present. A location clause always includes the parish, the street or a more precise topographical indication in relation to landmarks. Another clause describes the type of property, residential, commercial or mixed use. The number of shops and the existence of upper floors are also indicated. Occasionally the description of the property included recent changes to the layout of the house or additions. The abutting clause is crucial for precisely locating a property and for mapping it. Its original purpose is to locate the property in relation to the neighbouring ones. These are defined by the name of their respective owners, past owners or occupiers.

The leases are legal documents with formulaic clauses; however, they also contain qualitative information of perceptions of space and landscape. There are sentences and adjectives expressing judgements on size, relative age and appearance of structures; adverbs communicating perception of physical, administrative and ideal boundaries. Previous use is also sometimes indicated as a way to identify a particular building or area. Valuable qualitative information is also offered by the appurtenance clause. Its purpose was to to list all the possible features of a property, including the type of rooms and open areas, in order to avoid any ground for claims and court action between the parties.[118] The analysis of the leases has shown that the list of appurtenances although it may seems formulaic, is not random. It contains different features for each type of properties and its wording therefore needs to be carefully considered. The list of appurtenances, whilst is not a precise description of the property, gives important information on the structure of the proprety. The leases are also a rich source of

---

[118] R. E. Megarry and H. W. R. Wade, *The Law of Real Property* (London, 1959), p. 609.

social data on the inhabitant of the Close. They contain chronological information, names of lessors and lessees, their profession, resident status and for women marital status or parentage, is always indicated. There may also be additional information about sub tenants or occupiers. Convenant clauses at the end of the documents were additional agreements between the parties. They were unique for each property and usually consisted of requests, rules and prohibitions to the lessee by the landlords. The information provided by these convenants is very valuable for understanding the use of space and aspects of sixteenth-century society.

An additional register contains the leases of the Deanery property in the Close between 1617 and 1673.[119] The Chamberlain Rolls have been explored but found to be of limited use because they duplicate information from the lease.[120] The last group of documents consist of eighteenth-century law suits concerning the Archbishop's Palace and other eighteenth-century documents relating to prebedal houses.[121] Published sources, such as probate inventories and York City House Books, have been used to complete the information.

A third group of sources is represented by maps. Estate maps of the Dean and Chapter are integral to an understanding of the topography of the Close. Although they date from the eighteenth century, they are in agreement with earlier evidence from the written sources. Borthwick map 24 (Map 25) is used in conjunction with the OS survey of 1852 (Map 2) as the main base for the production of working CAD maps and the final GIS maps. In addition estate maps of the Ingram mansion (Map 26), plans of buildings by the RCHME survey, as well as plans from archaeological excavations, published or disseminated as grey literature, have been used to compose the GIS maps.[122]

---

[119] YMA, S3/5b.

[120] YMA, E1.

[121] BIHR, CC. Ab. 9, York; CC, P.

[122] RCHME, *York. The Central Area.*

The fourth group of sources consists of pictorial evidence. A large collection of about 100 prints and paintings representing the cathedral and its surroundings is dispersed in several museums and private collections. Copies of these as prints and slides are kept in the York Minster Library. The earlier representations are from the mid seventeenth century and can give information on vanished buildings, however, their iconology should be first considered carefully. These art works can be divided into two main groups. One constructs the cathedral as a classically isolated building, it anticipates the total clearance of the area by omitting existing buildings or offering impossible points of view. The space around the cathedral is expanded and practiced by well dressed people walking and by elegant horsemen. (Fig. 3) The second set of images show the cathedral in what it appears to be a more realistic context of cottages and orchards. In an 1820 painting the ruins of the Archbishop's palace are depicted by Paul Sandby Munn in a way which echoes contemporary romantic and picturesque views of the English countryside. (Fig. 4)The ruins of a grand past are populated with trees, urchins, and a pig and by a female figure framed by an arch. These representations show how the cathedral landscape may have constructed ideas of home or Englishness in the age of the Empire.[123]

Methodology

The first stage of the study consisted of archival research. Documents containing relevant information were selected and transcribed in Microsoft Word files, maintaining the original spelling. The data were then entered into a relational database made of Excel spreadsheets. Each of the leases was represented by a database record (row) and information divided into several fields (columns). Severa fields were created to cover chronological, geographical and social information. These were date, parish, names, profession and residential status of people exchanging contract, cross reference to previous leases, previous tenants, present and past occupiers; type and description of the property, location clause,

---

[123] M. Hallett, 'Pictorial Improvement: York in Eighteenth Century Graphic Art', in M. Hallett and J. Rendall (eds), *Eighteenth Century York: Culture, Space, Society*, Borthwick Texts and Calendars 30 (2003), pp. 24-49.

abutting clauses and boundaries, appurtenances, term of lease, rental value, paying days; standard clauses such as duty to mantain and repair the property; special clauses such as prohibition to sublet, frequent rights of inspection from the landlord, and convenant clauses. The Fabric Accounts rolls contained several contruction events for each year. A database record was created for each event, with fields for date, location, description of the event, building materials, craftsmen and their salary. Another spreadsheet was made for the pictorial evidence, with records for each picture and fields for date, subject, authors, medium, measurements and repository. In each Excell spreadsheet an additional field was created for the OS grid references, in order to connect the database records to a GIS.

The second objective consisted of locating the buildings and mapping them. With the exception of institutional buildings and some of the mansions, this was not a straightforward procedure. In the documentary sources buildings are located with reference to landmarks and then more precisely with reference to neighbouring properties. These are usually identified by the names of their contemporary or past tenants and occupiers. Therefore in order to locate a property is necessary to understand complex patterns of tenure and sometimes it is necessary to trace the the neighbourhood during the course of a century. The database was queried to cross reference information and neighbouring properties were grouped. Working diagrams, similar to stratigraphic matrixes, sketches and finally working models in CAD were used in this analytical process. For each area of the Close, the more appropriate historic maps were selected to locate and where possible to map the properties.[124] The reliability and research value of these maps for tracing sixteenth and seventeenth-century topography is discussed in Chapter 3. The digital OS Master Map of York, British National Grid Reference System 460341 451774 (Crown Copyright) in addition to plans of particular buildings drawn by the RCHME and archaeological plans were also used.[125] Assessment of standing

---

[124] See above p. 48.

[125] RCHME, *York. The Central Area.* See Appendix 3.

buildings and modern topography of the area of the Close were also carried out for reconstructing the sixteenth and seventeenth-century ones.

The migration of data from the database into a GIS was envisaged from the start as an analytical tool. However, in contrast with archaeological data for which the location is a starting point, the geographical grid reference of activities and building was the result of a long process. At that stage it was decided that the working-maps in conjunction with the database were adequate for a contextual interpretation of the sixteenth and seventeenth-century Close. However, the database produced by this research drawing together primary data, documentary, bibliographical references and pictorial sources, could be migrated into a GIS and made available as a resource for conservation of the cathedral precinct and for future research.

Having mapped the topography of the vanished buildings in the Close, the understanding of the built environment was integrated and refined with information from other sources. Information collected by the RCHME on the standing buildings and relating to their pre-eighteenth-century development, was reassessed. Pictorial and early-photography sources were used at this stage to understand the buildings in elevation. Data from archaeological excavations, which had received a post-excavation analysis and were disseminated at least as grey literature, were also integrated into the analysis. A limited number of measured surveys were carried out on selected standing buildings in Precentors' Court, to solve specific problems. The aim was to show the best example of correlation between information from the leases, the Fabric Accounts and archaeology. The sixteenth and seventeenth-century phases of development of standing building in the Close was described in Chapter 2 and documented with digital photographs.

Information collected in the database and information from literature on the use of space and on social practices in the landscape of the Close, was analysed and discussed in the cultural context of the time in Chapters 3 to 6. The contextual interpretation of the landscape of the Close was a reflexive process; when new understanding emerged by the analysis of data or by researching the literature,

the interpretation so far was reassessed. The constant frequentation of the site, walking and observing it with new insight and points of view was an important element of the research. Reflexivity meant that ideas about methodology of mapping and representation of space changed while writing Chapter 3 and this in turn influenced the production of GIS maps. Early-modern space was understood as a practice and not observed from high above. Mapping is a spatial discourse, therefore the GIS maps produced here are the final product of the interpretation of all thes sources, rather than the starting point of the analysis. They were created in Esri ArcGIS using as base map the digital OS Master Map of York, British National Grid reference system 460341 451774 (Crown Copyright). This was retained like a "watermark" in the background, to illustrate the earlier topography of the Close in relation to the present one. The historical maps and plans of buildings and archaeological excavations used as sources for this study and new surveys were used as raster images to create an ArcGIS mosaic dataset. (Appendix 3) The more appropriate maps or plans for each area or building were selected from the mosaic dataset and new ArcGIG shapefiles with separate layers for buildings, boundary lines, partitions and other features were created. From these, new interpretative shapefiles were created and published in PDF as layouts. If necessary, graphic information from maps was modified or integrated to reflect information from the documentary sources. The overlay of the mosaic dataset has shown that historic maps and plans, the OS Master Map and RCHME plans are in agreement with respect to landmark points, such as the cathedral, the city walls and prominent buildings. However, there are variations for the arrangement of the space in-between, therefore in creating maps, decisions needs to be made on the basis of the documentary evidence or of the agreement between two or more maps. Some of the vanished buildings, such as the ones in the area of the Masons' Lodge, the Deanery and some of the shops, were never represented in historic maps; although their location is known, their proportions and shape are conjectural. (Map 17) Other building, such as the Archbishop's Palace great hall, had well documented dimensions but its location is conjectural. (Map 4) Selected map layouts with labels were produced, they are meant to be a guide for explaining the text in Vol. 1. Distinct periods and phases of building activity and use are recognisable after the analysis of the sources. However, not all of them can be usefully represented or mapped. With the exception of the

well documented Archbishop's Palace and of the southern area of the Minster Yard, for the purpose of this study it has been decided to represent the Close in its maximum development of late sixteenth to mid seventeenth century. Historic documents and maps indicates that medieval structures still existed in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, but it is not always possible to delineate clear boundaries between phases of contruction on maps of vanished buildings. Periods of stagnation and periods when building activity is represented by repairs are documented by the written sources, but cannot be mapped and thus are described in the text.

Structure of the study

In Chapter 1, I have discussed the background of the study, the theoretical approaches, the sources and methodology. Chapter 2 draws on primary sources to provide a reconstruction of the topography and morphology of the Close. This information will support the contextual interpretations and "thick description" of social use of space developed in the other chapters of the thesis. Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6 are concerned with *fields of discourse*, which can be seen as several overlapping, but interconnected, layers of space. Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 are concerned with the social anthropology of two spatial themes. The first concerns the nature and practice of the boundaries of the Close, both external and internal. The second is concerned with the *habitus* of late medieval sacred space and with the transformations of these ideas occurring during the long Reformation. Chapter 5 explore *fields of discourse*, which were crucial for creating modernity. These are the practice of the law, the rise of consumerism, the distribution of printed material and the establishment of a modern system of education. Chapter 6 is concerned with practices of inhabiting a place. It will discuss transformation in the ideas of domestic space, changes in builders' working practices, ideas and management of the natural environment and resources. It also questions ideas of Renaissance and the English "urban renaissance". The titles of these chapters indicated their main emphasis, however, the anthropological approach, the creation of modernity and questions concerning meanings of inhabitation and Renaissance, apply to most aspects of this thesis. Appendix 1 contains tables with sources used and a glossary. Appendix 2 is a report of buildings

archaeology surveys in Precentors' Court. Volume 2 contains the illustrative material.

CHAPTER 2. The York Cathedral Settlement in the 16th and 17th Centuries: the Evidence

2. 1 Introduction

The administrative boundary of the Close

The nature and meanings of the boundaries of the Close will be discussed in Chapter 3. In this section a brief description of the administrative boundaries of the Close will be given, as defined in the location clauses of the sixteenth to eighteenth-century leases. This boundary line will then compared with the one recorded by the OS Map of 1852.

At the centre of the Close there was the cathedral, with the Archbishop's Palace to the north. Ten prebendal houses and the Deanery were located around the perimeter to the east, north and west of the cathedral. In the seventeenth century the Close included the Archbishop's Palace and portions of city walls, leased to Sir Arthur Ingram from 1617. (Map 3) The boundary followed the contour of the prebendal mansion of Fenton, reaching High Petergate. It then ran onto the back of the properties facing the street up to the West Minster Gate and gatehouse to the east. The row of tenements between the gatehouse and the church of St Michael-le-Belfrey were outside the Close.[1] To the east of the church the boundary ran on the back of the properties facing the street, joining the South Minster Gate. Across this stretch the boundary was marked by a "stone wall of the Dean", attested in 1424, before the construction of a house in that location at the end of the fifteenth century.[2] To the east of the South Minster Gate the boundary ran on the back of the properties facing Low Petergate up to the Deanery Back Gate. In this stretch the boundary between the properties in Petergate belonging to the Dean and Chapter and those of the Deanery, was marked by the "Deanery wall". This is attested in the leases in 1661 although

---

[1] See Chapter 2.2, p. 66.

[2] See Chapter 2.3.3, pp. 94-5.

there is no earlier information for the wall in this location.[3] The Deanery wall, however, did not join with the Deanery Back Gate and from this point onwards fences and garden walls constitute the boundary. Further east the boundary followed the contour of the Deanery yard, behind the Dean's tenements in Petergate, reaching the churchyard wall of Holy Trinity church in Goodramgate. From this point a palisade boundary headed north-west, still following the Deanery yard, eventually joining the south-east boundary wall of the prebendal mansions of Strensall and Wistow, the boundary then turning towards the east joining the East Gate of the Close in Goodramgate.[4] To the north of the gate the boundary followed the contour of the Cambhall Garth development, formerly a prebendal mansion and then the contour of the prebendal land of Huswayt and Salton, incorporated into St William College. The latter extended to Ogleforth, possibly just to the north of the Gate of the Close there. The east side of this street is more problematic, because the information from the leases is scarce. The church of St John-del-Pyke in 1543 was abutted by a house within the Close and therefore must have been either within or on the boundary of the Close. [5]

The OS map of 1852 records the local administrative boundaries of York.[6] (Map 2). The Minster Yard is marked as extra parochial and defined by the boundaries of the surrounding parishes. There are discrepancies between the boundaries marked in this map and the ones indicated by the location clauses of the leases. According to eighteenth-century leases, a property in High Petergate backing the Precentors' Court was within the parish of St Michael-le-Belfrey.[7] However, in the OS map, two properties to the east, one in Petergate and one in Precentors' Court are marked instead of the former one. Further east in Petergate the parish boundary ran along the northern edge of the street, including the land formerly occupied by the houses in front of St Michael-le-Belfrey and both tenements at

---

[3] See Chapter 2.4, pp. 100-1.

[4] See Chapter 2.4, pp. 102-8.

[5] See Chapter 2. 5. 3, pp. 121-2.

[6] D. Fletcher, 'The Ordnance Survey's Nineteenth Century Boundary Survey: Context, Characteristics and Impact', *Imago Mundi* 51 (1999), pp. 131-46.

[7] See Chapter 2. 2. 2, p. 70.

the corner of the Minster Gates. According to the leases, these tenements were outside the Close and in the parish of St Michael-le-Belfrey. The other boundaries correspond to the ones in the leases.

The location of the gate in Ogleforth and the course of the boundary on its east side, agree with those marked by a late eighteenth-century map, drawn when the gate had already been demolished; however, a stone is said to have marked the gate's previous position.[8] The position of Archbishop Holgate's free school on the OS map confirms the location of this gate; in fact, in the sixteenth century the school was both within the Close and near the gate in Ogleforth. The school was rebuilt in 1667 in the same location and was still in use during the nineteenth century.[9] (Map 14 and Fig. 44, 45)

Chronology of redevelopment in the Close

A summary of the major phases of development of the built environment of the Close emerging from the analysis in Chapter 2 will be given here.

Period 1. 1499- c.1540. Public buildings were redeveloped throughout this period. However, there was not much investment in the domestic sector. Only a new house and possibly a small workshop against the Chapter House were built in this period. (Map 4 and 4a)

Period 2. 1540-1567? A house and the church of St John-del-Pyke were adapted as a school. Otherwise this was a phase of marked stagnation with no increase in the building stock. However, maintenance and repairs to infrastructures and open areas were carried out regularly. The Great Hall of the Archbishop's Palace and possibly the upper floor of the chapel of St Mary and the Holy Angels were demolished. The cathedral interior was transformed.

---

[8] BIHR, CC, Ab 11/86. RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 172.

[9] See Chapter 2. 5. 3, pp. 121-2.

Period 3. 1567?-1590.   A period of great building activity and investment. Existing mansions were redeveloped by new tenants. Existing shops were refurbished and new houses and shops were built. First phase of conversion of the area of the Masons' Lodge and construction of a new carpenters' workshop. In 1584 after a pause of five years, residential space was further expanded at the expense of the Fabric workshops. (Map 10 to 15)

Period 4. 1590-1610. This was a period of relative stability with no major redevelopment. However, there were minor additions to the built environment and upgrading, partitioning and adaptation of mansions and houses continued throughout the period.

Period 5. 1610-1642. The Treasurer's House was rebuilt and the Ingram Mansion and gardens were redeveloped. Other mansions continued to be improved according to fashion. All cathedral workshops were definitively relocated to the north of the cathedral to free more residential space. (Map 5 and 16)

Period 6. 1668-1720. At the end of the seventeenth century new houses and shops were buildt in Minster Gates. Clearance of buildings abutting the cathedral was planned and carried out. The Minster Yard was reordered with the relocation of the cemetery of St Michael-le-Belfrey to the south of the cathedral. The eighteenth century classical redevelopment of prebendal mansions and buildings began. (Map 5a)

2. 2 The western area of the Close

2.2.1 The West Minster Yard

The portion of Minster Yard immediately to the west of the cathedral and the portion to the south-west, between the church of St Michael-le-Belfrey and Petergate, are dominated by the cathedral's west front. (Map 10) To the west of the cathedral façade, but oriented along a different axis, there was the most

ancient and most important access to the cathedral precincts.[10] This opened on the north side of Petergate, the Roman *Via Principalis*, and was in axis with Lop Lane, which was not a prominent axis of the Roman fortress but was important in the medieval period because it led from the cathedral to St Leonard's landing on the River Ouse. (Fig. 1 and 2)

The West Minster Gate

The West Minster Gate is attested as existing, as *porta cimiterii*, from the third quarter of the fourteenth century.[11] During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it was called the "Far Minster Gates".[12] The denomination "West Minster Gates" is also attested in the second half of the seventeenth century. This modern geographical definition is the one adopted for the purpose of this study.[13] Stylistic analysis of the architectural details on nineteenth-century pictorial and photographic evidence, confirm the second half of the fourteenth century as the date of the first phase of construction.[14] The gate was built of stone ashlar, with a round-headed arch for the transit of carriages and a pointed arch to the west for pedestrian access. The Royal licence to build gates for the Close was awarded in 1283 and the cathedral's west front was completed during the first half of the fourteenth century.[15] This monumental stone gate thus led to the main ceremonial entrance of the Gothic Minster. (Fig. 6, 7 and 8)

In the fifteenth century the upper part of the gateway was rebuilt.[16] This may have been a response to the redevelopment of the Bootham Bar in the late fourteenth century when lodgings were built on the gateway. A gatehouse with rooms above, protruding into the Minster Yard may have been added in this

---

[10] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral'.

[11] YMA, E3/2, The pavement was repaired in front of the *Porta cimiterii* or the churchyard gate.

[12] YMA, E3/ 53; YMA, We, fols. 109-109v.

[13] YMA, We, fol. 6v Pt II; We, fols. 328v-329.

[14] RCHME, *The Defences*, compare with architecture of the city gates.

[15] Brown, *York Minster*, pp. 118-22. *Cal Patent Rolls* 1281-92, 161.

[16] RCHME, *The Defences*, p. 116.

occasion to the West Minster Gate. Two rooms and a loft above this gate are attested since 1435 and were still leased in 1711.[17] They were reached from the Minster Yard by a "long pairs" of stairs. These were probably within the gatehouse on both sides as it is suggested by a pictorial source from 1837, showing the steps of a covered staircase within the ruins of the gate abutting Peter's Prison. (Fig. 8) This gatehouse was demolished at some point, possibly in connection with the redevelopment of surrounding buildings, only part of the elevation towards Petergate was left standing, until its clearance in 1827.[18]

The fifteenth-century phase of this elevation facing Petergate was articulated by three niches. A rectangular niche above the pointed archway was subdivided by two pointed-arches. The other two were symmetrical rectangular niches above and on both sides of the round-headed arch, with a further recess defined by a pointed arch. An 1895 copy of an earlier drawing shows the first niche empty and the other two occupied by the sculpted arms of the Liberty of St Peter.(Fig. 8) The clock of the West Minster Gates was repaired in 1577 and was probably located on the gatehouse facing the Minster Yard. [19] Before this date there is no mention in the sources of a clock connected with the gates.

To the east of the West Minster Gate, bonded to the same, there was a substantial gate lodge. (Fig. 7 and 8) Perhaps this was originally intended as the residence for the medieval porters of the Close. By 1547 it was divided into a house and two shops, the rents of which were part of the benefits attached to the office of the Keeper of the Gates.[20] The house is attested in the Fabric Rolls since 1531 and according to the 1583 lease this property was a dwelling house comprising an upper floor with a kitchen on the ground floor. A shop used as an office was next to the kitchen, while a separate shop was also on the ground floor probably

---

[17] YMA, E3/1, 17, 19, 45; We, fols. 109 –109v; We, fols. 368-368v; Wf, fols. 89-90.

[18] Tillott, *VCH York*, pp. 337-43, note 22.

[19] YMA, E3/48.

[20] YMA, Wb, fols. 36v-37; Wb, fol. 282.

facing Petergate.[21] From 1665 this building was leased together with the house with the four shops abutting towards north-east.[22] The list of the appurtenances suggests a substantial property with shops, solars, *sellars*, chambers, lofts, buttery and kitchens.[23]This is reflected by later the pictorial sources, showing the house re-faced in brick towards Petergate and eighteenth-century fenestration facing into the Minster Yard. The income of the house from this point until about the 1830s belonged to the Deacons of the cathedral.[24]

Peter's Prison

Immediately to the west of the gates, on the corner between Petergate and the Minster Yard, there was the prison of the Liberty of St Peter.[25] First mentioned in 1275, Peter's Prison was originally located to the south of the Minster but at some point it was moved to the west end of the cathedral. [26] This may have happened during the fourteenth century when both the Minster's west front and the gates were built. In the Fabric Rolls the prison is mentioned in 1442, when repairs involving eight days of carpentry work were carried out.[27] During the sixteenth century the building was repaired on several occasions. In 1581 the lead roof and the gutters were repaired and the walls repointed.[28] In 1584 the staircase was repaired in bricks and windows and doors were provided with irons bars and locks.[29] The pictorial sources show the eighteenth-century facade of the building. It was stone built with a semi-basement containing the gaol. The Court house was on the upper floor and it was reached by an external staircase from the

---

[21] YMA, Wb, fol. 321v; Wc, fols. 160v-161; Wc, fols. 297-297v; Wd, fols. 158v-159; We, fols. 7v-8 Pt1; We, fols. 13v-14.

[22] See below in this section, p. 63.

[23] YMA, We, fols. 109 –109v; We, fols. 368-368v; Wf, fols. 89-90.

[24] BIHR, Map 24.

[25] Leak, *The Liberty,* p. 10.

[26] *Cal Patent Rolls* 1272-81, pp. 111, 119-20, 173.

[27] YMA, E3/15.

[28] YMA, E3/59.

[29] YMA, E3/15, 58, 60.

Minster Yard. A second upper floor contained the accommodation of the gaoler.[30] (Fig. 8)

The "long shop"

Abutting Peter's Prison along its Petergate side there was a long and narrow building. This was outside the administrative boundaries of the Close, however its connection with the Prison and the West Minster Gate makes it significant. It measured ten yards in length along the street and had a shop and two chambers on the upper floor, divided into several offices or studies. It is first recorded in the leases from 1631 and was pulled down after 1726[31].

The Office of the Secretary of the Council in the North

Next to Peter's Prison to the north, on the corner between Minster Yard and Precentors Court, right opposite the Minster Great West Door, there was a house attested with precision from 1531. At least since the 1580s until 1640 it housed the Office of the Secretary of the Council of the North. [32] This was a substantial tenement with annexed service buildings, yards and backsides. After the Civil War the tenement became dilapidated, in 1669 the property was leased to a lawyer who agreed to undertake the necessary repairs to make it decent and inhabitable again. [33] In 1717 it was severed into two tenements, one facing the Minster Yard and the other Precentors Court and it was rebuilt in the eighteenth century in the form that still survives in part. [34]

---

[30] Leak, *The Liberty*, p. 10.

[31] YMA, We, fols. 108-108v; We. Fol. 107; We, fols. 400-401; Wf, fol. 280.

[32] YMA, E3/41; Wc, fols. 6v-7; Wd, fols. 71-71v; Wd, fol. 43v; We, fols. 343v-344; We, fols. 125v-126v.

[33] YMA, We, fols. 125v-126v.

[34] YMA, Wf, fols. 170v-171; Wf, fol. 394. RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 181 n.324.

The Prebendal Mansion of South-Cave

On the northern corner between the West MinsterYard and Precentors Court
stood the prebendal mansion of South Cave. (Maps 10, 6, 8) In 1507 this
mansion was leased with all its houses, buildings and garden.[35] In 1549, when the
prebend of South-Cave was abolished, the mansion was sold to Michael
Stanhope.[36] However, by the end of the 1560s until as far as the late seventeenth
century, the Fabric was receiving rent payments for this house.[37] In 1569 the
occupier was Sir Thomas Gargrave, the Vice President of the Council of the
North and MP for the City of York.[38] Extensive repairs were carried out by the
Fabric craftsmen.[39] The kitchen was repaired by two carpenters working for five
days. Two other men and an apprentice spent two days and a half on the chamber
and eleven days on the house. Repairs were also carried out on the roofs by tilers
and plumbers, for twelve days using a stone and a half and thirteen pounds of
lead. This was a modest quantity of material, probably used to line gutters and
waterproofing junctions in the roofs. An inventory of wainscot panelling made in
1591 mentions a dining chamber, a great chamber, a gallery and two other
chambers.[40] One of these was named after Cecil, perhaps William had been a
guest of his friend Sir Gargrave, and one was named after Checke, one of the
Secretaries of the Council. In 1613 the house was leased to Arthur Ingram and
was subsequently extensively redeveloped as part of his mansion.[41] The
redevelopment confused the boundaries between the Archbishop's Palace and the
mansion of South Cave to such an extent that in the eighteenth-century lawyers,
architects and craftsmen were struggling to separate the two properties.[42] Next to

---

[35] YMA, Wa, fol. 1v.

[36] Cross, 'From the Reformation', p. 197.

[37] YMA, E3/65

[38] Palliser, *Tudor York*, p. 261 and 201-225.

[39] YMA E3/51.

[40] Butler, 'York Palace', p. 27. Leeds City Archives Pawson MSS Acc 1038: Index vol I under
Archbishop's Palace York.

[41] YMA, E3/62/3; WYL, Pawson MSS op.cit.; BIHR CC. Ab, 9, York.

[42] BIHR, CC, Ab, 9, York.

this mansion the gateway to the Archbishop's Palace opened on the north-west side of the cathedral. This will be discussed in more detail in section 2.

Shops built in the West Minster Yard

The area of Minster Yard to the west of the cathedral was occupied by shops, abutting pre-existing buildings. A "little shop" with a chamber over is attested from 1596 and its lease was still granted in 1726. [43] It could be identified with one of the shops already existent in the fifteenth century for which the Fabric was taking income. It was built against the wall of Peter Prison facing the Minster and was of irregular shape; it measured five yards in length north-south and one yard and a quarter in width on its south side and one yard and a half on its north side.

On both sides of the Great West door, the Minster ceremonial doorway, two shops were built in 1597.[44] The one to the south abutted the cathedral's façade between the Great West Door and the south nave buttress. This was mirrored by the other shop on the north side of the Great West Door. (Fig. 105) The tenants were forbidden to build the shop any higher, to insert chimneys and to sublet the premises without the consent of the Dean and Chapter. The shops belonged to the Dean and Chapter, however, they had been purpose built as bookshops by Thomas Gubbin, a stationer from London.[45]The modest rent of 4s a year he paid must have taken into account the building expenses. Despite the orders of King Charles I in his 1633 visit, these shops survived as far as 1674.[46]

In the corner formed by the gate lodge, or Deacons' house, and the row of houses between this and St Michael-le-Belfrey church, there was another structure. A

---

[43] YMA, Wc, fols. 240v-241; We, fols. 50v-51; We, fol. 254v; We, fols 404; Wf, fols. 277v-278.

[44] YMA, Wc, fols. 275-276, on 6 March 1597, Thomas Gubbin Stationer erected the tenements; Wd, fols. 86-86v; We, fols. 11v-12.

[45] YMA, Wc, fols. 275-276. Gubbin lived in Petergate, see J. Barnard an M. Bell, *The Early Seventeenth Century York Book Trade and John Foster's Inventory of 1616,* Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary society, Literary and Historical section, 24, pt 2 (1994), p. 2.

[46] YMA, Wd, fols. 114v-115. See Chapter 6.1, pp. 295-6.

building with "four shops" abutted the gate lodge to the west, and the first
tenement of the row to the south and the Minster Yard on the north and east side.
This is attested from 1580 in the leases but was already providing income for the
Fabric at the beginning of the sixteenth century.[47] An etching of c. 1730 shows in
this location a tall, jettied house with a high pitched gable. (Fig.6) The ground
floor is not visible, but there are five levels of fenestration on the upper floors
including garrets. The windows were casement slightly protruding from the
façade, with lattice windows. The high rental value and the appurtenance clauses
of this building suggest that this was a substantial house, it comprised of
chambers, lofts, sellars and solars. This house was leased with two adjoining
parcels of grounds on the Minster Yard. The first one measured three yards and a
quarter in length and one yard and three quarters in width. The other was a built
up strip measuring two yards in length and in width at one end one foot and one
inch at the other end.

A row of houses and shops abutted the gate lodge to the west. (Fig. 6, 9, 11)
They were built during the fourteenth century with a shop frontage towards
Petergate. [48] They had doors or windows opening on the Minster Yard. The first
and the second tenement from the gate lodge are attested in the leases from the
late sixteenth century. [49] The second one in 1692 consisted of a ground floor with
a kitchen and a parlour, two chambers and a solar on the upper floor and
garrets.[50] The third house measured five yards in length and its list of
appurtenances included shops, hall, parlour, chambers, lofts, sellars and solars.[51]
A hall is mentioned only for this property in the row.The fourth tenement is
attested since 1617 and was leased together with the Lime house.[52] By 1693 the
property had been divided in two tenements leased by two subtenants. Next there

[47] YMA, Wb, fols. 305v-306; Wc, fols. 281v-282; Wd, fol. 78v; We, fols. 14-14v.

[48] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 2, pp. 200-10.

[49] YMA, Wc, fols. 288v-289; We, fols. 126v-127.

[50] YMA, We, fols. 342v-343.

[51] YMA, Wf, fols. 164-164v; Wc, fols. 289v-290; Wc, fols. 276-276v; We, fols. 342v-343;We, fols. 346-347.

[52] YMA, Wc, fols. 276-276v; Wd, fols. 44v-45; We, fols. 24-24v; We, fols. 346-347; Wf, fols.167-169.

was another house with chambers, solars and lofts, which in the early seventeenth century was used as a shop. Another property to the east was used as an office. In 1692 these two tenements were leased as one. A passage leading from Petergate to the Minster Yard separated these two tenements. The one to the east of the passage consisted of two ground floor rooms, one facing Petergate the other the Minster Yard. These were used as a kitchen and a wash-house or bathing kitchen.[53] This last room was perhaps used in connection with the profession of the occupier Matha Stobbard, commonly called the "moor midwife".

St Peter's School?

The building, of which the midwife occupied two rooms on the ground floor, was built against the façade of the south aisle of St Michael-le-Belfrey church. Between 1669 and 1712 it was occupied by the Crown Tavern.[54] It measured thirteen yards and a half (12.50m) along Petergate and about the same towards the Minster Yard. Because of its close proximity with the church an inspection by the Clerk of the Works to assess the state of maintenance of the building, was required twice a year. The rebuilding of the new façade of St Michael le Belfrey 1525-37, extending westward with respect to the older church, may have respected the position of this house.[55] A painting of 1840 depicts the clearance of the area, showing a medieval timber-framed house in that location, with roof ridge parallel to Petergate and windows opening on the side passage.(Fig. 9) However, it seems more likely that the house would have been remodelled after the rebuilding of St Michael-le Belfrey. Other pictorial evidence shows the west front of the church after clearance, with a horizontal row of chases indicating the floor joists of a building. (Fig. 10) Earlier drawings show a two bay, three-storeys building, with high pitched roofs with their line perpendicular to the street and casement windows. (Fig. 11) This building was different from the ones

---

[53] YMA, Wc, fols. 276-276v.before 1617 this tenement contained the offices of John Ferne Knight; We, fols. 341-341v; Wf, fols. 160v161v; Wf, fols.167-169.

[54] YMA, We 341-341v; Wf, fols. 97-97v; Wf, fols. 284-285.

[55] Masinton, 'Sacred Space', pp. 68-88 and Fig. 22.

in this row. It was deeper, larger and taller than the others. It was connected to the church but separated by a passage from the other houses. The treatment of the windows and door frames is different from that of the other houses. This building could be tentatively identified with the former St Peter's grammar school. A new school was built at the same time as the new Masons' Lodge.[56] A grammar school was located in Petergate during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and part of it was leased as lodging to the school master. The location of St Peter's School next to St Michael-le-Belfrey is indicated also by fifteenth-century testamentary evidence. In 1408 Katherine Patton of Stonegate asked to be buried in the cemetery of St Michael-le-Belfrey in the place which is called "Scoles". [57]

St Michael-le-Belfrey

The church of St Michael-le-Belfrey was one of the two parish churches within the boundaries of the close in the sixteenth century. The church has been the subject of recent studies, therefore here only a brief summary will be given. Its earlier history has been recently revised by Christopher Norton, suggesting that this was originally a belfry tower connected with the Anglo-Saxon minster and its cemetery.[58] The parish church St Michael-le-Belfrey is attested since twelfth century; its advowson belonged to the Dean and Chapter and was given as living to a parish priest. The Dean and Chapter had the responsibility for maintenance and repair; visitations and disputes between the Parish and the Minster are a source of information for the late medieval and early modern church. It was the richest parish in York according to census of the parishioners, in the late medieval and in early modern periods. The structure of the late medieval parish church has been reconstructed by Anthony Masinton on the bases of documentary evidence and analysis of the standing building. The church "consisted of nave, chancel, two aisles, a tower and a porch".[59] Between 1525

---

[56] YMA, E3/1.

[57] A. Raine, *Medieval York. A Topographical Survey Based on Original Sources* (London, 1955), pp. 32, 37.

[58] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral'.

[59] Masinton, *Sacred Space*, p. 76.

and 1537 the church was remodelled by the masons of York Minster, in the form that is still standing today. Masinton has concluded that during the development the church was extended towards the west, possibly to alter the proportion of the building in accordance with   changing ideas of space. The interior was also redesigned to allow more light and open views across the church.

St Michael-le-Belfrey churchyard

The area to the west of the church of St Michael the Belfrey was used as the parish cemetery, continuing the early-medieval use of the area.[60] In 1715 a mound was formed because of frequent burial on the same site. The Dean and Chapter therefore gave to the churchwardens of St Michael as a burial ground a parcel of land to the south of the cathedral between the Library and the south west tower.[61]

The late seventeenth and eighteenth-century pictorial sources show that the ground level of the Minster Yard rose considerably since the fourteenth century. The plinth of the cathedral church and the stairs leading to the Minster's west doorways were under ground level. (Fig.6). This suggests that eighteenth-century demolition debris, rather than carried away and disposed, was used as a makeup soil above previous paving or street level. The excavation of the stairs and plinth of the cathedral was carried out in the twentieth century. In 2000 an archaeological excavation has established the original level of the soil by the cathedral west front.[62]

Conclusion

The West Minster Yard was an area of ceremonial access to the cathedral, where the symbols of the religious and secular powers of the Liberty of St Peter and of the Archbishop were prominently displayed. Moreover, the West Minster Yard

---

[60] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral', p. 9.

[61] YMA, Wf, fols. 148v-149 ; see below p. 87.

[62] R. Hall, 'Archaeology at York Minster 2000', *Friends of York Minster* 70 (2001), p. 23.

was the place where the hinterland met the Close. Fairs and business transactions with the tenants of the Dean and Chapter were held here several times a year. Pilgrims arrived from far away to visit the shrines in the Minster. After the Reformation the nature of this area as the meeting point with the hinterland was reinforced. The Office of the Secretary of the Council in the North, which was the permanent point of contact between this institution and the public, was established here. Goods and building materials from the hinterland, carried from St Leonard's landing on the Ouse transited through the West Minster Yard. These themes will be developed in chapters 4 and 5.

2. 2. 2 Precentors' Court

The portion of Minster Yard called Precentor's Lane from the eighteenth century and later Precentor's Court, runs from the West Minster Yard towards the west, parallel to Petergate. (Map 11) Its northern side has been redeveloped in the twentieth century with the construction of the Purey-Cust Nursing Home, which involved the demolition of the Subdeanery and of the prebendal mansion of South-Cave. The ancient topography of the Roman Fortress has left its mark in this area; Sarah Rees Jones has observed that the east-west boundaries between the mansions corresponded to the one of the Roman barracks.[63] (Fig. 1 and Map 11)

The Wright House

In 1576 the craftsmen and labourers of York Minster were employed on two building projects.[64] One of those was the building of the Wright house, a new workshop and storage space for the Fabric's carpenters. Varied sources allow the understanding of the nature of this building and reconstruction of its phases of development and occupation: the survival of detailed building accounts for three campaigns of construction work, a sequence of leases dating between 1569 and

---

[63] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 1.

[64] YMA, E3/54 see also Chapter 2. 3. 3, pp. 92-3.

1723, and standing walls in the cellars of the eighteenth century houses in 2 and 3 Precentors' Court.[65] (Fig. 12, 13, 113-123)

The Wright house was located on the south side of Precentors' Court, to the west of the office of the Secretary of the Council of the North. Before this event timbers were kept in various locations within the Close. For instance, in 1433-34 they were stored in two rooms annexed to the prebendal house of Warthill and from there carried to a carpenters' workshop.[66] From 1456 until 1458 a courtyard or hall of the prebendal mansion of Fenton in Precentors' Court served as storage and workshop.[67] Timbers were moved by sledge from such storage places in the Minster Yard and in the Archbishop's Palace to the carpenters' workshop, and from there to the sites within the Close and in the city, where building work was to be carried out.[68] It is possible that the strip of land belonging to the Fabric, located immediately to the north of the cathedral, served for such purposes rather than the Palace yard itself.[69] In 1471 timbers were carried *ad ortum carpentariorum* which suggests the presence of a timber yard somewhere.[70]

There is no direct evidence to support whether the carpenters' workshop continued to be located in the Fenton mansion during the following century. [71] Two masons worked "taking of tiles for the Wright house" for the greater part of a day. It is not clear what this means. Whether they were stripping tiles from a previous building or moving building material from the area is not possible to establish. Severe subsidence of the floor on the east side of the Wright house (2 Precentors' Court) suggests that the new construction may have been on green field, and a large pit was filled up and paved over when the filling had not quite

---

[65] YMA, Wb, fols. 159v-160; Wc, fols. 194-195; Wc, fols. 218-218v; Wc, fols. 226-226v; Wc, fols. 304v-305; Wd, fols. 144v; Wd, fols. 145; We, fol. 151v; We, fols. 396-396v; Wf, fols. 247v-248.

[66] YMA, E3/13 "domus carpentariorum".

[67] YMA, E3/21-22-23. The term *aula* could mean a courtyard, however it could also be a hall.

[68] YMA, E3/22-23.

[69] See Chapter 2.6. 2.

[70] YMA, E3/25

[71] YMA, E3/54

settled. This feature may have been a cess pit or a spoliation trench to recover some building material from the Roman barracks, in addition to that taken from the Palace Yard.

The stone building material used in the construction of the building's walls was procured by an excavation in the Archbishop's Palace yard. In fact masons and labourers were paid for "digging up stones et siftinge sand in the Pallace Garthe for the Wright house". The walls in the cellars, standing at a height of 1.75 m, are made of regularly cut limestone and lesser quantities of grit stone, laid in regular courses. This can be identified as the same material used in the 2nd century AD rebuilding of the barracks of the Roman Fortress.[72] In addition there are a few occasional ashlar blocks of grey sandstone with tooling, similar to the ones of the Romanesque cathedral.[73] This suggests that the material was in the greater part procured by spoliation of Roman buildings. The excavation may have been on the site of the stone-built Antoninian barracks (second half of the 2nd century AD) of the Roman Fortress located to the north of the cathedral.[74]

From the wages paid to the workers the following sequence of events can be suggested. Two unskilled labourers removed the top soil for two days. The masons John Gell and his man, responsible for building the Wright house and other projects, then joined them for five days. During the excavation stones were dug up and sand, probably derived from the decay of Roman building material, collected and sifted. The presence of two experienced masons during the excavation is significant. They were probably selecting the appropriate stones for size, quality and quantity and supervising the collection of sand. At the end of the excavation the two labourers were joined by another two and they worked together for two days in carrying stones and sand to the Wright house building

---

[72] Ottaway, *Defences and Adjacent Sites,* pp. 98, 288 and 291-4, fig. 36 and fig. 186. Magnesian Limestone or Jurassic Oolite was the principal stone used in the 2nd century AD fortress. Millstone grit was used in situation when more durability was needed as in sewers and the base of walls, Ibid. p. 288.

[73] See Appendix 1, p. 355.

[74] Ottaway, *Defences and Adjacent Sites,* pp. 98 and 291-4, fig. 36 and fig. 186.

site and the remaining sand to the "sand house".[75] Four masons and one labourer worked for twelve and a half days building the walls and other structures of the Wright house. (Fig. 113-123, Maps 28 and 29).

The upper part of the structure of the Wright house was timber-framed. No timber was bought for this project, meaning that there must have already been an available supply.[76] Other timber material, however, was purchased: one thousand bunches of hard laths would have been used for roofing and twelve bunches of lesser quality sap laths would have been used for the walls.[77] In the sixteenth century laths were five feet in length, two inches in width and half an inch thick. Bunches usually contained 100 laths but in York may have contained only 25 or 30 pieces.[78]

Two chowders three quarters and seven bushels of grey plaster were bought to be shared between the walls of the Wright house and the other new house. This was probably used to daub or rough cast the walls.[79] A quarter of white plaster was also bought, this was 'plaster of Paris' that would have been used to finishing the wall surfaces or to decorate them, whitening the walls. More importantly white plaster was used to plaster chimneys or fireplaces since it would stand the heat better.[80]

Iron nails were bought to be shared between the Wright house and the other new house: 9,550 lath nails for roofing, 4250 six penny nails and nine 900 single spikyns nails for general purposes.[81] A smith also made twenty two great "stubs", short thick nails, for the Wright house.

---

[75] See Chapter 2. 3. 1 for the "sand house".

[76] See Chapter 6. 3, pp. 334-8, supply and reuse of timbers.

[77] Salzman, *Building in England*, pp. 240-1.

[78] Salzman, *Building in England*, p. 241.

[79] Salzman, *Building in England*, pp. 155

[80] Salzman, *Building in England,* pp. 155-7 and 189-91.

[81] Salzman, *Building in England,* pp. 304-17.

The framing, assembly and rearing of the building required the work of two carpenters for nineteen days. Two other carpenters worked with them for sixteen days while a labourer was on site for twenty seven days. During five days, probably involving the lifting of heavy timbers, two further carpenters joined the team.[82] A sawyer worked for a day in sawing timbers and boards and a simple door was made during most of a day by another carpenter. In contrast with the other new house built in the same year, there was no provision of glass for windows; it may well have been that these were left unglazed.

The amount of time spent by the carpenters on building the Wright house was relatively modest compared to other new domestic buildings.[83] It can be suggested that the time was employed in making a timber framed structure above the masonry walls, and a roof. A spacious workshop was therefore created, though at this stage there was not an inhabitable upper floor. Perhaps a first floor space had been already envisaged and subsequently converted to residential use. Alternatively a lofty workshop was soon to be closed and sacrificed to the growing demand for residential space within the close during the 1580s.

In two building campaigns in 1584 and 1587 the Wright house was redeveloped for mixed residential use.[84] The Lime kiln house was also converted at the same time.[85] In the 1584 redevelopment, a property immediately to the west of the Wright house was annexed to it. This property was attested since 1569 in the leases and in the Fabric rents and comprised of two units: a ground floor chamber measuring 6 by 6 yards (5.50 m.) and to the west of it, a stable with a chamber above and a hay loft.[86] The ground floor chamber was incorporated into the

---

[82] Salzman, *Building in England,* pp. 200-1.

[83] See p. 97, the new house built on the same year.

[84] YMA, E3/60-61.

[85] See Chapter 2. 3. 1 p. 81.

[86] YMA, Wb, fols. 159v-160; YMA, E3/51-64, yearly rents to the Fabric.

Wright house whilst the stable, chamber and hay loft kept their function until the eighteenth-century rebuilding.[87]

The 1584 campaign consisted mainly of timber building.[88] Three sawyers worked for nine days in preparing and carrying timbers and two carpenters worked on the property for fourteen days. Chambers and lofts were built above the Wright house and a new staircase provided access to them.[89] An upper floor was also created above the ground floor chamber. In fact a thousand bricks were bought to be shared between the setting of the walls in the Wright house and stable block and for the walls of the Lime kiln house. The bricks may have been used for infill- panels between timber framing or to build a solid masonry wall; bonded in double courses of stretchers they would have sufficed for a portion of wall measuring 8 by 8 m.[90] However, two masons with their two apprentices worked for only three days on the Wright house which must also have included the tiling of the roof.[91] It therefore seems more probable that these walls were timber-framed with brick infill-panels. Thirty three ridge tiles were shared between the roofs of the Wright house and the Lime kiln house, which would have been enough for 11.22 meters of roof ridge.[92] Given that the chamber measured 5.50 metres in width, half of the ridge tiles may have been used to roof this new addition to the Wright house.

Three years later, in 1587, further building material was bought and three tilers and an apprentice worked for eleven days mending and pointing the Wright house.[93] Portions of roofs were made with two hundred 'thaktiles', or flat roof

---

[87] YMA, Wf, fols. 247v-248.

[88] YMA, E3/60.

[89] YMA, Wc, fols. 194-195 "And also one starre case and all those chambers or lofts whatsoever now builded standinge and beinge over the said Wright house".

[90] The size of bricks was of about 10 inches by 5 by 2, Salzman, *Building in England,* p. 144.

[91] The time spent on rebuilding the Lime kiln house was much more therefore the majority of the bricks may have been used there.

[92] The ridge tiles since 1477 had a standard size of 13 and a half by 6 and a half inches, Salzman, *Building in England,* pp. 229-31.

[93] YMA, E3/61.

tiles. These would have covered an area of 8.64 square meters when not counting the overlapping of the tiles.[94] Two bunches of hard laths and three "casting boards" could have been used for the roof and for boarded ceilings.[95] This suggests that some alterations to the roof may have been carried out, such as the insertion of garrets to further expand the accommodation. Since one hundred bricks were also bought, it is possible that chimney stacks may have been inserted.

The two building campaigns resulted in the following arrangement.[96]The ground floor was a two bay building occupied by the carpenters' workshop, with a small yard to the south. To the west there was a ground floor chamber and a staircase giving access to one or two upper floors with chambers and lofts located above the workshop and above the ground floor room. All these chambers and upper floors formed a residential unit. The stable block was an independent unit but formed part of the same property. In a clause in the leases the residents of the Wright house agreed to accept, without making troubles and at any time, the noise generated by the carpenters' activities, such as sawing timbers and other necessary works for the repairs of the cathedral church.[97] By 1632 this clause disappears from the leases therefore the carpenters had perhaps left the premises. This seems reinforced by the fact that by 1672 the workshop had become a third residential tenement.[98] In the lease of 1723 five new built tenements had replaced the Wright house. These are N. 2, 3, 4, 4a and 5 Precentors' Court.[99] (Fig. 13 and 14)

---

[94] The standard measurement for those was 10 and a half by 6 and a quarter inches, Salzman, *Building in England,* pp. 229-31.

[95] Salzman, *Building in England,* pp. 214-216 for ceiled roofs.

[96] YMA, Wc, fols. 194-195 Wc, fols. 194-195; Wc, fols. 218-218v; Wc, fols. 226-226v; Wc, fols. 304v-305; Wd, fol. 144v; Wd, fol. 145; We, fol. 151v; We, fols. 396-396v.

[97] YMA, Wc, fols. 304v-305; Wd, fol. 144v.

[98] YMA, Wd, fol. 145; We, fol. 151v.

[99] YMA, Wf, fols. 247v-248; RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, pp. 199-200, n. 375 and 376.

Street levels in Precentor's Court

The threshold of the blocked doorway of the Wright house, in the basement of 2 Precentors' Court, is about 0.70 m below the present street level. This suggests that the sixteenth-century street level was lower. A make-up layer to raise the soil level was probably deposited during the eighteenth-century redevelopment of the Wright house, to create semi-basements.

South-west Precentors' Court and the Prebendal Mansion of Fenton

To the west of the Wright house there were two houses belonging to the Prebend of Fenton.[100] The next tenement is recorded only from 1660. It was within the parish of St Michael-le-Belfrey and consisted of two parcels. One comprised of a kitchen with a closet along Petergate and a passageway to the west leading to a yard on the rear.[101] The second parcel consisted of that yard with a stable and a brewhouse adjoining Precentors' Court to the north. This arrangement was still preserved in the 1835 map.[102] The brewhouse and stable may have had a carriage access opening into Precentors' Court, as it is the case at present. (Fig. 16) To the west of the brewhouse there was another house belonging to the Prebend of Fenton.[103] This arrangement suggests that these tenements may have been part of the curtilage of the mansion of Fenton, perhaps being a gateway with stables. This mansion extended from High Petergate towards the north-east. In 1365 the hall of the mansion of Fenton was located next to the northern buttress of the stone chamber of the Subdeanery.[104] This suggests that the hall may have been located on the site of 10 Precentors' Court. This town house was built in the early eighteenth century; the front was brick built but other elevations incorporate existing stone walls, therefore a hall in this location would probably have been stone built. Moreover the irregularity of the façade suggests that there was a pre-

---

[100] YMA, We, fols. 396-396v and We, fols. 328v-329 abutting clauses. BIHR, Map 24.

[101] YMA, We, fol. 6v II; We, fol. 328v-329.

[102] BIHR, Map 24, n 15 and 51 still with the same rental value.

[103] YMA, We, fols. 328v-329 abutting clauses. BIHR, Map 24, n13.

[104] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents' Vol. 2, pp. 214-5; YMA, L2/2a, fol. 47.

existing structure abutting towards the west.[105] In the northern elevation of this house it is possible to identify at least three main phases: one in stone and two in bricks. These may represent the medieval one of the hall, the sixteenth-century refurbishment and a 19th century redevelopment including a Dutch gable. (Fig. 14 and 15) The The presence of an early fourteenth-century scissor-braced truss in the house 8 High Petergate, suggests that a high status building with a span of about 20 feet (6 m.) was aligned along Petergate.[106] This may have been a second hall or a separate great chamber. The presence of two such halls, perhaps with different functions or built at different times, is not unusual in the fourteenth century.[107] If this was the case the carpenter's workshop recorded as being located in the *aula* of the mansion of Fenton, from 1456 until at least 1458, may indeed have been accommodated within one of the halls.[108]

To date it is not possible to establish whether the carpenters were based in the mansion of Fenton prior to the building of the new Wright house in 1576. However, the fact that in 1578 this mansion was leased to a lawyer, suggests that the carpenters may have been relocated in advance of redevelopment.[109] At the time, the mansion of Fenton was a substantial property with extensive grounds. The list of the appurtenances included houses, cottages, buildings, stables, dovecotes, orchards, gardens, yards, courts and void grounds.[110]

The Subdeanery

In 1266, houses situated next to the Archbishop's Palace, near the houses of the prebend of South Cave were donated to the Dean and Chapter. In exchange they were to pay every year 26s 8d to the vicars and clerks who were present at the

---

[105] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 201.

[106] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 181, n. 320.

[107] M. Girouard, *Life in the English Country House* (New Haven and London, 1978), pp. 59-60.

[108] The term *aula* is could be translated as courtyard, however it is more commonly translated as hall.

[109] YMA, fols. Wb 301.

[110] YMA, Wb, fol. 301; YMA, Wb, fols. 370v-371; YMA, Wf, fols. 192-193.

obit of Roger Pepin, former subdean.[111] In 1292 these houses were annexed to the Subdeanery, located near the houses of the Prebend of Fenton. The Subdeanery was a mansion on the north-eastern side of Precentors' Court. By the fourteenth century this consisted of a hall with a stone-built first floor chamber to the south-west, running longitudinally along Precentors' Court.[112] In 1365 the chamber was described as being supported by buttresses; with a latrine on the north-west side protruding 5 and a half feet (1.65 m.) towards the mansion of Fenton.[113] (Fig. 17, 18) This configuration seems to have been retained through successive rebuildings until the twentieth century.

In 1365 there were also a stone-built brewery and a bakery on the east side of the chamber wing. The distance from the northern buttress of the chamber, next to the entrance to the hall of Fenton mansion, to the stone wall of the brewery and bakery, measured 105 feet (31 meters). This measurement corresponds almost perfectly to that between the northern corner of the chamber and the east wall of the building to the south-east, given by the OS 1852 map. This east wall was on the corner of Precentors Court, and on the boundary with the prebendal mansion of South Cave. The brewery and bakery measured 12 feet (3.64 meters) in width. It seems likely that these two structures stood isolated from the residential wings of the mansion, in order to permit access to the mansion's courtyard from the street and perhaps to avoid a potential fire hazard. Although the structures recorded on the OS 1852 map may not be the medieval ones, it is worth noting that their orientation is rotated about 30 degrees clockwise from the alignment of the street. Their orientation created a space that may have been occupied by a gateway or entrance to the mansion.

To the north-east of the hall there was a range with services and perhaps lodgings, built at some point before the second half of the sixteenth-century,

---

[111] N. J. Tringham (ed.), *Charters of the Vicars Choral of York Minster: City of York and Its Suburbs to 1546* (York,1993), pp. 180-1.YMA, VC3/1/1, fols. 29v-30.

[112] YMA, Wb, fols. 281v-282; Ridsdale-Tate 1912, see fig.; BIHR, Map 24 and map CC.Ab. 11/86.

[113] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', vol. 2, pp. 214-5, a lawsuit about the latrine of the Subdeanery encroaching on the mansion of Fenton, YMA, L2/2a, fol. 47.

when the mansion was refurbished. The medieval Subdeanery may therefore have been a courtyard mansion composed of three ranges with the entrance to the south-east and a boundary wall toward the east. (Fig. 18) In 1576 the Subdeanery was leased to a member of the Council of the North, who carried out extensive repairs at his own expenses and provided it with valuable fittings.[114]

An inventory of these new fittings, written as an appendix to the 1576 lease, gives information on the extent and quality of the refurbishment.[115] The purpose of the inventory was to specify the fittings that should not be removed at the end of the lease and their value. The order in which the surveyor describes the rooms is the upper and ground floor of each range, rather than a suite of rooms on each floor. Therefore the perception of the architectural components of the building took precedence over the interior layout of the house. However, in the following description the sequence of rooms in each floor will be reconstructed with the aid of maps and iconographical sources. The inventory starts with the most important reception room in an Elizabethan mansion: the great chamber.[116] This was on the upper floor and was probably the refurbished or rebuilt medieval chamber. A 1912 drawing of Precentors' Court seen from the west shows a two storey brick and stone building; this could date to the 1576 rebuilding.[117] (Fig. 6) The lower third of the west elevation was made of regular courses of regularly cut stones. This looks as if it is conserved from the western wall of a previous building, possibly of the chamber documented in 1365. On the upper floor there were two windows on the south and one on the west. This was divided into ten rectangular panes by a stone transom, two large mullions and two thinner mullions in the centre. The windows of the mansion had removable iron stanchions, which were valued together at £ 11. The glass panes of the great chamber were worth 40 s and could have been decorated with coats of arms. Great chambers were often decorated with the coats of arms of the owners; the antiquarian Matthew Hutton

---

[114] YML, Wb, fols. 281v-282.

[115] YML, Wb, fols. 281v-282.

[116] Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, pp. 81-118.

[117] York Civic Trust, *York Minster Revealed. An exhibition of York Minster from the 17th century to the present* (York, 2007), p. 27.

describes the heraldry in a glazed window in a prebendal house in the Minster Yard.[118] There were two chimney stacks on the south side; the one to the east was protruding from the wall into the street.[119] A classically-moulded eaves cornice with a hipped roof crowned the building. This feature indicates re-roofing sometime after 1630.[120] The building had a semi-basement floor more deeply interred towards the east, due to the sloping level of Precentors' Court. The grated windows followed the fenestration scheme of the upper floor. The ground floor could have been a cellar, a rather common use for the lower floor of a great chamber.[121] The interior of the great chamber was fitted with wainscot panelling and wainscot benches worth 16 pounds; these were the most expensive fittings in the house.

Adjacent and parallel to the chamber on the north side, was a short cross wing. This ended with a buttressed and protruding chimney stack, flanked by two semicircular structures, whose lower part was stone built and apparently continued the chamber's stone masonry. The chute of a medieval latrine can be seen to the south side of the chimney breast and a blocked pointed drainage arch is visible at the base of the semicircular structure.[122] It can be suggested that the stack was on the site of the medieval latrine towards the prebend of Fenton. There was a window on the upper floor to the north of the chimney stack and a 9 pane sash window, perhaps inserted in the eighteenth or nineteenth century, in the south semicircular structure. The room on the upper floor may have been a closet or privy room with a fireplace and a latrine continuing the medieval use; it may have been en suite with the great chamber.

---

[118] Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 110. YML, Hutton, Matthew, *Antiquities of Yorkshire,* 1659, fol. 41.

[119] BIHR, Map 24.

[120] J. Summerson, *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830* (New Haven and London, 1993), pp. 142-56. RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, passim. The artist may have added some of the details.

[121] Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, pp. 81-118.

[122] M. Wood, *The English Medieval House* (London, 1965), p. 385, pl LIX, drainage arches for gardrobes. In London as far as 1189 there was a rule that not walled wardrobe pits should be built 3 feet and a half from the neighbouring property, if walled only 2 and half. It is possible that the dispute between the prebendaries was about the proximity of the latrine to the boundary of the mansion of Fenton and the cause was won by the Subdean because it could be demonstrated that there was enough distance.

From the great chamber a gallery led to the other rooms on the upper floor.[123] A roof ridge running NE-SW, perpendicular to that above the great chamber may represent the position of a gallery. It can be suggested that the gallery faced the courtyard, exploiting the sunny south-eastern aspect with a view of the cathedral. The study was associated with the gallery in the inventory. Both rooms had wainscot panelling, which in the gallery was worth £ 8 and worth £ 10 , 4 s, 8 d, in the study; this being the most expensive panelling after the one in the great chamber. This suggests that this room had a very high status within the household and was either quite large or very finely finished. The windows glass in both rooms was worth 46 s, 7 d.

Two chambers may have also been located in the gallery wing: the "little" and the "blue" chamber. They did not have wainscot and therefore were probably used as bedrooms rather than for reception. The walls of the "blue" chamber may have been painted, adding luxury to this room because dyes were very expensive in the sixteenth century. The blue dyes were obtained with a lengthy and unpleasant process from the plants of the indigo family, the best ones coming from tropical areas, though dyes were also produced in England from the woad plant.[124] Both rooms had a portal, this being a lobby separated from the chamber by wainscot panelling.[125] The portals were worth 16 s for the "little" chamber and 20 s for the "blue" chamber, therefore a very modest quantity of panelling was used.

Two other chambers were also located on this floor, in the NW-SE wing. One was located above the parlour and the other above the kitchen. They also did not have wainscot, but had a portal of the same value as the one of the "blue" room. The chimney stack from the kitchen would have made these bedrooms quite warm. All the chambers on this floor had window glass panels all together worth 40 s.

---

[123] YMA, Wb, fols. 281v-282.

[124] J. Shneider, 'Fantastical Colors in Foggy London', in L.C. Orlin (ed.), *Material London* (Philadelphia, 2000), p. 112.

[125] J.S. Curl, *Oxford Dictionary of Architecture* (Oxford, 1999), p. 513. See Chapter 5.2.

A wooden staircase leads into the gallery from the ground floor. On the maps a square measuring about 6 by 6 meters, is projecting from the hall wing into the courtyard.[126] This may have been a porch but also it may have housed the wooden staircase. A brick built projection housing a wooden staircase was a solution frequently used when a hall was closed over.[127] Alternatively the stairs were housed in a portion of the hall. The value of this fitting was of 40 shillings, the same as the parlour floor and the palisade in the garden.

On the ground floor in the NE-SW wing there was the hall. It had been refurbished and fitted with wainscot worth 53 s and 4 d., which was considerably less than the panelling used for the studio, the parlour and the chamber on the ground floor. This suggests that it had become a small room in the context of the sixteenth-century redevelopment.

A chamber was located in this wing under the gallery end. This may have been at the south end of the hall. The wainscot panelling, worth £ 7, and the absence of a portal seem to indicate that this was a reception room. The value of the windows' glass, 13 s 4 d., suggests that these may have been few or the glass less precious. A parlour was located to the north of the hall, in the NW-SE wing, it was fitted with wainscot panelling and a portal valued at £ 5. A new a floor made of fir tree boards, worth 40 s, suggests that this room may have been extensively rebuilt. The glass panes were worth 30 s, a value second only to the windows of the great chamber. Having a view towards the gardens it is possible that the glass may have covered a greater extension that in the other reception rooms or that the glass was decorated. The parlour was an informal living and dining room, its proximity to the kitchen, as in this house, is an arrangement that became a common feature at the end of the sixteenth century.[128] The presence of a portal in this room suggests that it could have doubled as a bedroom for important guests, as was commonly done.[129] In Assize weeks the judges were lodging in the

---

[126] BIHR, Map 24 and a late 18th century map BIHR, CC. Ab. 11/86.

[127] J. Schofield, *Medieval London Houses* (New Haven and London, 1995), p. 84.

[128] Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 103.

[129] Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, pp. 58-9, 102-3.

Subdeanery and this high status room would have been more suitable for a high standard level of hospitality than some of the smaller bedrooms on the upper floor.[130]

The kitchen was next to the parlour; its position may be indicated by a chimney stack protruding into the courtyard on later maps.[131] Other service rooms, such as pantries, may have been present but were not mentioned in the inventory. The gardens of the Subdeanery were located towards the north-east and contained a wood palisade worth 40 s. By 1707 the Subdeanery had been divided in four tenements.[132]

Conclusion

Precentor's Court was originally an area occupied by the mansion of Fenton, by the Subdeanery and their curtilages. The mansion of Fenton was used as a workshop. From 1570s these medieval mansions were redeveloped and upgraded with the most contemporary features. A new carpenters' workshop was built on the south side of the street, but in the following decade this area with workshops, stables and service buildings was progressively developed into residential lodgings. The social changes reflected by these developments will be discussed in chapter 5.1 and 6.2.

---

[130] YMA, Wb, fols. 281v-282. Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, pp. 108-9.

[131] BIHR, Map 24; BIHR, CC. Ab. 11/86.

[132] YMA. Wf, fols. 223-224 ;with surrender of a 1707 lease. From 1585 all the rent is given to the Vicar Choral. YMA Wb, fols. 338-339; Wc, fols. 90-90v.

2. 3 The southern area of the Close

2. 3. 1 The south-west side of the cathedral

The development of the area bounded by the south aisle of the cathedral to the north, the present street Deangate to the south, the west wall of the south transept and Library and the west tower of the cathedral, is very well documented by the written sources. However, there are not visual or archaeological sources for this development, therefore the mapping of its topography is hypothetical. Three main phases of land use for this area between the fourteenth and the early eighteenth century have been identified. Six residential properties were attested there from the end of the sixteenth century until the beginning of the eighteenth century.[133] (Map 12)

Phase 1. From c. 1350 to 1544

During the third quarter of the fourteenth century, when the construction of the south nave of the cathedral had been completed, a house called *le loge* in the *cimiterium*, was rebuilt after a fire destroyed a previous Masons' Lodge on the site.[134] This was situated between the south nave and Deansgate, a few yards from the west wall of the standing Library building. A lime kiln house was part of the Masons' Lodge and situated on its west side.[135] From the written sources it is not possible to know how these were constructed. A well, known as the Masons' well, was situated to the north of the Lodge towards the cathedral. It was already in use during the second half of the fourteenth century and was attested until 1661, by 1576 it was enclosed within a well house.[136] The Lodge housed tools and implements for the Mason's craft. A large carriage with four wheels, used to carry stones, timbers and other things and two other carriages

---

[133] There are no measurements for the buildings in this area, therefore their east-west width can only be hypothetical.

[134] YMA, E3/2. Brown, *York Minster*, pp. 101-6.

[135] YMA, Wb 333v-334.

[136] YMA, E3/3, bucket with ropes for the well by the Lodge. E3/45, 1543-44; E3/47,1549-50; E3/50, 1567-68 E3/53, 1573-74; E3/61, 1586-87repairs to the bucket of the Mason well. We 9v Part II. E3/54 a wooden door with new lock, keys and staple was made for the well house.

used to carry stones away from the Lodge, were also part of the equipment.[137] This suggests that the Lodge may have been used for working and storing the stones of the cathedral. Some of the architectural design may also have been done there, as it is suggested by the presence of tracing boards and compasses in the Lodge.[138] The activity that most certainly took place in this area was the production of mortar for the fabric of the cathedral. Three structures also served this purpose: the well, the lime kiln house and the Lime house, located directly to the west of the kiln house. A sand house may also have been located in this area.[139] The Lime house was attested since 1433 and served to store lime and plaster.[140] The Library was built to the west of the south transept between 1415 and 1420 and therefore the space available in this area for the masons' activities may have then been reduced.[141] After 1472, when the cathedral was completed, masons were still employed for repairs and maintenance, but in the following century the Masons' Lodge and its area underwent radical changes.

Phase 2. From 1544 to 1701

During the second half of the sixteenth century this area was converted into residential and commercial use. In 1544 there was a small building between the Library and the Masons' Lodge This was possibly the same tenement leased in 1578, which occupied the space between the south nave of the cathedral, the Library to the east and the Masons' Lodge to the west.[142] It was a timber framed

---

[137] YMA, E3/3.

[138] The tracing room was on the loft of the Chapter house vestibule A. B. Holton, 'The Working Space of the Medieval Master Mason: the Tracing Houses of York Minster and Wells Cathedral' in *Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Construction History*, Volume II (2006), pp. 1579-1597.

[139] YMA, E3/54, 1575-76 labourers carried sand to the sand house.

[140] YMA, E3/12 1432-33 E3/13, 1434-35; E3/15, 1441-42; E3/16, 1442-3; E3/17, 1444-45; E3/18, 1445-46; E3/19, 1446-47; Lime was carried from the river to a *domus plastri* within the Close. E3/53, 1573-74;E3/54, 1575-1576 Lime house. In sixteenth century Fabric Rolls labourers were pounding stones for the kiln. For mortar production see Salzman, *Building in England,* pp. 149-54.

[141] Brown, *York Minster*, pp. 210-11. Before the construction of the south aisle the site was occupied by the old Cathedral school, moved in 1289 in Petergate, Brown, *York Minster,* pp. 88-89.

[142] YMA, E3/45; Wb, fol. 302; Wc, fols. 5v-6, 11; Wc, fols. 228v-229.

house with one or more upper floors, the list of the appurtenences suggest the presence of a hall, parlour, kitchen, chambers, lofts, solars, "dyng" and yard. In 1578 the tenant had the responsibility for the repairs except for the frame's "great timbers". Perhaps because of its proximity to the Library the Dean and Chapter may have wanted to have more control of the repairs. The tenement had a small yard on the back that may have extended to the space in the corner formed by the south transept and the south nave, to the north of the Library. In 1661 this property was severed into two tenements, the one lying to the west may have included a shop[143].

In 1569 the Masons' Lodge was object of minor building works. Two carpenters worked there for five days and one for three days. Ten bushels of grey plaster were used suggesting that partition walls may have been erected to create separate rooms.[144] The Lodge may have been prepared to be leased as residential use, in fact in 1578 the eastern part of the Mason's Lodge was in the occupation of a goldsmith, William Rawson, who moved into the new built house across the street in the same year.[145] By 1584 this part of the Masons' Lodge has been converted into a substantial house, which was described as a "lately built", suggesting that it was perceived as a structure of some age.[146] This had upper storeys, a cellar and could have included hall, parlour, kitchen, chambers, lofts, solars, dynges and yards. In the small backyard of the property there was the Masons' well, this and its well house were also extensively refurbished in 1584.[147] Two tilers worked at its structure for three days and a new iron frame was made. Great attention was given to the drainage system in this area. Gutters around the well were made by three masons, two apprentice and two labourers working for five days. These gutters were probably draining water away from the cathedral through a gutter running in the alley along the west wall of the Library

---

[143] YMA,We, fols. 35v, 26; We, fols. 67v-68; We, fols. 223-223v.

[144] YMA, E3/5.

[145] YMA, Wb, fol. 302.

[146] YMA, Wb, fols. 333v-334; Wc, fols. 248; We, fol. 9v Part II.

[147] YMA, E3/60.

and joining the channel running in the street.[148] One mason worked for five days, two further masons, two apprentice and two labourers, worked for four days. Due to the close proximity of the cathedral, these masons were probably taking great care in designing the drainage system.[149] When the property was leased the access to the Mason well remained free and convenient for any person that needed to use it according to custom[150]. The lessee of the house was Henry Swinbourne a prominent lawyer.

The lime kiln house in 1584 was intended to be kept for the necessary uses of the cathedral church, however, in the following year this industrial building was redeveloped together with the Wright house.[151] A timber frame and a roof may have been built at this time. Three sawyers prepared the timbers and carried them to the building site. Two carpenters worked there for twelve days, another one for nine days and two labourers for three days. This suggests that a timber frame was made and a roof was erected in the three days in which all the workers were on site. A thousands bricks and thirty two ridge tiles were shared between the walls of the Wright house and the lime kiln house.[152] Three hundred thack tiles may have been used for covering the roof, capped by the ridge tiles.[153] This required the work of three masons or tilers and an apprentice for eight days.[154] In 1617 the lime kiln house was defined as a "building or room". This in the seventeenth-century leases seems to indicate a building used for storage, like a shed, comprising of one room and no upper floors. However, by 1661 this tenement was definitively residential, described as a "little house" with a small backyard.[155]

---

[148] YMA, E4a, 1688.

[149] YMA, E3/60.

[150] YMA, E3/61; E3/62/3,.

[151] YMA, Wb, fols. 333v-334; E3/60.

[152] For the Wright house see pp. 68-73.

[153] For reuse of material see Chapter 6.3.

[154] YMA,E3/60.

[155] YMA, Wc, fols. 276-276v; Wd, fols. 44v-45; We, fols. 24-24v; We, fols. 346-347;We, fols. 40v-41.

To the west of the lime kiln house there was the Lyme house. This was also defined as "a building or room" and from 1617 it was leased together with a house in the Minster Yard.[156] By 1693 this room was divided in two tenements, one was occupied by a poor woman receiving financial support from the Dean and Chapter.[157] This indicates, as in many other instances that in the second half of the seventeenth century there was a tendency to subdivide residential space. To the west of the Lime house there was another building. This was described in 1617 as "a late erected building", implying that the building was perceived as having stood for some time. Its proximity to the kiln and the Lyme house suggests that this building could have been the former sand house.[158]

On the back of these tenements, right to the south of the cathedral, between the backyard of the former lime kiln house to the west and the property next to the Library, there was Mr Penrose office. This was a small building, attested from 1614, consisting of a ground floor room and a chamber above.[159] The access to this building may have been gained throughout an alley next to the west wall of the Library, which would also have permitted convenient public access also to the Masons' well.[160] After 1667, the leases of these tenements were renewed. However, the clearance of the area was carried out in 1701.[161]

Phase 3. From 1701 to 1715

A limestone capped brick wall was built to enclose the area, a portion of which, to the north of the Library, served as a wood yard. (Map 5 a) A gate provided access to the site. In 1715 the plot of land, measuring 47 yard in length, from the south transept west wall to the south west tower, became the burial ground for the parish of St Michael the Belfrey. The wood yard remained in the use of the

---

[156] YMA, Wc, fols. 276-276v; Wd, fols. 44v-45; We, fols. 24-24v.

[157] YMA, We, fols. 346-347.

[158] YMA, Wc, fols. 276-276v; Wd, fols. 44v-45; We, fols. 24-24v.

[159] YMA, Wc 244;We, fols. 4-4v Part II;We, fols. 281-281v.

[160] YMA E3 Fabric Books 1688; Wd, fols. 114v-115.

[161] YMA, Wc, fol. 244, 26; We, fols. 4-4v Part II;We, fols. 281-281v.

Dean and Chapter, who also gave precise rules in order to avoid any damage to the cathedral church. The level of the ground was not to be allowed to rise and kept at least ten feet under the water table of the lowest window. Water management was considered important for the conservation of the cathedral. Sources and water courses in the area were not to be disturbed and water channels and drains that carried away rain water falling from the cathedral were not to be damaged or changed. Maintenance and repairs of the drainage were to be carried out in order to avoid the stagnation of water near the walls and buttresses.[162]

Conclusion

The first phase of development in this area was represented by structures for the storage and processing of building materials destined to the fabric of the cathedral and the Masons' Lodge. During the second half of the sixteenth century the area was redeveloped as residential and these pre-existing structures were converted into housing. Documents for the area to the south of the cathedral also provide important information on sixteenth-century water management. These themes will be discussed in Chapter 6.2 and 6.3 and 6.4.

2. 3. 2 The south and south –east sides of the cathedral

Abutting the south wall of the cathedral's south transept, on both sides of the south door from the mid sixteenth century until 1674 there was a row of timber-framed buildings. The building accounts together with the leases, the pictorial sources and archaeological excavations, allow a study of these structures unparalleled within the Close. (Fig. 19, 20, 21)

---

[162] YMA,Wf, fols. 148v-150.

Shop to the west side of the cathedral's south door

A "new shop" was built in 1569.[163] For its construction a tree was bought and sawyers were sent to the wood of Langwith to provide ten wagon loads of timbers. Other timber materials such as 88 planks and 61 studs were bought, as well as 35 bunches of laths. To frame and assemble the building a carpenter worked for seventeen days. Two worked for sixteen days and one of them for further fifteen days. One other carpenter worked for fourteen days. At the times when the building was raised and more people were required for heavy lifting, they were joined by a carpenter for eight days and a half and by two for nine days. The same men worked together again for five days. Two wood planks were used to make the roof gutters of the new shop and other two planks were employed to make two shop boards. These were probably counters and shutters.

In 1569 a considerable quantity of brick and tiles was bought for the building projects of the Fabric. Unfortunately the accounts do not specify on which building site they had been used; however, 1000 thack tiles that were bought in three different batches were carried from New Street to the new shop. Sixteen ridge tiles would have also been used for its roof pitch. Moreover 2,200 bricks and 750 tiles were bought. These were shared between this site the Masons' Lodge and the house of South Cave. In the "new shop" bricks and tiles may have been used for nogging between the studs of the timber frame. Indeed a considerable amount of time was spent by tilers on this project. A tiler worked for ten days, another one worked in two separate occasion for three days and then for seven days. His labourer was on site for six days the first time and for seven days the second. Another tiler and his labourer worked for five days. Tilers may have also built the limestone sill supporting the frame.[164] A plumber worked for three days and half, probably finishing the roofs and lining the wooden gutters. A smith provided the building with all the necessary iron accessories. These were

---

[163] YMA E3/51; E1/91-92/2, 93/1; Wb, fols. 373-373v. in the Fabric Rolls is defined as a "new shop", in the Chamberlain Rolls as a "new shop wherein the Stationer dwelleth", and in the Leases as an house and shop.

[164] Dean, 'Minster Yard and Minster Gates', pp. 7, 8 and 16.

an iron dog to strengthen the woodwork and a series of objects, which had the function of strengthening the windows frame and supporting the glass. These were four pair of iron bands with eight eyed hooks, a pair of metal stanchions and a pair of joints for them, six bars and twelve window stanchions and six bolts iron bands, hinges for the windows and staples, plus pins for hanging the doors and hooks.[165] The nails were bought together for all the projects and included double and single spinkins, rather large nails for timbers, and sixpenny nails for general carpentry. Lead nails, 5000 "brodd" nails, large, flat with a small head, and 150 "stotson" for fixing wooden studs. In addition 1000 sharpeling nails were bought.[166]

The building abutted the west side of the south transept of the cathedral, between the south doorway and the transept's south-west corner buttress. A seventeenth century engraving of the cathedral's south transept shows this property.[167] It was represented as a three bay, two-storey house. Two small bays were built between the portal of the south doorway and the west buttress of the aisle of the south transept. The contrast with the dimension of cathedral allows the estimate of the width of each bay. They must have measured about three meters in width each. A third bay was built between the west face of that buttress and the east face of the west corner-buttress. This bay would have been about six meters wide. The height of the building from street level to the roof pitch would have measured about seven meters.[168] The depth of the building measured from the transept wall was c. 4.50m.[169] External fittings, such as a counter and shelving, are shown in the first bay of the shop to the west. A penthouse runs along the top of the ground floor.[170] A doorway was also in this bay. On the top floor there was one latticed window and three other small ones. The upper one suggests the presence

---

[165] Salzman, *Building in England*, pp. 292-3.

[166] Salzman, *Building in England*, pp. 304-17.

[167] King 1656, plate 62. An engraving by King 1656 shows the cathedral without the building by the south door. This is also the case of the one reproduced in Dugdale 1676.

[168] The measurements are taken from plans and elevations of the cathedrals Brown, *York Minster*, pp. 29, 274.

[169] Dean, 'Minster Yard', p. 8.

[170] Barnard and Bell, *John Foster's Inventory*, pp. 27-31.

of a loft space under the gables. The second bay had two latticed windows on the ground floor and one on the upper floor. A ground floor passage between the second and the third bay may have lead to the third bay's doorway. A window opened onto the passage and two short and wide rectangular ones on the street side. On the first floor there was a six paned, rectangular latticed window and a further garret window under a gabled roof. Two thin chimneys, one on the fist bay and one on the third bay, show that this was a proper dwelling house rather than just a shop. To the west of this property there was a yard, this had been obtained by fencing a portion of the Minster Yard with a new palisade.[171]

Shops on the east side of the south doorway

On the east side of the cathedral's south door there were three other shops. These are attested from 1572 and may have been built earlier than the shop on the west side.[172] The 1656 engraving show that this building was standing between the cathedral south doorway and the west face of the east corner-buttress of the south transept. It was a four bay building of about twelve meters in length. Remains of the base of its base limestone wall have been found in a archaeological excavation.[173] As the shop on the west side it had an extended ground floor and gabled roofs. The first shop consisted of a bay occupying the space between the Minster doorway and the east aisle-buttress of the south transept, and a smaller bay. On the ground floor there was a doorway in the second bay and a lattice window in the first. On the upper floor there was a large lattice window of at least three panes in the first bay and another window in the second bay. The second and the third shops had adjacent doorways and short and wide rectangular windows on the ground floor and lattice windows on the upper floor. Two thin chimneys are shown in a symmetrical position as the house on the west side.

---

[171] YMA, Wb, fols. 373-373v.

[172] YMA, E1/91-92/2, 93/1, YMA, Wc, fols. 43v-44; Wc, fols. 293-293v. In 1572 the three shops are describes as "thre other builded shoppes" in contrast with the "newe builded shoppe". This may suggest that they were built between 1552 and 1567, when there is a gap in Fabric Rolls. We, fols. 11-11v Part II;

[173] Dean, 'Minster Yard', pp. 7, 8 and 16.

From the appurtenances lists in the leases, the shops in this development would have had parlours and chambers.

Open area to the east and south of the south transept

The area to the east of these shops was kept as grass plots or allotments. Immediately to the east of the said houses and leased with them, there was a parcel of ground three yards and twelve inches long and one yard and three quarter in width against the house and tapered to two feet and a half at the other end (3.45 by 0. 90 m). [174] A narrow plot of ground immediately to the east of the Vestry was leased with the shop to the west of the south door of the cathedral.[175] Next to this there was a garden or grass plot bounded by walls, which measured 24 yards in length and seven in width.[176] It was located to the south of the cathedral and belonged to the former prebendal house of Warthill.[177] A note in margins of a 1677 lease indicates that this was a "garden under belfrido".[178] The belfry referred to was the one on the top of the gable of the south transept, which was removed shortly after 1750.[179] Therefore this garden may have been located along the vestry to the south.[180] This location would fall within the boundaries of the mansion of Warthill if these were prolonged towards the cathedral church. The location of this parcel and the fact that it belonged to the prebendal house of Warthill is significant for the early topography of the Close and the impact of the construction of the Lady Chapel in the late fourteenth century.

---

[174] YMA, Wc, fols. 293-293v.

[175] YMA, We, fols. 40v-41v.

[176] YMA, We, fols. 36-36v; We, fols. 185-185v; We, fols. 200-201.

[177] See Chapter 2. 4. 1., p. 108-9.

[178] YMA, We, fols. 200-201.

[179] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral', p. 5.

[180] Daniel King's 1657 etching of the south prospect of the cathedral shows a low wall in this position. However, this representation is imaginary.

Conclusion

The houses in this location were purpose built as bookshops. The meanings of their location by the cathedral's doorway will be discussed in chapter 4 and 5.2. This area provides also information on attitudes to environmental issues and water management, which will be discussed in Chapter 6.4.

2. 3. 3 From the South Minster Gate to the Minster's South Door

This area sits between Petergate to the south, the church of St Michael-le-Belfrey to the west, the present Dean Gates to the north and the boundary of the medieval Deanery, now occupied by York Minster School, to the east. The present street Minster Gates preserves the medieval alignment and runs from Petergate to the Minster's South Door. Despite the radical eighteenth and nineteenth-century redevelopment, today's property boundaries preserve the early modern arrangement. (Map 12)

The South Minster Gate

The South Minster Gate was situated on the northern side of Petergate at the intersection with the street running north-south and leading from the South door of the Cathedral towards Stonegate, the present Minster Gates. (Fig. 22-23)In respect of the historical topography of the area the South Minster Gate was at the intersection of the *via Praetoria* and the *via Principalis,* respectively the *cardo maximus* and the *decumanus maximus* of the Roman fortress of Eboracum. The South Minster Gate is first mentioned in the second half of the fourteenth century in reference to the rents of an house or tenement next to the "Gate of Stonegate"*:* *"pro j domo iuxta portam de Staynegayte"*.[181] In a lease of the Commonality of

---

[181] YML, E3/3. The Gates are defined by the name *porta* as a singular object, in every reference to the same property (YML, E3/5, 6, 7, 8, 9,10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15,19) until 1458: "*iuxta portam clausi versus Staynegate*"(YML, E3/23). From 1470 until 1499 (YML, E3/24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 32) in the Fabric Rolls, John de Beverly's tenement is described as located "*iuxta portas Staneigate*" , next to the gates, in the plural. In a survey of the jurisdiction of the Dean and Chapter c 1390 a tenement is described as being in front of the Dean's gates *"coram portis decanis"* (Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents',Vol. 2, p.179 YML, M2/2c, fol. 31). In 1398 is referred to as "the great gate of St Peter, which extended towards Stonegate" (Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 2, p. 192, YML, M2/2a, fo 44).

York the gate is named the "Great Gate of the Dean", indicating that for the city the Deanery was the prominent landmark in this area.[182] In the sixteenth and seventeenth-century documents these are referred to simply as "Minster Gates", suggesting that this was seen as the main entrance to the Close. From 1618 the denomination "South Minster Gates" is also attested.[183] The Gates were built as a timber gatehouse with a first floor chamber annexed to and accessed from the tenement abutting on the east. In the last quarter of the fifteenth century, possibly in 1483, new doors for the gate were made.[184] They were substantial wooden fittings that required the work of two carpenters for sixty-six days and a half. The doors were reinforced with four hundred pounds weights and a quarter of "medium iron", perhaps in the form of boucles to strengthen or given to the doors a more defensive look. A locksmith made the doors' furnishing: one plate lock, one iron pin, one mallet and one iron ring. A woodwork carver and his apprentice worked for thirty four days, the doors therefore must have carried a sculpted decoration. The craftsmanship appears to have been of high standard since the carvers Henry and John Connyng were working in that year at the polyptic of St Peter for the cathedral's high altar.[185] Since the West Minster Gates were decorated with the sculpted coats of arms of the Liberty of St Peter, it is possible that arms of the Dean and Chapter were also prominently displayed at this entrance to the Close.[186] The South Minster Gate may have been a passage for pedestrians only: posts blocking the passage for vehicles were recorded in 1370 and a drinking fountain was in the street in c1470.[187] The gateway was still attested in 1736 leases, but was destroyed without recording by 1800.[188]

---

[182] YCA, I: 80A.

[183] YMA,Wc, fols. 301-301v, We, fols. 12v; We, fols. 327-327v; We, fols. 333-334v; We, fols. 326. See chapter 3, pp. 159-66.

[184] YMA, E3/29.

[185] YML E3/29; In contrast with other craftsmen the Connyng are recorded in the Fabric Accounts only in this year. Therefore they were probably specialists wood carvers employed for this particular job, see Salzman, *Building in England*, p. 32.

[186] See chapter 3, pp. 159-166.

[187] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 160.

[188] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 160, no documentary reference.

Tenements on the corner between Petergate and Minster Gates

These tenements are not within the administrative boundary of the Close, however, they are connected with the main gate towards the city and have double access to the Close and the street.[189] The tenement on the corner with Petergate, abutting unto the Minster Gates on the east side, was developed as shops in the second half of the fourteenth century.[190] The house was repaired by tilers in 1569. [191]By 1594 this timber framed house comprised several shops and a chamber above the Minster Gates.[192] On the ground floor there was one shop opening onto the east side of the street now Minster Gates. A second shop was to the south of the first one, opening on the same street and next to the Minster Gates, and another shop was on the north side of Petergate adjoining westward unto the Minster Gates. Above the shops facing Minster Gates, there were two chambers and two garrets. One chamber and two closets were above the shop in Petergate and one chamber and a closet were over the Minster Gates. The tenement was rebuilt in 1839, no structures of the previous buildings remain on the site.[193]

To the west of the Minster Gates on the corner with Petergate, in the fourteenth century there was a plot of land measuring 22 feet in length and 13 feet in width (6.70 by 4 m). It belonged to the mayor and commonality of York, which on 17 March 1312 were granted licence to enclose it.[194] At the beginning of the fifteenth century the same tenement appeared to have been extended in size incorporating a tenement to the north. [195] On a lease dated 26 April 1424 it was described as "newly built", measuring 9 ells (10 m and 35 cm)in length along Petergate, from the tenement of the Dean and Chapter on the west, to the "Great

---

[189] See Chapter 2.1 and 3 for the setting of boundaries.

[190] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents'Vol. 2, pp. 192-3.

[191] YMA,E3/51.

[192] YMA, Wc, fols. 81-81v; Wd, fols. 159v-161v; We, fols. 150-150v; Wf, fols. 92-92v.

[193] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 161; YMA, H10 (2), f 160.

[194] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents'Vol. 2, p.195 PRO, C, 143/88/4; *Cal. Pat. Rolls* 1307-13, p. 448.

[195] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 2, pp. 196-7.

Gate of the Dean" on the east. It measured in width 6 and a half ells (7 m and 47 cm), from Petergate to the stone wall of the Dean behind. [196] The significance of this will be discussed in Chapter 3. At some point between 1424 and 1547 this "newly built" tenement became part of the estate of the Dean and Chapter.[197] A timber framed house is still standing today at 1 Minster Gates and 38 High Petergate. (Fig. 23) The elevation towards these streets, however, was veneered in bricks in the late eighteenth century, preserving the timber frame on the interior and on the back of the house.[198] This is a four bay, three-storey house with jetties towards the Petergate frontage, which have been cut back to make a regular front. The timber framed structure dates to the fifteenth or the early sixteenth century. [199] A fourth attic floor, with ogee brackets, was added in the late sixteenth century and a room on the second floor contains early seventeenth century panelling and a fireplace.

The west side of Minster Gates

House with the "Coltman shop".

On the west side of the street, next unto the South Gates of the Close there was a shop, the "Coltman shop", recorded in the leases from 1618.[200] It measured one yard and a quarter in width along the street front and two yards and three quarters in depth (c. 1.20 by 2.50m). The neighbouring house to the north was composed of two shops, which together measured two yards and three quarters in width and two yards in depth (2. 50 by 1.80m). [201] The house had upper floors extending above the "Coltman shop" and abutting the north side of the house in 38 High Petergate.

---

[196] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 2, p. 196, YCA, I: 80A.

[197] YMA, Wb, fols. 35-35v, Wb, fols. 138-138v; Wb, fols. 318; Wc, fols. 274v-275; We 7-7v Part I; We, fols. 197-197v-198.

[198] For this kind of Georgenaisation see M. Jenkins, 'Urban Myths: the Communities of Micklegate, York', PhD Thesis, University of York,(forthcoming).

[199] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, pp. 160-1.

[200] YMA, Wc, fols. 301-301v, We, fols. 12v; We, fols. 327-327v; Wf, fols. 162v-163.

[201] YMA, Wc, fols.300-301; We, fols. 37v-38; We, fols. 333-334; Wf, fols. 78-78v.

William Gibson's house

To the north of the house with the two shops there was a house attested since 1562 in the leases but earlier in the Fabric Rolls.[202] This was redeveloped in 1574 and named after its occupier "William Gibson's house", who was a tailor and held the office of Keeper of the Gates.[203] The material bought for this work included "a great timber", meaning a timber for the structural frame of the house, poles, boards and timber for studs and "sparris". Six carpenters worked there for 20 days; with the material bought they may have substantially modified the house or increased its space such as adding a storey. Fifteen bunches of laths were also bought, perhaps used for partitions or ceilings. Tiles and 800 bricks were used, suggesting that the timber frame was filled in bricks, since three tilers worked for thirteen days in filling and plastering the walls; a chimney also may have been added. The roof was provided with gutters made of one hundred and a quarter pounds in weight of lead. The materials and the number of days needed for the construction suggests that this was the redevelopment of a substantial house. This is reinforced by the high rental value, compared to other properties, and by the appurtenances that since 1562 included halls, chambers, parlours and two shops. By 1605 this house was leased together with the next one to the north.

The "new house".

To the north of William Gibson's house, a new house was built in 1575 on the corner between Minster Gates and the Minster Yard. [204] There is no information on how this land was used before, but the fact that the ground was levelled before construction by three masons for a day suggests that it may not have been a previously built up. It could possibly have been the enclosed land attested in 1499 next to the Exchequer (see below). The building project ran in parallel to the construction of the Wright House by teams working on both sites.[205]Two

---

[202] YMA, E3/ 41-45; Wb, fols. 129v-130;Wc, fols.97v-98.

[203] YMA, E3/53.

[204] YMA, E3/54; Wc, fols. 227v-228.

[205] See pp. 68-74.

sawyers prepared the timbers during six days. A timber framed house was built by six carpenters, two working for 50 days and four working for 44 days. Despite the number of days worked by the carpenters, no timber was bought for this job, which indicates extensive recycling of timber. However, 500 bunches of hard laths were bought for partitions; three mason or tilers worked for 44 days in kilning, lime or plaster, plastering and sealing the walls. Grey and white plaster was shared with the Wright house.[206] Two tilers worked for 22 days but even for this job no material was purchased. The yard of the house was surfaced by two labourers in two days, with two bushels of "calmierashes" bought for this purpose.[207] The iron nails bought were shared with the Wright house, but a smith did custom made iron fittings. The list of these gives information on the layout of the house. On the ground floor there were a shop and a "little shop", they had a door each with lock and key and windows with hinges, bands, bolts and wedges. The windows of the house required three days work from a glazier. The shop stalls required ten pairs of joints. This suggests the presence of folding counters perhaps extending towards the street, with casements to shut the windows at closing times. The shops casements' in fact had iron joints and crocks. The latter may have served for fixing the shutter open, forming a protective penthouse. The house had a gate-door, perhaps meaning a shop door and a strong backside door made of poles provided with lock and key. A further back door had a latch. On the interior on the foot of the stair there was a door with bands and crock leading to a ground floor room and another door was under the stairs. The door of the buttery was provided with lock and key as well as the one of the chamber, which was probably on the upper floor, and a loft. Iron objects were also used for structural purposes, a doge of iron was made and nailed to join two "pannes" of the house, this may have been a strengthen the timber frame between two bays.

Margareth Warthon's house

---

[206] See pp. 68-74.

[207] I was not able to find what this material is.

To the west of the above mentioned house's yard, there was an empty area bounded by the Exchequer office to the south, the church of St Michael-le-Belfrey to the west and the Minster Yard to the north. A house was built at some point between 1692 and 1710 on the site of the yard of the "new house".[208] This tenement measured about eleven yards from the Exchequer to the Minster Yard and five yards and two feet in width. It abutted the Exchequer office to the south and the "new house" to the east.

The Archbishop's Exchequer Office

This building in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was located to the east of St Michael-le-Belfrey. Towards the north the Exchequer was set about 10 meters back from the Minster Yard and was bounded by the properties in Minster Gates and the ones in Petergate.[209] An Exchequer was already mentioned in the Fabric Accounts in 1499 regarding the rent of a piece of land within the Close: *"de parcella terre circum clause iuxta scaccarium".*[210] Between 1531 and 1544 a house of the Fabric was rented by the Archdeacon of Richmond to be used as the Exchequer of the Archbishop.[211] This occurred at the time when the church of St Michael-le-Belfrey was being rebuilt. Anthony Masinton's stone by stone recording of the east front of this church has identified the vestige of two buildings abutting its east wall. One was demolished before the 1525-37 remodelling of the church. A horizontal row of chases in the masonry under the east window sill represents the upper floor joist of a building demolished before the construction of that tracery window.(Fig. 26) The second building is represented by a low pitched roof scar cutting into the new window sill. A lower structure therefore was built when the east front was completed.[212] It can be

---

[208] YMA, We, fols. 332v-333; Wf, fols. 207v-208; Wf, fols. 208-209.

[209] YMA, Wb, fols. 35-35v; Wb, fols. 138-138v; Wb, fols. 318;Wc fols. 274v-275; We fols. 7-7v Part I; We, fols. 197-197v-198; Wc , fols.300-301; We, fols. 37v-38; We, fols. 333-334; Wf, fols. 78-78v; Wb, fols. 129v-130; Wc 9, fols.7v-98; Wc, fols. 227v-228; We, fols. 332v-333; Wf, fols. 207v-208; Wf, fols. 208-209.

[210] YMA, E3/32.

[211] YMA, E3/42-43-44-45.

[212] Masinton, 'Sacred Space', p. 71 suggests that the older building was perhaps the house of John Porter, where an obnoxious latrine was attested in 1409, YMA, L2(3) b f 10r. However, the

suggested that an alternative location for this office was found while building work was in progress to the east of St Michael-le-Belfrey.

From 1576 the Exchequer is located with precision in the leases and an eighteenth-century map shows its position.[213] (Map 24) Recent excavations in 12 Minster Yard have discovered foundation made of large blocks of limestone.[214] (Fig. 24) Their location is consistent with the boundary of the sixteenth-century Exchequer, which is respected by neighbouring properties. The building, however, appears to have been of medieval date. An undated drawing shows an ashlar building set back from the street and abutting to the left houses of sixteenth or seventeenth-century appearance.[215] The ground floor has a doorway with a shouldered arch, similar to the ones in the eastern buttress of the north-west tower of the Minster, dating to the early fourteenth century. The upper floor is stepped back from the ground floor and has a very low pitched roof. It is therefore possible than the Exchequer was reduced in height to clear the east window of the redeveloped church.

The remains of an *in situ* burial and many skeletons disturbed by later construction works suggest that the area to the east of St Michael-le-Belfrey had been used at some point as a cemetery. [216]

The east side of Minster Gates street

On the back of the properties in on the east side of Minster Gates there was the crenellated Deanery wall. It ran from the Deanery house parallel to Minster Gates and then turned parallel to Petrgate. The east corner between Minster Yard and Minster Gates, the area now occupied by 10 Minster Gates and 10 Minster

---

latrine was most likely located in the back yard of one of the tenements facing Minster Gates or Petergate.

[213] YMA, Wb, fols. 289-290; BIHR, Ab/11/86.

[214] Dean, '12 Mister Yard', pp. 13-4.

[215] YML, YAYAS photographic collection, D 585, Engraving of exterior of the Old Wills Office and Interior D 584 (Fig. 26).

[216] Dean, '12 Mister Yard'.

Yard, during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was property of the Deanery. There was a house measuring in depth from the Deanery to the street 5 ½ yards (5 m) and in width 3 ½ yards (1.20m) on the street side and 2 ½ yards (2.20m) on the Deanery side. A shop was presumably on the ground floor of this house and another shop was next to it. It measured 4 yards (3.70m) in depth and 1 yard (0.95 m) in width towards the street and 2 feet (0.20 m) toward the Deanery. These properties were leased to the tenants of the adjacent house to the east of the South Minster Gate since as far as the 1570s' and were last leased in 1661.[217] From this date there is no mention of buildings in this area until 1720, when the renewal of a 1703 lease describes a different arrangement.[218] There was a house with a yard abutting Mister Gates to the west, another house to the south and the Deanery "Deanery Great Wall" to the east. A back lane 12 yards long (3.70m) lead to the Minster Yard. Another house to the north was on the corner of Minster Gates and the Minster Yard and the back lane. To the north-east side of this house an area of 13 yards (11. 91m.) had been abusively walled and was abusively encroaching on the Minster Yard. This house in 1722 was a coffee house. (Map 5 a)

Conclusion

The Minster Gates were the point of entry and main interface between the city and the Close. The extensive development of the residential and shop frontage in the sixteenth and in the late seventeenth century demonstrate that this was the most sought after commercial area of the Close. In Chapter 5.1 and 5.2 the nature of the trade in this area of narrow shop frontage will be discussed. It was also part of the legal space of the Close, providing access to the Ecclesiastical Courts and their offices, which will be discussed in Chapter 5.1.

---

[217] YMA, E3/51; YMA, Wc, fols. 81-81v;YMA, S3/5b fols. 82-3; 175-6; 134-36.

[218] YMA, Wf, fols. 202-203; Wf, fols. 203-204.

2. 4 The south-eastern area of the Close

2. 4. 1 The Deanery and the former prebendal house of Warthill

The Deanery, including the site of the mansion of Warthill, which was annexed to it in late thirteenth century, occupied the south-east part of the Close.[219](Maps 8 and 13) With respect of the topography of the Close the Deanery was in a prominent position, its main entrance almost facing the cathedral south door. It was located in proximity of the South Minster Gates, to the east, which were also called the Dean's Gates.[220] With respect to the Roman Fortress the Deanery was built on part of the east wing of the *Principia*, a very central and perhaps symbolic location.[221] (Fig. 2) To the east a fence separated the Deanery grounds from the prebendal mansion of Strensall.[222] To the south-east there was the churchyard wall of the Holy Trinity in Goodramgate and to the south properties facing Petergate. Some of which were part of the Dean's estate.[223] To the west and to the north, on the back of tenements facing Petergate and the present Minster Gates, there was a substantial stone boundary wall "the Deanery great wall".[224] This may have been the one built after the licence to crenellate was granted to the Dean in 1302.[225]In the seventeenth-century sources the "great wall" was only present in this part of the Deanery, the other boundaries were constituted by fences. It is possible that the "great wall" had disappeared or was not recorded, but it is also possible that only the portion overlooking the city was ever built. A substantial crenellated wall, continuing the one represented in front of the Deanery by the iconographic sources, would have been visible behind the timber framed tenements facing Petergate and Minster Gates. (Fig.29)

---

[219] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol 2, pp. 187-94 for the history of the Deanery estate in the medieval period.

[220] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 2, p. 195.

[221] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral', Fig. 2, p. 6.

[222] YMA, 02/MY/29.

[223] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 2, pp. 191-4.

[224] YMA 02/MY/29; We, fols. 326; Wf, fols. 203-203v-204.

[225] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* 1301-1307, p 19.

A fragmentary probate inventory of 1545 and the deed of sale of 1650, when the Deanery was sold by the Parliamentarian to William Allanson, former mayor of York, provide information on its appearance.[226] It was composed of a main residential house with a hall range running from north-east to south west. A cross wing was located to the south-west and two were to the north-east. These latter wings were probably standing on the land of the prebend of Langtoft, acquired to expand the Deanery at the end of the twelfth century.[227] In 1661 a ground floor room in the most external wing was described as being in the old building; this probably meant that this wing had retained its medieval appearance.[228] The 1650 inventory annexed to the deed shows that the Deanery had been redeveloped at some point during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century. The hall was in the central range facing the Minster. This had a medieval chimney protruding from the façade towards the Minster Yard. To the west of this there was the Porter's lodge consisting of a ground floor room and a chamber on the upper floor with a small parcel of ground to the north. In the south-west cross wing of the central hall there were four ground floor rooms and four chambers on the upper floor along with the great kitchen. Adjoining to the east end of the of kitchen there was a room measuring four yards square, which in 1635 was converted into a new pastry.[229] Two new ovens and a chimney were built and the room was to be fitted with all the necessary implements for making bread and baking.

The great kitchen may have been the medieval kitchen mentioned by the 1300 licence granted to the Dean to enclose a thoroughfare in order to expand his place and make the Close safer.[230] The lane was four feet wide and 60 feet long, leading from Petergate to the cemetery under the Dean's kitchen. It can be suggested that the lane ran parallel to the kitchen wing and emerged in the

---

[226] C. Cross, *York Clergy Wills, 1520-1600, I Minster Clergy*, Borthwick Texts and Calendars: Records of the Northern Province, 10 (York, 1984), p. 58-64; YMA 02/MY/29.

[227] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 2, p. 187.

[228] YMA S3/5b, 153; adjoining unto Warthill house.

[229] YMA S3/5b, 130-1, 132-3.

[230] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* 1292-1301, p. 558.

Minster Yard to the south-west of the Deanery house. (Fig. 27, 28 and 29) The distance of 60 feet (18m) corresponds almost to the distance from the site of the Deanery Back Gatehouse to the Minster Yard. A gate and a path visible in early nineteenth-century pictorial evidence may have commemorated this earlier thoroughfare. (Fig. 30) The closure of the lane would have been necessary for the Dean in order to build his great boundary wall. Abutting this, to the north-west of the kitchen but separated by it, there was the old pastry.[231] This measured five yards (4.50m) in width from the window to the Deanery great wall and about six yards (5.4m) in length from one of the chimneys of the great kitchen. The pastry in 1635 was deemed unfit for its purpose, it was a dark room and a drain was running against its chimney and ovens making the room damp. To the north-east there was a parcel of ground called the Deanery coal-hole. Adjacent to the pastry, on the west corner of the property, there was a slaughter house. It measured eight yards (7.2m) in length and seven yards and two inches (6.33m) in width NW-SE. The ground floor was leased during the seventeenth century and by then it does not seem to have been used for its original purpose. On the upper floor there was a chamber that during the seventeenth century was leased to the tenants of the house to the east of the Minster Gates.[232]

On the north-east side of the hall, in the cross wings, there were a wainscotted parlour and three chambers. A chapel and three other chambers may have been in the innermost cross wing. A cross passage gave access from the yard. Four chambers were located on the ground floor of the outer wing.[233] One of these was rented as a tailor shop in the first half of the seventeenth century and was said to be located in the yard of the Deanery in the "old building" of that house and adjoining Warthill house. On the upper floor above these rooms, there was a great chamber wainscotted and two smaller chambers. One of these was called

---

[231] YMA, S3/5, 132-3.

[232] YMA, S3/5b, 136-7, 173-4.

[233] YMA, S3/5b, 153.

the "Duke's chamber" and was right above the tailor's shop.[234] These two chambers may have overlooked the Minster Yard and had garrets above them.

Two further chambers were to the east end of the great chamber on the outer wing of the house. From the great chamber a passage with stairs gave access to the leads or roof top. It is possible that the Deanery roof was covered in lead as this may have been the case for other high status and public buildings within the Close such as the cathedral and Peter Prison; alternatively the leads may have been in reference to walkways at the base of the gables. Two chambers were located next to the leads. These had further garret chambers above them.[235]

A wainscotted long gallery was probably located above the hall range. A chamber to the north, on the inner cross wing, provided a suite to the great chamber. The gallery would have had a southern prospect towards the gardens and stairs led directly from the gallery to the gardens. A long chamber extended from the gallery southward. This would have been on the wing above the chapel. Four other chambers and a closet completed this range of rooms. On the upper floor there was a garret chamber. One great cellar, a smaller cellar and a little buttery with a passage between them were probably located in the undercroft of the north-eastern cross wings. The great cellar also had access to the Minster Yard from a parcel of land next to that of the Porter lodge. On the back of the great cellar there was a backyard. This suggests that the great cellar may have been under the outer cross wing. The Deanery cellars, aligned with the Roman Fortress *principia*, may have made use of these strong and high quality walls in limestone and grit, in a similar was as can be seen today in the houses in central Rome.

---

[234] YMA, S3/5b, 153.

[235] Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, pp. 104-8.

The Deanery Yard and the Gatehouse

The "Deanery great wall" enclosed the Deanery mansion to the west towards the Minster Close and continued on the back of the properties in Minster Gates. [236] The wall was probably turned towards the east, running parallel to Petergate. In the portion of Petergate between the South Minster Gates and the Deanery Back Gatehouse there were four properties, the two immediately to the east of the South Minster Gates belonged to the Dean and Chapter and the two further to the east belonged to the Dean's estate. [237] One of the Dean and Chapter properties abutted the "Deanery great wall" towards the north.[238] The properties of the Dean's estate in the seventeenth century were both leased with an annexed portion of the Deanery yard, measuring three yards and three quarter in width and nine yards in length (3.33 by 8,18m).[239] Fences were separating these parcels of land from the rest of the Deanery yard but there is no mention in this location of a more substantial structure as a great stone wall.[240]

The "Deanery great wall" therefore was not linked to another important boundary structure: the Deanery Back Gatehouse. This was built over the lane running from Petergate to the *cimiterium*, which the Dean had permission to enclose in 1300.[241] The arrangement of the Deanery yard is here reconstructed with a combination of sources between 1600 and 1691. The Gatehouse consisted of a passage between walls probably stone or brick built.[242] The eastern one measured nine yards (9.00m) in length from Petergate to the Deanery yard and

---

[236] See p. 93.

[237] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 2, identifies four or five properties in this location from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century. From the seventeenth century leases it seems that there were four properties in this area, two belonging to the Dean and Chapter and two to the Deanery.

[238] YMA, We, fol. 326.

[239] YMA, S3/5b, 1-2, 64-5, 98-9, 99-100; S3/5b, 3-4, 66-7, 115, 116, 191. This was on the site of n 48 Low Petergate RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 187. In the cellar there are stone walls that have influenced the shape of the 19th century rebuilding.

[240] YMA, 02/MY/29.

[241] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* 1292-1301, p. 558.

[242] YMA, We, fols. 363v-364.

was ten feet (3.00m) tall to the first cross beam, supporting a timber framed upper floor. On this floor there were chambers above the gates and to the north-east of these there were a stack of chimneys with closets.[243] These were built on a parcel of land on the north side and in 1691 were defined as "anciently built". The perception of the antiquity of this feature is significant. It shows how at that time privies were considered antiquated. However, it indicates the medieval origins of this gatehouse with lodgings provided with all comforts. [244] This structure may have been built during the fourteenth century after the granting of the Royal licence to crenellate the Deanery. Two houses facing Petergate belonging to the Dean's estate were abutting the gatehouse on both sides. The tenants of these houses had to carry out repairs when necessary except to the great timbers.[245]

On the north-eastern side of the gatehouse, near the closets and stacks, at the end of the seventeenth century there was a small parcel of ground enclosed by a brick wall.[246] Manure and dung were deposited on this site. The chimney stacks and closets were built on a parcel of ground four and a half yards wide and fourteen yards long (4.11 by 12.80m), leased as one lot in 1691 and enclosed by a brick wall. This was running parallel to the row of properties facing Petergate.[247]A "house of office" or latrine stood on this land, adjoining the gatehouse. An extension on the back of one of the properties fronting Petergate, was "lately built", on this portion of the Deanery yard. This building consisted of part of a kitchen and a back kitchen with rooms on the upper floor. A sewer collecting the water and sewage from the Deanery yard and possibly going towards the King's Ditch was running through this parcel of land.[248]

---

[243] YMA, S3/5b, 99-100.

[244] Wood, *The English Medieval House*, pp. 277-388 garderobes and fireplaces.

[245] YMA, S3/5b, 1-2, 98-99; S3/5b 45-7.

[246] YMA, We, fols. 363v-364.

[247] Lesed as several lots during the seventeenth century to the tenants of the Petergate properties. Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 2, tenements 46-9. YMA, S3/5b 45-7, 69-70, 84, 139. S3/5b, 55-7, 80, 107-8, 110-11.

[248] YMA, We, fols. 363v-364.

Further to the south-east, on another parcel of the Deanery yard a shed was built in the early seventeenth century. This was a "shedd or rome wherein turves are usually put" that is a shed to store peat, and abutted the south-west end of the Dean's stables.[249] These were located along the boundary between of the Deanery yard. The churchyard wall of St Trinity church was enclosing the yard towards the east.

The former Mansion of Warthill

The prebendal mansion of Warthill was located to the south-east of the Deanery, between the Deanery and the prebendal mansion of Greendale. Towards the end of the thirteenth century, between 1275 and 1279, it was leased to the Dean and annexed to the Deanery.[250] The mansion of Warthill extended toward the north-west and was truncated by the construction of the south part of the choir in1373-94 and the creation of a street to the south of it.[251] The narrow garden located to the south of the Vestry, formerly part of the mansion of Warthill, is an indication that the mansion extended towards the cathedral.[252] The truncated mansion of Warthill was not adequate as a prebendal house, therefore in 1415 it was given in mortmain by the prebendary of Warthill.[253] The Dean for the yearly rent of 3s 4d received a strip of land measuring 8 feet (2.4m) by 228 feet (66.12m) to expand his house. What remained of the mansion was given to the Dean and Chapter for lodging ministers and other needs of the Church of York for a yearly rent of 10s. This property consisted of the above mentioned garden, two ground floor rooms and a garden to the south of these rooms. The 1835 map shows two rectangular buildings, one with a fireplace on the short side to the south and the other with a fireplace on one of the long sides to the south east.[254] Together they may have measured about eleven yards (10m) in width and they may have been part of the

---

[249] YMA, We, fols. 363v-364; S3/5b, fols.189-90; 02/MY/29.

[250] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 2, p. 189.

[251] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 2, p. 104; Brown, *York Minster*, pp. 169-70 for the choir.

[252] YMA We 36-36v We 185-185v; We 200-201.

[253] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* 1413-1416, p. 288.

[254] BIHR, Map 24 (Map 25)

medieval mansion hall or wings.[255] By the seventeenth century the Dean had become the proprietor of the two rooms and of the back garden, which adjoined the Deanery yard. The two rooms by 1625 were partitioned by a tenant into five or six small rooms used as offices of bookshops.[256] In 1650 these were divided in two small rooms and two rooms adjoining the Minster Yard.[257] The uncertainty about the number of rooms, four to six, may indicate that there were partitions made by screens or panelling, which could have been easily changed according to needs. There was no upper floor above these rooms. The two gardens had combined dimensions of 11 yards (10m) in width and 24 (21.84m) in length.[258] On the boundary to the south-east there was a brick hut built after 1633.[259]

Conclusion

The area to the south east of the cathedral was occupied by the Deanery with its back yard and out buildings. The Deanery was oriented according to the Roman alignment. The medieval Back Gatehouse with lodgings was still surviving at the end of the seventeenth century. The medieval hall and cross wing mansion were redeveloped at some point between 1545 and 1650. To the north east of the Deanery the remaining ranges and gardens of the former mansion of Warthill had been maintained to be used for various needs of the cathedral community.

2. 4. 2 From the Prebendal Mansion of Strensall to College Street.

To the north-east of the mansion of Warthill there were the prebendal mansions of Grendall and of Strensall. (Maps 9 and 13) It is possible that these two mansions had also been cut by the building of the choir and Lady Chapel. This may explain why in 1492 the mansion of Grendall with all its buildings was given to the prebendary of Strensall for the yearly rent of 12 s.[260] The tenant was

---

[255] YMA, Wd, fol.115v.

[256] YMA,S3/5b, 85; 171-2.

[257] YMA, 02/MY/29.

[258] YMA, Wd, fols. 115-115v; We, fol. 45; We, fols. 362v-363; S3/5b, fols. 61-4, 48-50.

[259] YMA, 02/MY/29.

[260] YMA, M2/5, fols.343v-344.

allowed to pull down existing buildings and to rebuild them. The mansion of Strensall was thus expanded and probably partially rebuilt at the beginning of the sixteenth century. In 1590 the appurtenance clause for this mansion comprised of houses, buildings, stables, backsides, orchards, gardens, yards, grounds, curtilages and a brewhouse.[261]

By 1722 the greater part of the site was rebuilt and leased in three parcels.[262] The Residentiary house was erected as part of this rebuilding and was in the tenure of the Dean and Chapter. A map attached to an indenture dated 1784 shows the property at that time.[263] To the south-west of the Residentiary house there were ranges of buildings arranged about two courtyards. It is possible that this was part of the medieval complex or of its sixteenth-century rebuilding. A passage 27 feet wide opened into the Minster Yard and another passage nine feet wide led to the second courtyard further to the south-east. Both passages were on the line of the ward boundary marked on the OS 1852 map. (Map 2) This, in its southernmost part was on the line of the *Via Quintana* of the Roman Fortress. Right of way across these passages was specified in all leases; this may have been purely for access reasons but it is possible that the memory of an ancient thoroughfare was preserved in this way. The whole property, including the Residentiary house, was enclosed against Goodramgate, or more precisely a lane running parallel to Goodramgate, by a wall 210 feet in length. A passage along this wall put in communication the Residentiary gardens and the second courtyard. Another lane, Duberlane, led from Goodramgate along the churchyard of Holy Trinity church.[264] This system of lanes may have been a continuation of thoroughfares of Roman origins. It has been suggested that Duberlane continued on the north side of the Deanery.[265]

---

[261] YMA, Wc, fols. 27-27v

[262] BIHR, CC.P/Str 10 York 5, York 2.

[263] BIHR, CC.P/Str 10 York 8-15.

[264] Tringham, *Charters of the Vicars Choral*, pp. 107-8, YMA, VC 3/Vi 119 late 13th century and p. 126, YMA, VC 3/Vi 141(1404).

[265] Raine, *Medieval York,* p. 48.

To the south of this courtyard there were buildings described as houses and
shops. A range of stables and coach houses ran along the south-west side of both
courtyards. On the corner with Minster yard there was a coach house. On the
corner to the east of the first passage there was a residential wing with a
protruding chimney. Two other wings, one between the two courtyards and one
along the north-east side, were also residential.[266] The stable range and the
building to the north-west of the central range were demolished between 1835
and 1852.[267] This was probably carried out when the old Deanery was
demolished and the area to the south-east of the cathedral landscaped.

The prebendal mansion of Wistow was to the east of the east front of the
cathedral on the corner between Minster Yard and College Street and bounded to
the south-east by the lane running parallel to Goodramgate. This is the only
prebendal house not accounted for in the sixteenth and seventeenth-century
leases. However, it could be suggested that this was the mansion given to the
"master of the children" as his dwelling house and to house the song school.[268] In
the eighteenth century it was leased to, and continued to represent the presence
of, the Mayor and Communality of York within the Close. In 1778 some of the
premises had been rebuilt and the mansion consisted of two dwelling houses with
the appurtenances.[269]

The site of the church of St Mary-ad-Valvas

Topographical information relating to the Mansion of Wistow is important for
locating the site of the church of St Mary-ad-Valvas. This was a parish church
belonging to the Dean and Chapter and in 1315 attested with the name of *Mariae
ad portam monasterii*.[270] Between 1365 and 1376 the church was demolished to
widen the passage around the new Lady Chapel and its parish annexed to the one

---

[266] BIHR, Map 24.

[267] BIHR, Map 24 and OS 1852.

[268] YMA, Wa fols. 50v-51; Wa, fols. 157v-158.

[269] BIHR, CC.P/Wis 10 York 1.

[270] Tillott, *VCH York*, pp. 339-40, 384, 389.

of St John-del-Pyke.[271] The OS Map of 1852, preserving the memory of previous administrative boundaries and landmarks, locates the site of the demolished church, immediately to the east of the cathedral east front.[272] However, recently this location has been questioned by scholars. In 1972 during road works in College Green, opposite St William College, an ashlar wall was excavated.[273] The size and nature of the masonry indicated a high status building dating to the twelfth century and it was suggested that this could have belonged to St Mary-ad-Valvas. However, charters of the Vicars Choral shed light on the medieval topography of this area of the Close, suggesting a different interpretation. In the fourteenth century next to the mansion of Cam Hall and bounded by Goodramgate, there was an orchard. This had been given to the Vicars Choral by John le Romayn as a chantry.[274] The Vicars were leasing the orchard to the canons of Wistow and if they did not pay the rent they had the right to close the gate between the yard of the mansion of Wistow and the orchard. This suggests that there was contiguity in space between the orchard and the yard of the mansion of Wistow. The medieval mansion would have been located opposite the mansions of Salton and Huswayt, later redeveloped into St William's College. Ranges of buildings visible in the 1852 OS Map along Vicar Lane may have belonged to the medieval mansion, therefore it is likely that the structure emerged in the 1972 excavations, belonged to the twelfth-century phases of the mansion of Wistow. Therefore the location of St Mary-ad-Valvas indicated on the OS Map of 1852, to the north-west of the mansion of Wistow, is probably correct. The location *ad Valvas* and *ad portam monasterii*, rather than to the East Gate of the Close, probably referred to the gate into the *monasterium*, a more private area of the precinct before the secularisation of the Chapter. [275]

---

[271] Brown, *York Minster*, p. 144.

[272] See Chapter 2, pp. 54-5 for discussion on 1852 OS map.

[273] B. Wilson and F. Mee, *The Medieval Parish Churches of York: the Pictorial Evidence*, Archaeology of York Supplementary Series 1 (1998), p. 110; Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral', p. 22 and note 91.

[274] Tringham, *Charters of the Vicars Choral*, p. 82.

[275] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral', pp. 23-4 and note 91; for French examples see Picard *The Chanoines dans la Ville*, passim.

Conclusion

The two prebendal mansions in this area are aligned with the Deanery and the Roman Fortress. There is indication that the church of St Mary's at Valvas was probably located to the north-west.

2. 5 The eastern area of the Close

2. 5. 1 From the East Door of the cathedral to Chapter House Street

Abutting on the south side of the Chapter House and adjoining the Minster north-east doorway there was a parcel of ground measuring six yards in length and ten in width (5.48 by 9.14 m).[276] These measures correspond with the space between the fist and the second buttress of the chapter house. The parcel was used as a garden or grass plot. There were clauses restricting the tenants from building on this land, to alienate the lease or sublet without the consent of the Dean and Chapter. The tenants in this more private area of the close were under the control of the Dean and Chapter.

A small house was built on the south side of the Chapter House in the space between the second and third buttress. The roof scars are still visible on the Chapter house walls. (Map 15 and Fig. 31 and 32) This small building "*opella iuxta domum capitularis*" appears in the Fabric Accounts rents from 1538.[277] In 1569 this house was in need of repair; either to the walls of roofs. Two tilers and one labourer worked there for seven days.[278] From 1605 up to its demolition between 1710 and 1720 this house was rented with a substantial tenement in Minster Gates.[279]

---

[276] YMA, Wc, fols. 237v-238, We, fols, 260v-261, We , fols. 36-36v.

[277] YMA, E3/44, but the rolls in the previous decades were very damaged.

[278] YMA, E3/51.

[279] YMA, Wc, fols. 227v-228; We, fols. 332v-333; Wf, fols. 77; Wf, fols, 208v-209.

2. 5. 2 Chapter House Street and College Street

The Prebendal Mansion of Langtoft

The prebend of Langtoft was located to the east of the cathedral and occupied the land on the corner between Chapter House Street, College Street and Ogleforth.[280](Map 14) Different alignments seem to meet in this property. The north-west wall of the houses 4 Minster Yard and 1-3 Chapter House Street is aligned according to the Roman grid. The garden wall further east, changes orientation towards Ogleforth. This change could have been connected with the blocking of the east gate of the Roman Fortress at some point during the Middle Ages.[281] The date of this event is a problem in the topography of the Close that can only be solved with archaeological interventions.

The layout of the medieval mansion of Langtoft is known from two probate inventories of 1529 and 1547. [282] It was comprised of a hall and two wings, outbuildings and a stable. In 1557 it was leased with one garden and all the buildings belonging to the said house.[283] The lease was for life but no rent was asked from the tenant, an Archdeacon of the Church of York. However, he was asked to maintain the house in good repair and to provide for the lessor whenever he was coming to York. About twenty years later, in 1579, the mansion was leased to the Vicar General of the Archbishop, who paid a yearly rent of 53s.[284] In 1603 the mansion was leased to a lawyer. A list of the appurtenances expected in a prebendal mansion was given. These included the site of the same house, all the rooms, yards, halls, parlours, chambers, lofts, cellars, solars, kitchens, stables, gardens and backsides.

---

[280] Tringham, *Charters of the Vicars Choral*, pp. 203-4, YMA, VC3/Vi 295 tenement in Ogleforth bounded by the mansion of Langtoft.

[281] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral', p. 23.

[282] Cross, *York Clergy Wills*, pp. 10-4 and 58-64; see Chapter 5.1.

[283] YMA, Wb, fol. 116v.

[284] YMA, Wb, fol. 312; Wc, fols.156v-157.

A number of buildings standing today were within the curtilage of the mansion of Langtoft. (Fig. 33-42) They have a complex building stratigraphy because they were much altered in several occasions. A stone building stands on the corner with Chapter House Street, forming part of the property in 4 Minster Yard.[285] Its north-western stone wall is continuous with the ground floor wall of the front of the houses 1 and 3 Chapter House Street. This wall follows the line of the Roman *via Principalis*. The floor level of the ground floor on each house is slightly below street level. It can be suggested that the wall belonged to a stone built, medieval range measuring about 25 by 5m. During the fifteenth century a timber framed upper floor was built above the stone wall in 1 Chapter House Street.[286] Part of the original crown-post roof, with curved braces from tie beam to crown-post, is still preserved. The house at 3 Chapter House Street has a timber-framed jettied upper storey with a simple collar rafter roof. These buildings may represent the lower end of the mansion with the kitchen and other service rooms. The main wing of the house on 4 Minster Yard, oriented north-west to south-east, was rebuilt at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Its location and orientation correspond to the hall of the mansion of Langtoft.

A two storey timber framed building, comprised of five bays, was built in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century. Located on the site of 2 College Street and 5 Minster Yard, it was oriented almost east-west and measured eighteen meters in length and seven in width. The surviving rafters indicate a scissor-braced construction suggesting a fourteenth-century date. The high end of the house with the upper floor chamber may have been located in this wing. During the seventeenth century, 2 College Street and 5 Minster Yard were extensively redeveloped. A large chimney stack was inserted in the second bay from the east, as well as a new staircase to the north and a passage to the south. A new two storey timber framed extension was added to the north of the second and third bays.[287] A Dutch gable on the north-west side elevation of 4 Minster Yard may

---

[285] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 162. Appears in Cossin 1727 map as Dr Ward's house.

[286] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 116.

[287] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p.163.

also represent the same rebuilding. The portion of 4 Minster Yard on the corner with Chapter House Street possibly had a phase of seventeenth-century brick rebuilding. In the lower end a brick built range was added on the garden side, parallel to the medieval one. [288] One of the first floor rooms of 1 Chapter House was wainscot panelled. This was the substantial redevelopment of a mansion. The lawyer's family who began their tenancy for life in 1603 may have been responsible for the rebuilding.

In c. 1700, 2 College Street and 5 Minster Yard was divided in two houses and the east part was rebuilt in bricks. The nineteenth-century rebuilding changed the alignment of the original wall on the east bay of 5 Minster Yard. The timber framed upper storey of the houses in Chapter House Street was veneered in bricks and the jetty of n. 3 was cut back. This gave a more contemporary classical look to the medieval buildings and may have happened at the time of the redevelopment of 4 Minster Yard.

The timber-framed building in 16-12 Ogleforth on the corner with 5 Chapter House Street was probably also part of the mansion of Langtoft. (Fig. 41-42) This is a jettied two storey, five-bay building, originally extending further towards the south-east. However, the OS 1852 map shows the building as it is today and the arrangement of boundaries in the area seems coherent. The building had been described as having been jettied only toward Ogleforth on the evidence of surviving posts at the back.[289] However, a wall scar in the brick rebuilding towards Chapter House Street suggests that there also was a jetty on the back. The building has been dated to the sixteenth century and it has been suggested that it was not a domestic building due to the lack of interior partitions. It may have been be one of the service buildings of the mansion, perhaps a stable with hay loft and gateway to the courtyard. The brick boundary wall of the garden along Chapter House Street has many phases of rebuilding.

---

[288] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, pp. 116-7.

[289] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p.173 describe the timber framing and roof trusses.

St William's College

To the east of the mansion of Langtoft in College Street stands St William's College. It was built in 1465 on the site of the prebendal mansion of Salton and Huswayt.[290] Its purpose was to house the chantry priests serving the Minster. A detailed study of this complex would require separate research. Here, changes to this building important to the scope of this research will be highlighted. After the dissolution in 1549 the building was bought by two chantry commissioners; after their killing at Seamer it remained in private ownership by distant landlords.[291] In the second half of the sixteenth century alterations were made to the building, possibly indicating its use as lodgings. Chimneys were built at the north end of the western range and at the east end of the northern range. In the southern range, to the west of the entrance, a chimney was inserted with a stone newel staircase alongside it, giving access to the cellar and to the first floor. The hall was partitioned into two storeys. From the beginning of the seventeenth century the property was owned by Sir Henry Jenkins of Grimston, remaining in the same family for most of the century.[292] In the third quarter of the century major alterations were made. A brick stair block was added to house the wooden stairs in the centre of the north-east side of the building. A classical stone portal two storey high was added in the courtyard. This forms a monumental entrance in axis with the staircase leading to the upper floor chambers. These features suggest that the building was used as a high status residence. This continued at the beginning of the eighteenth century when the Earl of Carlisle was occupying the building during the construction of Castle Howard between 1701 and 1721.

Cambhall Garth

To the east of St William's College and on the corner with Goodramgate, there was a development of small tenements. (Map 7, 14 and 27), It was built in the

---

[290] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 62.

[291] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p.62; *Cal. Pat Rolls* 1548-9, 205 and A. Stacpoole, *The Noble City of York* (York, 1971).

[292] Drake, *Eboracum*, p. 571.

1360s by the Vicars Choral on the site of the mansion of Camb Hall. This was the mansion of John de Caen, prebendary of Driffield, who obtained licence to crenallate in 1298.[293] Jayne Rimmer has recently studied the construction and significance of this development, called Cambhall Garth.[294] The Vicars built a complex of eight small timber framed houses for rental which still survive in 11-12 College Street. These were small jettied houses comprising of a ground floor and an upper floor. In the eighteenth century they were veneered in bricks and provided with shop windows on the ground floor.[295] In the sixteen and seventeenth century these would have been used as tenements, but it is not possible to establish if they were used as shops.

The East Gate or Bedern Gate and tenements to the south

The access from Goodramgate was through the east gate or Bedern; the only gate of the Close still standing. (Fig. 46-47) It was so called because it was the one used by the Vicars Choral to access the Close from their quarters in the Bedern, just outside the Close. It consists of a timber frame gatehouse originally built in the fourteenth century. As was the case for the other gates, it had chambers on the upper floor and a garret reached by a tenement on the south side of College Street.[296] It also had doors, the iron fittings of which were mended on several occasions.[297] A licence to build a bridge across Goodramgate between the solar of the gate and the Bedern and the solar of the gate of the Close was granted in 1396.[298] This was for protecting the safety of Vicars crossing the street in a seedy area of the town, especially at night. However, there is no evidence that a bridge was ever built in this location.[299]

---

[293] *Cal. Pa.t Rolls,* 1292-1301, p. 358.

[294] Rimmer, 'Small Houses', pp. 32-4 and 46-7.

[295] BIHR, CC./VC. 11

[296] BIHR, CC. VC. 10 York LAL 5

[297] YMA, E3/54

[298] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* 1391-6, p. 712; Harrison, *Life in a Medieval College*, p. 32.

[299] Richards, *The Vicars Choral of York Minster*, p. 540.

Eighteenth-century leases show that abutting the gate to the south there was a house and next to it in College Street another house with a stable on the back. These two tenements were used in the late eighteenth century as the Angel Inn.[300] Next to it there was another tenement comprising of two ground floor rooms and two chambers above. It was 7.90 in length and 4.57m in width. It had a piece of land at the back, measuring 2.70 by 1.5m, where the chimney of the house stood.[301] It is not clear if there were further tenements as the OS Map 1852 suggests. The lane running behind the prebendal mansions of Stensall and Wistow joined College Street at this point.[302] Twentieth-century photographs show the appearance of these properties before their demolition. From Goodramgate the East Gate appears to be bonded to the north with Cambhall Garth and with other fourteenth-century properties in Goodramgate. To the south the gate was structurally bonded and shared a post with a jettied house. A photograph from the inside of the Close shows the gate with the chamber over, the Cambhall Garth and medieval timber framed house to the south of the street.

Conclusion

College Street, previously called Little Alice Lane and then Vicar Lane, was the area mainly frequented by the communities of minor clergy serving the cathedral.[303] The prebendal houses had their boundary walls towards this area and their entrance towards the cathedral. The area in proximity of the East Gate belonged to the estate of the Vicars Choral, which they developed as cheap rental housing. The consequence of the proximity of this neighbourhood will be discussed in Chapter 3.

---

[300] BIHR, CC. VC. 10 York, GOO, 65-70.

[301] BIHR, CC. VC. 10 York , LAL, 1-5.

[302] BIHR, CC. VC. 11, 1S; OS Map 1852.

[303] It was previously known as Little Alice Lane and Vicars Lane see Tillot , *VCH, The City of York,* p. 339.

2. 5. 3. Ogleforth

This street was aligned with the Roman Fortress, running from Goodramgate to Chapter House Street, parallel to the walls. Only the northern part of the street was inside the Close. (Map 14) To the south of the gateway of the mansion of Langtoft there was a parcel of land belonging to the convent of Hextildesham, bounded by the mansion of Langtoft on one side and the mansion of Huswayt on the other. This parcel of land with buildings was given to the Vicars Choral in 1366 and measured 89 feet from Ogleforth, about 24 meters.[304] In the sixteenth century a house was built by a tenant who in 1582 lived in the parish of St John del Pyke.[305] This document proves that the mansions of Langtoft and Huswayt extended to Ogleforth. The north-western wall of St William's College is made of reused stones of various dates and is thinner than the other walls. This may have been part of that mansion.[306]

The ward boundary marked on the OS Map 1852 crosses the street at this point. The gate of Ogleforth was probably timber framed and mentioned in the Fabric Rolls. In c. 1350 the gate was mentioned when three "tunall" were bought "pro bretissinge super portam de Ugelforde".[307] The "bretisses" were stripes in a coat of arms, therefore they may have been the arms of the Liberty of St Peter.[308] The lock was repaired in 1447 and in 1575; in 1693 new gates were made and painted.[309] In 1575 the gate in Ogleforth was said to have been next to the Free School.[310] The gate was demolished at some point in the early eighteenth century.[311] (Fig. 43)

---

[304] Tringham, *Charters of the Vicars Choral*, p. 203. YMA VC3/Vi 295

[305] Tringham, *Charters of the Vicars Choral*, pp. 203-4, notes on verso. The land is now occupied by the Minster offices.

[306] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 62.

[307] YMA, E3/1.

[308] A. Marquand, *Robbia Heraldry* (London 1919).

[309] YMA, E3/19, 54, 64.

[310] YMA, E3/54

[311] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, pp. 171-2.

The church of St John-del-Pyke and the Free School

On the north-east side of Ogleforth there was the parish church of St John-del-Pyke. This was first documented in 1114 and its advowson belonged to the Archbishop. Historical information is scarce, however, the church is attested by testamentary evidence and its cemetery is mentioned in York Minster Fabric Accounts in 1537.[312] In 1548 the church was suppressed by the City Commonality.[313] Nothing remains of this church and even its site has been the subject of speculation. Its name may have derived from its proximity to a gate, or Pyke, which could have been the east gate of the Roman Fortress. The OS Map of 1852 locates the site of the church near Archbishop Holgate's School, in the proximity of the site of the Roman gate. However, the date of the blocking of the Roman gate and closure of the thoroughfare has not yet been established and remains an unsolved problem of the topography of the Close.[314] An alternative location for the church has been suggested by Norton, who located it in proximity of the corner with Goodramgate on the basis of medieval documents.[315] However, evidence from later written sources supports the close connection between the church and the school and confirms the location indicated by the OS Map. The deed of foundation of Archbishop Holgate's Free School states that the "Free School shall be in the Close in one house and place therefore provided adjoining to the parish church of St John-del-Pyke." [316] A month before the foundation of the school, on 14 December 1546, the Archbishop acquired from the Mayor and the Commonality of York a tenement under the city bastions with a portion of the bastion and an area along the King's Ditch.[317] The property was endowed to the Free School a month later. It consisted of a tenement bounded by the bastions to the north, by Goodramgate to

---

[312] VCH, *York*, pp. 384, 389; Raine, *Medieval York*, pp. 48-50; YMA, E3/43.

[313] VCH, *York*, pp. 384, 389; See Chapters 4 and 6.1.

[314] RCHME, *The Defences*, pp. 125-132; Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon', pp. 21-2.

[315] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon', pp. 21-2.

[316] F.H. Woodward (ed.), *Deed of Foundation of the Free School of Robert Holgate, York*, The Archbishop Holgate Society, Record Series 1 (1948), art 25.

[317] BIHR, CC. Ab. 9. York;. Gray, *The Mansion House of the Treasurers*, pp. 49-50; Woodward, *Archbishop's Holgate School*, p. 2-3.

the east and towards the south by the tenements of the later surrendered monastery of Malton. It was also bounded by the house of Archdeacon George Dakins, by a tenement of the archbishop "nowe beyng a scoole howse", by the church garth wall of St John-del-Pyke and by the garth of the Treasurer of the cathedral. The portion of the city bastions, or common moat, and of the ditch, extended from Goodramgate to the northern corner of the garth of the mansion of Ullerskef, that is three yards above the second tower from Monkbar. Moreover a lease dated 1541 of a tenement "set lying and beyng nygh unto the church of Saynt John de Pyke within the closse of Yorke", establishes the location of the church in the Close. [318] In addition in 1575 there were "Minster Gates next to the fre scole".[319] In 1553 the City sold to Holgate the redundant church of St John-del-Pyke.[320] This may have been for the purpose of expanding the school premises. The association of the church and the school could also explain why the church disappeared completely. In 1667 a new school house with annexed school master house was rebuilt on the site of the previous one. These may have occupied part of the site of the church; some of the architectural material from the church appears to have been reused in the new school building. (Fig. 44, 45)

The bastions

The Close was bounded to the north-east and north-west by the city walls. (Map 9)The internal bastions of moat sloped from the walls towards a drainage ditch, the King's Ditch, running at the base of the bastions between the Bootham Bar and Monkgate. The history of the ownership and lease of the bastions is interesting because they were valuable assets in the period of this study, first as pasture grounds and later as garden features.[321] However, it is complex, because medieval property rights had been forgotten in the sixteenth century. A research done by a lawyer advising the Archbishop in 1815 on whether to sue the City of York for the ownership of the bastions allows the reconstruction of the following

[318] YMA, Wa, fols. 149-150.

[319] YMA, E3/54.

[320] YCR, v, 91.

[321] See Chapter 6.4.

account with the available sources. [322]The portion between the third tower from Bootham Bar and three yards to the north of the second tower from Monkgate were granted to the Archbishop in 1268.[323] The Archbishop was able to expand the Palace with a plot including the bastion up to the city walls. The City of York retained the right to access for maintenance of the walls and defence of the city. The remaining portions of the bastions closer to the city bars, became the property of the city at some point, which also came to believe that the ramparts of the Archbishop were theirs. The city sold the portion of ramparts closer to Monkgate to Archbishop Holgate to endow the Free School. Later in 1564, a 99 years lease of the bastions from the portion owned by the school up to the third tower from Bootham Bar, was given to Archbishop Young.[324] This was meant as endowment to the school because the same lease is reissued to the headmaster of the school, Gregory Belwood, in 1584.[325]Later the bastions and the ditch were leased by the school to the Ingram family.[326] The endowment of these lands is attested until 1824 and provided the school with funds for the maintenance of its buildings.[327]

Conclusion

Ogleforth was the access to the prebendal houses in the eastern and northern part of the Close. There were small houses around the precinct of the Church of St John-del-Pyke. The Free School funded by Archbishop Holgate was established next to the church.

---

[322] BIHR, CC. Ab. 9, York, Exctracts of observation on perusing papers to the ground belonging to the late Palace at York (28-30 October 1815). He advised the Archbishop not to sue the city for the ownership of the bastions, which legally belonged to the Archbishops since the grant of Henry III. But because Young accepted the lease of the bastions, he acknowledged the ownership of the city.

[323] Tillott, *VCH York*, pp. 337-43; *Cal. Pat. Rolls* 1266-72, 263.

[324] YCA, York House Book, 23.

[325] YCA, York House Book 28, f. 156.

[326] BIHR, CC. Ab. 9, York, lawsuit.

[327] Woodward, *Archbishop's Holgate School*, p. 2-3.

2. 6 The northern area of the Close

2. 6. 1 Minster Court

Treasurer's House

On the corner of Chapter House Street and Minster Court there was the mansion of the Treasurers of York Minster. It stands in part on the line of the Roman via Principalis, some of the paving and two columns of which have been found under the house.[328] (Map 14 and 15) However, this mansion and the neighbouring ones of Ulleskelfe are on the same alignment as the Archbishop's chapel. This is remarkable since the Prebendal mansions in the Precentors Court area, in the Deanery and East of cathedral area and in the block between College Street and Ogleforth, are all aligned with the Roman Fortress.

The present house had a complex development with several phases of rebuilding, the first of which is represented by a twelfth-century wall oriented north-east to south-west. To the south-west, in the basement of the cross wing to the north of the seventeenth-century hall, there is twelfth-century masonry. However, it has not been established if this is *in situ* or if it is reused material. To the north-east of the twelfth-century wall there is a wing with walls dated to the fourteenth century. (Fig. 48, 49) This may have been a chamber with an undercroft, similar to the one described for the Subdeanery or the Deanery, or a chapel. A hall may have been aligned with the twelfth-century wall or perhaps under the present Treasurer's House.

Following the Reformation the house was surrendered to the Crown and sold to Archbishop Holgate.[329] The house was eventually acquired by Archbishop Young (1561-68) and rebuilt by his son George in the sixteenth century.[330] This rebuilding involved the building of a hall and wings on the site of the present house. (Fig. 50 showing part of the sixteenth-century redevelopment in stone on

[328] Ottaway, *Defences and Adjacent Sites*, fig 186; RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 69.

[329] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 69.

[330] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 69.

the right) An extensive redevelopment, part of which still remains today, was carried out in the 1620s by Thomas Young who occupied the property between 1624 and 1648. The sixteenth-century central hall was raised to make room for a cellar or basement; the northern wing was rebuilt and remodelled and the southern wing doubled in space to form a symmetrical composition. The result was a two storey central hall with two double cross wings with two storeys and garrets. The fenestration had been changed in several occasions but the façade is symmetrical and the wings have Dutch gables. The classical portal on the front entrance had two couples of doric columns on the lower storey and two ionic responds on the upper floor. On the inner court, an upper floor gallery supported by reused twelfth-century columns was built against the twelfth-century wall. The gallery linked the two wings. A chimney stack was added to the east side of the north wing in the second half of the seventeenth century. (Fig. 50, 51)

The Prebendal Mansion of Ullerskelf

To the north of the Treasurer's house there was the prebendal mansion of Ullerskelf.[331] (Map 15) Parts of its medieval features still survive in the complex of buildings at 1-3 Minster Court.[332] A medieval hall orientated north-west to south-east is represented by a fifteenth-century four bay roof. On the north-western side of the hall, running at right angle, there are the remains of a fourteenth-century roof. A sixteenth-century roof was added to complete the range. (Fig. 53) To the south-east the medieval stone walls of a range are preserved on the base of a brick built phase dating to the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. (Fig. 52) Jonathan Clark suggests that this was part masonry and part timber framed range with a chimney, which is still standing. The date of construction of this range can be assigned to the beginning of the sixteenth century.[333] Another stretch of stone walls parallel to the aforementioned is visible on the base of the walls of 1 Minster Court. A further range enclosing the front courtyard range is shown on an eighteenth-century map. The early

---

[331] YMA, Wb 315v; YMA, Wc 23v-24.

[332] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, pp. 158-60.

[333] Field Archaeology Specialists, 'Conservation Plan', Vol. 2, pp. 157-67, p. 162.

sixteenth-century redevelopment of this mansion corresponds to the period in which Dean Hidgen, also prebendary of Ullerskelf, was in office. Moreover, the hall of an unidentified prebendal house in the Close was decorated with a glass window depicting Wolsey with a cardinal cap and heraldry of Dean Hidgen.[334] It is likely that this was the mansion of Ullerskelf.

The Prebendal Mansion of Stillington

The mansion of Stillington was to the north-west of the one of Ullerskelf. In 1577 it was leased to the commissary of the archiepiscopal Exchequer, who underwent considerable expense to repair and redevelop the mansion.[335] Therefore Stillington house was dilapidated by the mid sixteenth century. The mansion was next to and had the same orientation as the Archbishop's chapel and was composed by three ranges. A drawing of 1777 shows a two storey building from the north, composed of three wings, with four high pitched roofs.(Fig. 63) The easternmost wing has a stone built ground floor with a doorway in the late thirteenth-century style and a blocked four pane window with a stone transom, which could date to the sixteenth-century redevelopment. The upper storeys are brick built, which have been inserted with twelve pane windows of an eighteenth-century style. The structural separation of this wing from the other two suggests that it was older, perhaps dating to the thirteenth-century prebendal house. The central wing is taller, part of its ground floor is stone built and the upper storeys are brick built with eighteenth-century windows. The southernmost wing towards the chapel has a stone built ground floor which may consist of the remains of a previous building. The sixteenth-century mansion had among the appurtenances edifices, offices, rooms, courts, closes, gardens, orchards, grounds and backsides.[336] The mansion of Stillington was partially destroyed by the building of the nineteenth-century Deanery. A range of buildings with annexes and a cross wing are visible in the OS 1852. These were on the site of the standing twentieth-century Deanery.

---

[334] Hutton, Matthew, *Antiquities of Yorkshire*, 1659, fol. 41.

[335] YMA, Wb, fols. 295v-296.

[336] YMA, Wc, fols. 27v; Wf, fols. 34; Wf, fols. 161v-162v.

The coach house

On the corner between the prebendal mansion of Stillington and the wall of the Archbishop's Palace Yard there was a coach house. This in 1626 was considered as "lately built" therefore of rather recent construction. It was leased by Sir William Ingram and previously by William Ingram the Elder, a lawyer in the Archbishop courts.[337] In 1661 the tenant had the permission to demolish it if he wished to do so. However, the building material was to remain in the possession of the Dean and Chapter. [338]

Conclusion

The northern part of the Close was occupied by prebendal mansions with large gardens, which were extensively redeveloped in the sixteenth century.

2. 6. 2 Palace Yard: buildings abutting the northern side of the cathedral, belonging to the Dean and Chapter Estate

"The Hell" and St Mary and the Holy Angels

The strip of land immediately to the north of the cathedral belonged to the estate of the Dean and Chapter. An "old broken fence" on the plan of the Palace grounds of 1782, ran from the north-west buttress of the Chapter House vestibule to the opening of the Palace gateway.[339] (Map 6, 9, 16 and 26) This supports the suggestion that the boundaries of an early medieval square enclosure on the site of the Archbishop's Palace were respected by later developments.[340] On this land there was a stable preceded by a narrow plot of ground, which was walled by 1661. [341] The stable is attested in the Fabric rents from 1569.[342] It was located "at

---

[337] YMA, Wd, fol. 24v; Wd, fols. 49v-50.

[338] YMA, We, fols. 214-214v-215

[339] WYL, TN/YO/G, see (Map 26)

[340] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral', p. 6.

[341] YMA, Wc 276v-277v; We 52-52v. After the 1661 lease there is no record for this stable in the Fabric accounts and it may have been cleared.

[342] YMA, E3/51 first mention, however, previous 16th century rolls are very damaged.

128

the west end of the said Cathedral Church of York near unto the place there called the bishop's prison in the Palace Yard".[343] In 1617 it was defined as a "house or stable" and in 1661 as a "room or stable". The building was "commonly called 'The Hell'". The name first appears in 1573 and it was used since then.[344] This is significant because this means that it was a well established common name, used in both building accounts and in legal documents as the leases. During the sixteenth and early seventeenth century the "Hell" was leased only to the Clerks of the Works of the cathedral. This stable was pulled down during the phase of clearance of buildings abutting the cathedral in the last quarter of the seventeenth century and disappeared from the documents.[345] In the following paragraphs I will explain how this building can be identified with the former chapel of St Mary and the Holy Angels and I will suggest an interpretation for its location.

The chapel of St Mary and the Holy Angels was founded by Archbishop Roger in 1180 and used as a collegiate-chantry chapel connected with the cathedral.[346] It was located "*ultra porta palatii*", this has been interpreted as the chapel being beyond the entrance of the Palace rather than on the top floor of the gateway.[347] However, the dedication to St Mary and the Holy Angels is of Byzantine origins, suggesting an upper floor.[348] Moreover bishops' chapels of twelfth-century date were usually two storeys.[349] The chapel from 1266 was also commonly called St Sepulchre, probably because it may have been connected with the Easter Week

---

[343] YMA, Wc, fols. 276v-277v.

[344] YMA E3/53.

[345] YMA, E3/6; YMA, Fabric Books 1671-1709.

[346] A. Hamilton Thompson, 'The Chapel of St Mary and the Holy Angels', *The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 36 (1944): 63-77. The popular name of the chapel was also "Holy Sepulcher" perhaps a reference to its use during the Easter rituals.

[347] Hamilton Thompson, 'The Chapel', p. 67.

[348] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral', suggests this is a rebuilding of an eighth century building. The dedication to Mary and the Angels, of late-antique Byzantine tradition, was very appropriate for an upper storey chapel by a cathedral and possibly by the entrance to an Episcopal complex. For a discussion see P. Verzone, *From Theodoric to Charlemagne* (London, 1968).

[349] Miller, *The Bishop's Palace*; Thompson, *Medieval Bishops' Houses*.

rituals.[350] After the Reformation, in 1546, the chapel was appropriated by the Crown and sold.[351]

A comparison with an Italian example, even if in a different context, may shed light on popular perception of chapels and question the complete demolition of St Mary and the Holy Angels during the sixteenth century. In the sixteenth century in north-western Italy, a series of complexes named *Sacri Monti* were built to increase devotions to the Roman Catholic Church during the Counterreformation.[352] In the *Monte* of Crea (Alessandria), a centrally planned two storey chapel was built in 1590. It was dedicated to St. Mary surrounded by Angels and is commonly called "Paradiso", meaning the heaven. The lower chapel was vandalised for unknown reasons and partially filled up during the seventeenth century. With its original significance forgotten, it became known as "Inferno", the hell.[353]A similar process may have occurred in York. The name "Hell" may have indicated the opposite of a heavenly place. Alternatively it may have been the result of a corruption of the word "holy".[354]

The exact location and appearance of the chapel of St. Mary and the Holy Angels is problematic. In the nineteenth century Browne conducted excavations in search of the chapel and produced a plan of the results. He discovered the walls of a rectangular chapel and of the gateway of the Archbishop's Palace and of the prison to the north-west.[355] New excavations conducted by Phillips in 1974 confirmed that what Browne discovered were twelfth-century walls made of stones worked in a similar way to the ones of Archbishop Roger's cathedral.[356] He also discovered the walls of two rooms of the same building, partially buried

---

[350] Hamilton Thompson, 'The Chapel', p. 67.

[351] *L. & P. Hen VIII*, XXI, 485 (g. No. 970, 34).

[352] UNESCO World Heritage Site.

[353] C. E. Spantigati, *Il Sacro Monte di Crea* (Torino, 1999).

[354] Thanks to Andrew Spicer for this suggestion.

[355] J. Browne, *The History of the Metropolitan Church of St. Peter York*, Vol. 1 (London, Oxford and York, 1847), p. 181.

[356] Phillips, *Excavations at York Minster,* pp. 51-2.

under the cathedral's north aisle. Phases of minor alterations were recognised, consistent with the structural adjustment that would have been made to this building at the time of the building of the gothic aisle (1291-1315). Phillips suggested that what Browne discovered were two phases of the Palace gateway: a larger one built in 1180 and a new one to the north, built between 1291 and 1315. Sarah Brown, considering the plan of Phillips'excavation, has suggested that after the reconstruction of the cathedral aisle the chapel must have been remodelled. Rogers' chapel in fact was said to have been "hard by" the eleventh-century cathedral, which was narrower than the present Minster.[357] The chapel of St Mary and the Holy Angels thus would have been located or relocated somewhere along the cathedral, to the east of the gateway.[358]

The analysis of standing buildings show that there were buildings abutting bay six of the northern aisle of the cathedral. A blocked doorway was probably the access to the chapel, as the iconography of the inner doorway also suggests.[359] (Fig. 58) A roof scar on the east buttress of the north-west tower of the cathedral suggests that this may have been the roof line, either of the chapel or of its vestibule. (Fig. 59) Two doorways, one on the ground floor, the other on the upper floor, give access to a staircase inside the east buttress of the cathedral's north-west tower. (Fig. 57) These have been interpreted as an alternative access to the Palace gateway and north-west range, however, they could have been as well the stairs between two levels of a double chapel. A further roof scar on the east face of the northern pillar of the cathedral's north-west tower could represent a covered vestibule to the staircase. (Fig. 60) In the pictorial evidence, an incomplete blocked round arch, abutting the east pillar suggest that this may have been a west doorway of the Romanesque chapel. (Figs. 56 and 61)

A new interpretation of the location and archaeology of the chapel of St Mary and the Holy Angels will be attempted. The structures excavated by Browne and

---

[357] Brown, *York Minster*, p. 108. The plan published by Brown was used to drawn my maps of the area.

[358] Butler, 'Notes of the Minster Close', pp. 22-3.

[359] Brown, *York Minster* , pp. 107.

Phillips represent the twelfth-century chapel, with its annexe to the south-east and the gateway to the north-west. This was still standing and in use in the eighteenth century. To the north-west of the gateway there was the Archbishop's Prison. The structure identified as the chapel measures about 20m in length and 10m in width. These would be extraordinary dimensions even for a city gateway, but are perfectly appropriate for a chapel. The blocked doorway in the sixth bay of the cathedral, counting east to west, would have given access to a wedge shaped vestibule, perhaps similar to the arrangement of the Chapter House's entrance. Possibly there was a similar structure between the stairs and a doorway on the west side of the chapel. At the Reformation the chapel was retained and it became a stable: the "Hell".[360] This was demolished in the last quarter of the seventeenth century. All detailed cartography and pictorial evidence of this area starts in the eighteenth century, therefore there is no trace of this standing structure. The area it occupied looks unfinished in the pictorial evidence. Lower buildings were built abutting the gateway, standing clear from the cathedral's wall.[361]

The "Store House" and other small buildings

The corner between the north transept and the northern aisle was an area dedicated to workshops for the maintenance of the cathedral.[362] (Map 16)A Lead house in 1573 was provided with locks and key and wood and lead were brought there for the plumbers to work.[363] In 1584 the walls of the Lead house were mended with 200 tiles.[364] In 1608 a "Store house" appears in the accounts.[365] This was provided with a well. In 1624 a labourer, George Dalton, worked for 12 days seeking a new well in the Store house.[366] The even stones of the old well

---

[360] See Chapter 4.1, p. 190 and Chapter 6.1, p. 281.

[361] For reasons of the clearance see Chapter 6.1, pp. 302-4).

[362] Brown, *York Minster*, p. 108 note 98, suggests that a similar location was used for the plumbery in Salisbury from the thirteenth century.

[363] YMA, E3/53, 55, 56, 59, 60, 62.

[364] YMA, E3/60.

[365] YMA, E3/62.

[366] E3/63/1.

were dug up and reused in a new well, employing six labourers for up to 12 days.
A Glazier chamber was built, involving substantial works from tilers; 800 bricks
and 500 tiles were bought for the job, as well as 10 bunches of laths. Two teams
of tilers worked for 13 days on the walls and roof of Glazier chamber, helped by
two labourers. Other labourers helped from time to time to bring timbers for the
roof. It is possible that these structures are the buildings with tiled roofs shown in
the James Malton's painting of 1794 and described by Butler from that
painting.[367] (Fig. 54) A number of roof scars are still visible in that location on
the cathedral walls. It is possible that the masons and the carpenters also
relocated their activity there, where they stayed until the new Mason's yard was
created on the site of the mansion of South Cave in the nineteenth century.[368]
(Fig. 55)

Conclusion

The area immediately to the north of the cathedral from the late sixteenth century
was used for the building activities of the Fabric of the cathedral. In the medieval
period, however, it was occupied by a chantry chapel, connected with the
Archbishop Palace. The meanings of this change in use will be discussed in
Chapter 4.

2. 7 The Archbishop's Palace and the Ingram Mansion

2. 7. 1 The Medieval Archbishop's Palace

The study of the Archbishop's Palace and its redevelopment into the Ingram
Mansion would require a detailed study of the documentary sources. This is
outside the scope of this study. However, I will here summarise information
useful for understanding the role of the palace within the Close. (Map 4 and 9)
The Palace was built by Archbishop Roger (c. 1181) and was added to and
altered on several occasions. Archbishop de Grey in the mid thirteenth century

---

[367] Butler, 'Notes of the Minster Close', p. 22.

[368] OS Map 1852.

built a chapel.[369] An aisled hall was built as some point and the hospitality wing of the Palace was altered several times for Royal visits, the last of which was the one of Margaret Tudor in 1503.[370] At present the Archbishop's Palace is represented by the Gothic chapel, now the Minster Library, and by a Romanesque arcade, perhaps a fragment of Archbishop's Roger palace. The appearance of the Palace could be reconstructed with the use of cartographic and pictorial sources; however, there are problems on interpretation which could only be solved by further research.

In the late medieval period the Palace was comprised of a west range with a gateway, a north range with the standing chapel and the residential apartments of the Archbishop and an aisled hall. The location of stables and service rooms is also uncertain.

The west range and gateway

To the north-west of the gateway of the Palace there was the Archbishop's Prison. This was kept furnished with chains and used throughout the sixteenth century.[371] On this wing according to the architect of the Minster, Thomas Atckinson, in the 1780s, there was an undercroft with "circular arches and in the Saxon style of building".[372] This means that part of the Norman building had been preserved during successive redevelopments. An inventory of 1531, made when the Palace was returned to the Archbishop by the Crown after having taken it from Wolsey, gives some information on the use of the rooms.[373] Their location can only be suggested. On the upper floor of the west wing there may have been accommodation for the Royal guests and their retinue. Two chambers were occupied by the Queen during her visit and presumably the lodgings for her

---

[369] *Cal. Close Rolls* 1231-4, p. 238.

[370] Tillott, *VCH York*, pp. 337-43; B. Dobson, 'The Later Middle Ages 1215-1500', in G.E. Aylmer and R. Cant (eds) *A History of York Minster* (Oxford, 1977), p. 100; *Cal. Close Rolls* 1247-51, p. 518; PRO E101/501/8; PRO E/101/502/22.

[371] PRO SC/11/766.

[372] BHIR, CC. Ab. 9. York.

[373] PRO SC/11/766.

household. This was probably referring to the visit of Queen Margaret in 1507.
[374] A map made for a lawsuit of 1782 suggests that to the northern part of this
wing there may have been lodgings provided with chimneys and latrines. (Fig.
66, Map 26) This block is defined as the "old building", suggesting that it was
not much altered during the redevelopment. The association of the function of
hospitality with ranges containing the gateway was a usual arrangement in the
late medieval period.

The residential wing of the Archbishop

Form the same 1531 inventory it could be suggested that there was a wing
containing the gothic chapel and the private quarters of the Archbishop. The
chapel was dedicated to St Andrew and was a double chapel, typical in Episcopal
palaces. On the ground floor there was a room with three aisles and a doorway on
the south-west front. The archbishop would have used this space for pastoral
audiences to people who were not important enough to be received in the more
exclusive upper floor hall or in the great hall. [375] Perhaps the Romanesque arcade
was retained from a previous arrangement, because it formed a pathway, covered
or not, along the Palace Yard to the chapel's doorway. (Fig. 65) On the upper
floor there was the Archbishop's private chapel. Connected with the chapel
through an entrance room were a hall and a chamber. A parlour was on the
ground floor. This arrangement of hall and chapel was common feature of late
medieval bishops' palaces and is considered by Miller distinctive of Episcopal
palaces.[376] The structures found in the excavation for the new wing of the
Minster Library consist of a stone building supported by pillars. It shape and
location suggests that this may have contained on the upper floor the
Archbishop's private hall.[377] This elongated shape was typical of bishop's halls,

---

[374] Tillott, *VCH York*, pp. 337-43; Butler, 'Notes on the Minster', p. 13.

[375] Miller, *The Bishop's Palace,* pp. 170-216, discuss this arrangement and function in Northern
Italian palaces.

[376] Miller, *The Bishop's Palace*; Thompson, *Medieval Bishops' Houses*, for plans of palaces.

[377] K. Giles, 'Documentary and Cartographic Research', in Field Archaeology Specialists,
'Archaeological Excavation and Survey, York Minster Library', Unpublished Field Report
(York, March 2000) discussion on bishops' palaces.

according tho Miller, and this space emphasised the hierarchical structure of their power.[378]

The Great Hall

According to the inventory of 1531 the Palace comprised of a great hall.[379] A previous document describing the order of ceremony of a Garter feast held in 1486 suggests that this was an aisled hall, measuring 122 feet by 76 feet (36 by 23m).[380] On the basis of information from the aforementioned document, it has been suggested that it was located to the north of the arcade, perpendicular to the west range. However, there are documents suggesting that the place was commemorated by a statue in the walled garden of the Ingram house and that "Ingram made a garden in the very place where the hall stood". [381] Thus the hall would have been located somewhere in the middle between the chapel and the west range. Without further study it is not possible to decide for either location. However, the function of this hall was to offer reception and hospitality at a grand scale. Since the Archbishops were not residents, the hall in the fourteenth century was used also for more mundane activities, such as housing a mint and even for storing the wagons for the York Mistery Plays. In the 1560s the hall was pulled down.[382]

2. 7. 2 The Ingram Mansion

The Palace in 1618 was leased by Sir Arthur Ingram, who was already tenant in the neighbouring mansion of South Cave. (Map 16) The redevelopment of the Palace has been described by Ron Buttler, based on archival research in the

---

[378] Miller, *The Bishop's Palace,* pp. 170-216.

[379] PRO, SC/11/766.

[380] College of Arms, Arundel MS 30, f.214 cited in A. F. Johnston, (ed.) *Records of Early English Drama: York*, (Toronto, 1979.), pp. 146-152; K. Giles, 'Documentary and Cartographic Research', in Field Archaeology Specialists,' Archaeological Excavation and Survey, York Minster Library*',* Unpublished Field Report (York, March 2000), pp. 75-7.

[381] BHIA, CC. Ab. 9. York.

[382] See Chapter 6.1, p. 287.

Temple Newsham archives.[383] Nothing is left of the mansion but the remains of a stone arch and walls have been recently discovered in a crypt in the grounds of the former Purey-Cust nursing home.[384] The west range of the Palace was redeveloped together with the mansion of South Cave. The appearance was described by the cathedral's master carpenter giving a witness statement in the eighteenth century: "the foundations as well as part of the superstructure of the Palace are of stone, the walls of great thickness and appear very ancient and the same have undergone many alterations since many parts have been repaired in brick and in his opinion on or after James 1".[385]

The redeveloped Ingram Mansion was made of ranges organised around two courtyards, one of these opening on the Minster Yard. (Fig. 67) The west range contained the most important chamber of the house and the long gallery overlooking the garden. An oriel window extending on two floors gave extra views on the central axis of the walled formal garden. There was also a chapel on the upper floor, with a staircase possibly leading from the ground floor hall. The service rooms such as washrooms and bakeries were on the back of the house to the north. The development was not innovative at that time but maintained the traditional structure of ranges around courtyards and a mixture of old stone and new bricks.

Gardens

The gardens extended on the ground of the Archbishop's Palace and comprised of four main parts.[386] To create them Ingram sublet from the Holgate School the city bastions and a portion of the King's Ditch. A walled garden with formal beds and statuary was located to the east of the house. It incorporated as a decorative feature the Romanesque arcade to the north. An area of orchard was

---

[383] Butler, 'York Palace'.

[384] K. Gambles, *Purey Cust Nuffield Hospital and the Minster Yard*, C5 Case Study RIBA Candidate (2007), pp. 55-6 and p. 8.

[385] BIHR, CC. Ab. 9 York.

[386] Butler, 'York Palace', WYL, Pawson MSS Acc 1038.

planted to the north of this and on the bastions. Structures for the practice of sports were on both sides of the walled garden. A covered tennis court was to the north and a bowling green to the south. (Fig. 64) A water garden and structures to house wild animals and to breed others for the table were in the fourth part on the northern corner of the city walls.There were a dovecote, aviaries and fish tanks. The meanings of the gardens and other structures will be discussed in Chapter 6.4.

Conclusion

The area to the north of the Close was occupied by the medieval Archbishop's Palace. After 1616 the Palace and the neighbouring mansion of South Cave were redeveloped into the Ingram Mansion and extensive gardens.

CHAPTER 3. The York Minster Close: Anthropology of an Urban Enclosure

3. 1 The Minster Close: setting the boundaries

Degrees of boundedness

In his study of secular cathedral closes in southern France, Yves Esquieu has recognised three degrees of enclosure or boundedness of a close. [1]The first degree is represented by a total enclosure, with walls and gates, like a fortress. In England Salisbury Cathedral Close belongs to this type.[2] However, fortified closes are uncommon in France, where Lyon and Viviere are the best examples.[3] The second degree, a mitigated enclosure, was the most common in France and good examples were in Toulouse, in Nimes and in Apt (Provence), where the walls of the canons' houses constituted the boundary.[4] In Apt, the houses had entrances directly off the city's main street, which was the former *decumanus*. The statutes of 1372 ruled that doors opening on the outside of the close should be shut at sunset and later the canons were ordered to seal them with masonry walls. However, the doors were still open by 1546 when the houses were sold.[5] The third degree consisted of a precinct which was not enclosed, where the houses and the activities of the canons were not separated from those of the city.[6] This was the case in Narbonne for example, from as early as the thirteenth century. However, the area containing the houses of the canons was still called "le cloitre" in eighteenth-century property deeds. Esquieu observes that the idea of a close as a territorial entity must have been very strong in the consciousness

---

[1] Esquieu, *Autour des Nos Cathédrales*, pp. 139-43.

[2] RCHME, *Salisbury*; Richardson, 'Corridors of Power'.

[3] Esquieu, *Autour des Nos Cathédrales*, pp. 98-115.

[4] Esquieu, *Autour des Nos Cathédrales*, pp. 120-5; Casez, *Saint-Étienne de Toulouse*, p. 140.

[5] Esquieu, *Autour des Nos Cathédrales*, p. 125.

[6] Esquieu, *Autour des Nos Cathédrales*, pp. 127-8. The absence of an enclosure around the cathedral was common in Italian cities.

of the Narbonnais. Therefore the idea of a cathedral close is not synonymous with an actual physical enclosure.[7]

The French examples are particularly useful because of the great number of cathedral settlements that were studied systematically.[8] During the sixteenth century there were dramatic changes in the nature of the cathedral closes in France caused by the secularisation of the remaining chapters that still led a communal life and the fights with Protestants during religious struggles. This affected the boundedness of the cathedral closes and their relationship with the city. In Lyon for example the canons' houses and part of the boundary wall were destroyed by the Protestants in 1562-3. The wall was swiftly rebuilt by the chapter, but from then onwards there was pressure from the inhabitants for opening doors and windows in the close's wall.[9] In Toulouse the close continued to be gated and closed at night until the French Revolution in 1792, but other closes lost their separateness from the city during the seventeenth century.[10] This raises important questions for the changes made to cathedral closes in sixteenth and seventeenth-century England.[11] In this section the nature of the boundaries of York Minster Close in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries will be discussed and their origins and meanings will be explored. The separate identity of the Close from the city will also be questioned.

Writing about space and boundaries

In the present cathedral landscape of York the boundaries of the Minster Close are lost and only part of the East Gate in Goodramgate survives as witness for the

---

[7] Esquieu, *Autour des Nos Cathédrales*, pp. 125-7; Y. Esquieu, 'Narbonne', in J.C Picard (ed.), *Les Chanoines dans la Ville. Recherches sur la Topographie des Quartiers Canoniaux en France* (Paris, 1994), pp. 317-28.

[8] Picard, *The Chanoines dans la Ville*, topographical studies for 22 French cathedrals.

[9] C. Arlaud, J. Bournouf, Y. Esquieu, J.F. Reynaud, M Vialettes, 'Lyon', in J.C. Picard (ed.), *Les Chanoines dans la Ville. Recherches sur la Topographie des Quartiers Canoniaux en France* (Paris, 1994), pp. 271-85.

[10] Casez, *Saint-Étienne de Toulouse*, pp. 140-153; Picard, *The Chanoine dans la Villes*, passim.

[11] Lehmberg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals*.

existence of an enclosed place.[12] However, information on the nature of the boundaries of the Close can be obtained from the written sources of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The quantity and quality of spatial information regarding properties in the Close increased in this period and reflects new attitudes towards writing in general and record keeping for administrative purposes. Tittler observes that records of civic administrations during the sixteenth century became more extensive and accurate.[13] This also applied to writing about buildings and space.[14] In particular a preoccupation with defining property boundaries both in the country and in towns produced new genres and new attitudes in spatial writing.

The medieval custom of establishing boundaries was by perambulation, which consisted of walking along the perimeter of the estate and declaring the position of a boundary in the presence of witnesses.[15] Not only property boundaries but also administrative ones were affirmed in this way. In Canterbury during the fifteenth century, the boundaries between the liberties of the city corporation and those of the monastery of Christ Church were reasserted by periodic perambulation.[16] The mayor and thirty six council members "walked the bounds" and at the turning points of the boundary gave copper coins to various children, so that they would remember the limits of the franchise. The perambulation concluded with feasting and a "solemn libation of wine" in a field. Perambulations of local administrative boundaries were still carried out until the nineteenth century. In York the boundaries of the city's common lands, or pasturage, were ridden by the mayor accompanied by a group of young men.

---

[12] See chapter 2.4, p. 118.

[13] R. Tittler, *The Reformation and the Towns in England. Politics and Political Culture, c.1540-1640* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 211-13, 216-7, 279-80; from the mid-sixteenth century English replaced Latin as the principal language of documentation.

[14] M. Howard, *The Building of Elizabethan and Jacobean England,* (New Haven and London, 2007), pp. 100-115.

[15] P. Seed, *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640,* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 19, 24; D. Buisseret, *The Mapmaker's quest. Depicting New worlds in Renaissance Europe* (Oxford, 2003), p. 153.

[16] A. Green, *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century* (London, 1894), p. 135.

This practice was recorded from 1374 and ended in 1819.[17] In England local boundaries such as parish boundaries were reaffirmed every year with Rogationtide processions. These were retained by Elizabeth I because of their important function and were still being recommended by bishops at the beginning of the eighteenth century.[18] These ritual practices of setting and reaffirming boundaries indicate that land was seen as social space and the boundaries themselves were inscribed in the memory of the community.[19]

Although written surveys of estates and lands have been made since the late twelfth century, a new attitude toward defining property boundaries began in the sixteenth century. The first manual of surveying to be published was written by John Fitzherbert in 1523. It was concerned with the social aspects of good management of the estate, rather than with measuring land and thus was continuing the medieval tradition. By the mid sixteenth century treatises such as Leonard Digges' *Tectonicon* (1556) and *Pantometria* (1571) and John Norden's *Surveyor's Dialogue* (1570), promoted new concepts in surveying. These were methods of land measuring based on Euclidean geometry, making use of new technologies and instruments developed in the military field. These surveyors, rather than being interested in land stewardship, were focusing on setting boundaries lines on the ground. Written surveys were the product of their fieldwork. [20]

New attitudes towards surveys which were developed on the landed estates were also applied in the urban context. In crowded sixteenth-century London there

---

[17] Tillott, *VCH York*, pp. 315-8.

[18] E. Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars. Traditional Religion in England c.1400-1580* (New Haven and London, 1992), pp. 568 and 578-9. D. Fletcher, 'The Ordnance Survey's Nineteenth Century Boundary Survey: Context, Characteristics and Impact', *Imago Mundi* 51 (1999): 132, parish processions in the dioceses of Worcester.

[19] B. Klein, *Maps and the Writing of Space in Early Modern England and Ireland* (Basingstoke, 2001), p. 44.

[20] Klein, *Maps,* pp. 42-5, 49-50; Buisseret, *The Mapmaker's*, pp. 152-3.

were frequent boundary disputes between neighbours.[21] The London Viewers were a group of experts appointed by the Corporation of London to examine and settle these disputes. Their reports are preserved from the mid sixteenth century and are a witness to the growing need for definition and clarity of boundaries in an urban domestic context.

Another group of written documents began to appear regularly during this period. While written deeds were compulsory since the thirteenth century for the sale of real estate, leases were chattels and therefore established by Common Law with a simple contract or even on oral evidence. However, there was growing discontent with this practice and by the late sixteenth century the Court of Chancery was unwilling to enforce parole leases.[22] Therefore from that period all leases were written and during the seventeenth century they contained increasingly more detailed and precise information on location, boundaries, measurement and nature of the tenements.[23]

During the first half of the sixteenth century only the leases of prebendal mansions between the clergy were recorded in writing by the Dean and Chapter.[24] But in the second half of the century the increase in the quantity and quality of documentation of leases reflected the changes in attitude towards record keeping and property management. From 1558 the leases were written in English instead of Latin and from 1562 leases of tenements and new built houses were recorded in the register.[25] In contrast with the earlier sixteenth-century documents they contain a detailed list of appurtances that give an indication of the nature and status of the property. Location and abutment clauses became

---

[21] L.C. Orlin, 'Boundary Disputes in Early Modern London', in L.C. Orlin (ed.), *Material London* (Philadelphia, 2000), pp. 344-376; L.C. Orlin, *Locating privacy in Tudor London* (Oxford, 2007), pp.156-70.

[22] Megarry and Wade, *The Law of Real Property*, p. 609

[23] V. Harding, 'Space, Property and Propriety in Urban England' *Journal of Interdisciplinary History,* 32: 4 (2002): 549-569; Megarry and Wade, *The Law of Real Property,* p. 609, in 1677 the "Statute of Fraud" finally ruled that all leases should be in writing, the only exceptions were leases not exceeding three years.

[24] YMA, Wa, fol. 1v.

[25] YMA, Wb, fols. 129v-130.

progressively more precise, increasingly accompanied by oriented measurements of the tenements.

Maps and property rights

New cartographic forms from continental Europe, especially Italy, Burgundy, Flanders and Germany, started to be used in the Court of England from the beginning of the sixteenth century. However, from 1533 the fear of invasion by continental armies combined with the wealth available in consequence of the Dissolution gave great impetus to the development of cartography. In 1539 Henry VIII commissioned the most extensive cartographic survey carried out before the nineteenth century: a body of regional maps was created to decide where fortifications needed to be placed. Henry VIII's mapping of the realm had great influence on the future development of cartography in England, and the awareness of the utility of maps and the skills to make and read them were rapidly spreading.

One of the consequences of this was that by the late sixteenth century scaled maps were promoted as the best tools to set out property boundaries.[26] Ralph Agas was the first theoretical surveyor to realise this in the 1570s and he argued that estate boundaries could be shown with great precision in scaled maps accompanying written surveys.[27] The development of the estate map was stimulated by the sale of former monastic lands after the Dissolution. By the mid sixteenth century, when these lands were rapidly resold, the market became very lively. Moreover, high inflation and the growth in population made every acre of land very valuable and thus knowledge of the extent of the boundaries of the estate was necessary to increase profits from rents or from the sale of land. The

---

[26] P. Barber, 'Mapmaking in England ca 1470-1650', in D. Woodward (ed.), *The History of Cartography. Cartography in the European Renaissance*, vol. 3, part 2 (Chicago and London, 2007), pp. 1643-8.

[27] Barber, 'Mapmaking in England', p. 1642.

high value of land also caused frequent litigation and maps setting out boundaries were the best proof of ownership.[28]

 The advantage of maps in setting estate boundaries was also realised in an urban context. During the first decades of the seventeenth century Ralph Treswell, a surveyor of land estates, mapped the tenements belonging to urban estates of corporate bodies such as those of Christ's Hospital and the Clothworkers' Company in London. These detailed plans were used in estate management, for assessing rents when granting new leases and in property disputes.[29] In York, although individual property maps may have been attached to indentures of lease of the Dean and Chapter's estate during the seventeenth century, the first surviving map showing property boundaries for the whole area comprised between Petergate and Goodramgate dates the mid 1700.[30] (Map 25 is a copy of and earlier map)

It has been argued that mapping boundaries was a response to the passage from feudal to capitalist estate management. A network of mutual responsibilities and duties defined the relationship between the lord of the manor, his tenants and the land. In a capitalist economy with a distant landlord, maps crystallised the boundaries and affirmed private ownership.[31] Maps are not neutral, geometrical representations of land, but articulate and manipulated space promoting particular sets of human relations.[32] It is now widely accepted that cartography is a form of knowledge, used in discourses of power and political control.[33] Klein suggests, drawing from the theory of Lefebvre on the feudal to capitalist transition, that estate mapping corresponded to a shift from a "spatial practice",

---

[28] Barber, 'Mapmaking in England', p. 1637-1643.

[29] J. Schofield, *The London Surveys of Ralph Treswell* (London, 1987).

[30] YMA, 02(4) e ii.b. (not available at present)

[31] Klein, *Maps,* pp. 43-5; Barber, 'Mapmaking in England', p. 1638.

[32] J.B. Harley, 'Maps, Knowledge and Power', in D.Cosgrove and S. Daniels (eds), *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic representation, Design and Use of Past Environments* (Cambridge, 1988), 277-312; D. Cosgrove, (ed.), *Mappings* (London, 1999).

[33] Harley, 'Maps', p. 277-312. E. Said, *Orientalism* (London, 1978) ; D. Gregory, *Geographical Imaginations* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 70-203.

or "absolute space" to a "representation of space". This is a conceptualised "abstract" space, deliberately created by an expert applying a technology, imposed upon the physical reality.[34]

Interpreting a map requires the ability to decode an abstract geometric representation of a place as viewed from a high or zenithal advantage point.[35] This is a different perception of space from the experience of walking in the countryside or in town. Howard, comparing the notes written by John Leland in the 1540s and William Camden's *Britannia* of 1586, argues that the development of mapping in the sixteenth century changed the verbal description of the urban landscape. The reader, instead of experiencing a sequence of places as if he was walking in the town, was able to understand the city in its totality and to imagine "whole groups of buildings and their relationship to one another".[36] Therefore the sixteenth and seventeenth-century sources for the boundaries of the Close, both written and cartographic, were produced at a time of great changes in the perception of the built environment.

These changes, however, may not have happened very fast. Because of the high costs involved in producing maps and because the expertise in interpreting scaled maps was not so common, mapping was a minority phenomenon and written surveys remained the main way to represent boundaries throughout the seventeenth century.[37] Perhaps there was also some resistance to changes in the perception of space, as the development of another cartographic genre demonstrates.

---

[34] Klein, *Maps,* p. 49-50 ; H. Lefebvre, *La Production de l'Espace* (Paris, 2000), pp. 309-35.

[35] De Certeau, *L'Invention du Quotidien*, pp. 142, locates changes in the perception of space in the sixteenth century; C. Jacob, 'Towards a Cultural History of Cartography', *Imago Mundi* 48 (1996): 191-8, for social practices and readership of maps; Barber, 'Mapmaking in England', pp. 1594-5, recent research suggest that medieval local maps were more frequent that previously thought, however, medieval maps were non measured sketches used as an aid to solve legal disputes.

[36] Howard, *The Buildings of Elizabethan*, p. 165.

[37] Barber, 'Mapmaking in England', p. 1643.

Urban cartography

The perception of urban space from a high point was developed from the mid-sixteenth century by the diffusion of city views, such as Anthonis van den Wyngaerde's panoramas of London.[38] Scaled town maps were made from the 1550s onwards: the anonymous Copperplate map of London (1557-59) was one of the first. This was followed by maps of other cities, such as those of Oxford by Ralph Agas (1578) and Exeter by John Hooker (1587) and then by collections of maps of several towns by William Smith (1588), John Norden (1595) and John Speed (1611-2).[39] Their development was due to various factors such as improvements in printing techniques and the promotion of civic self-image.[40] These maps represented the towns as oblique views, bird's-eye views, in which standing buildings were recognisable.

Bird's-eye views represented buildings, people, activities and ceremonies. Gordon, discussing a passage from *Coriolanus*, argues that in the sixteenth century a city without buildings was unrecognisable.[41] Moreover mapping a flat, abstract urban space failed to generate civic self-identification. In fact the first time that the city of London was represented as a flat geometry was after the Great Fire of London of 1666. The suburbs, however, were represented in oblique perspective, with standing buildings. The insertion of a profile view of London burning further expressed the resistance to the city being represented by two-dimensional geometry. Therefore even in the seventeenth century, in order to be recognised, towns needed to be represented as a space lived and performed in rather than as an abstract entity.[42]

---

[38] Howard, *The Buildings of Elizabethan*, pp. 174-5.

[39] Barber, 'Mapmaking in England', pp 1648-57; S. Bendall and J. Speed, 'Draft Town Maps for John Speed's "Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine", *Imago Mundi* 54 (2002): 30-2.

[40] Buisseret, *The Mapmaker's,* p. 169-71; Barber, 'Mapmaking in England', pp. 1654-56.

[41] A. Gordon, 'Performing London: the map and the city in ceremony', in A.Gorgon and B. Klein (eds), *Literature, Mapping and the Politic of Space in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge 2001), pp. 71-2.

[42] Gordon, 'Performing London', pp. 69-88.

An innovative aspect of urban map making, highly relevant to York, was the first attempt at mapping local administrative boundaries. In 1540 Henry VIII was planning to restrict the number and rights of traditional places of sanctuary and to replace them with new areas of sanctuary for debtors in eight English cities.[43] In an Act of 1540-1 York was selected as one of these and the city corporation was to designate the new area of sanctuary.[44] In 1541 Henry ordered leading English towns to produce plans showing the places of sanctuary and those for York, Norwich and Southwark survive.[45] York's plan was identified as the one for which York Corporation in 1541 paid "the armet (heremit) of the Kyngs Manour at York for drawing the platt of the sanctuary".[46] (Map 18) This map is dated on palaeographical evidence to 1545, the representation of the city is schematic and not scaled and some important features, such as the gates of the Close, are represented standing. Written words define other important landmarks, streets and areas occupied by houses. The boundaries of the new sanctuary, in the central area around Thursday Market, are very clear and drawn in red. This was the first time the Crown used maps for administrative purposes, rather than for planning defences.

However, it was only in the Ordnance Survey's nineteenth-century Boundary Survey that invisible spatial features, such as administrative boundaries, were systematically recorded after extensive consultation with local people.[47] In fact knowledge of administrative boundaries such as the parish ones existed only in local memory, which during the eighteenth century was still periodically reinforced with processions or perambulations.[48] The OS maps therefore made permanent a collective memory of local administrative boundaries. This explains

[43] Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space,* p. 207.

[44] D.M. Palliser, *Tudor York* (Oxford, 1979), p. 80.

[45] Barber, 'Mapmaking in England', p. 1603; P. D. A. Harvey, *Maps in Tudor England* (London, 1993), pp. 68-9; the map of Norwich is pictorial showing the market square with detailed standing buildings, while the Southwark one is sketchy. See Chapter 4.4 p.173-8 for the Close as sanctuary.

[46] TNA, MPB 49, 51. RCHME, *City of York, South West,* vol. 3 (London, 1972), pp. xxviii fig. 1 and xxxiv.

[47] Fletcher, 'The Ordnance Survey's', pp. 131-46.

[48] Fletcher, 'The Ordnance Survey's', p. 132; Tillott, *VCH York,* pp. 311-2.

the discrepancies between the information of the leases and the boundaries in the OS Map of 1852.[49] (Maps 2 and 3) These appear to be on the sites of recent demolition and rebuilding, where the physical reference to the original boundary has been lost.

Cartographic discourses between the Close and the city.

The surviving general plans of the Close and of the city of York, before the OS Map of 1852, represent two kinds of discourse. One recognises the separate identity of the Close, the other shows it as integrated into the town. The representation of a mixture of flat geometry and oblique views of buildings is instrumental to these discourses.[50] The first plan that recognises a separate identity for the Close from the city is the above mentioned 1545 map of York. This shows the cathedral and two blocks representing the Archbishop's Palace and its garth. The street system of the Minster Garth is represented in all its ramifications, apart from Precentor's Court. The Chapter House is represented as a disproportionately large circle defined by a double line.[51] The West and South Minster Gates and the Archbishop's Palace gateway are represented as standing arches. This is in contrast with Bootham Bar, the only visible city gate, and St Mary's gatehouse and postern, which are represented in plan. Curiously the Gate of the Close in Ogleforth and the East Gate of the Close (Bedern), are not drawn even if they were standing at the time.[52] The prominence given to the South and West Minster Gates and to that of the Archbishop's Palace perhaps indicated that the Close was a traditional area of sanctuary. The omission of two of the Close gates may suggest that these were considered less important, alternatively there may have been rules on entrance for request of asylum in the Close.[53]

---

[49] See Chapter 2.1, pp. 54-5.

[50] Buisseret, *The Mapmaker's,* p. 170 notes that modern city maps for tourists still highlight important landmarks in this way.

[51] The colours on the original map in The National Archives may provide further explanation for this double line.

[52] See Chapter 2. 5. 3, p. 120-4.

[53] See Chapter 4, p.173; S. MacSheffrey, 'Boundaries of London Sanctuaries'(Forthcoming).

The second map showing the separate identity of the Close is Speed's (1611)
bird's-eye view of York. This is a measured map, which highlights some of the
features of the Close in the early seventeenth century. (Map 19) Only the
cathedral, the Archbishop's palace, the Deanery and the prebendal mansions of
Fenton, Strensall, Whistow, Langtoft, Ullerskelfe and Stillington, and the
Treasurer's house, are drawn. This suggests that the religious buildings and the
mansions defined the character of the Close. More importantly, its separateness
from the city and its status as an enclave are highlighted by a row of houses
facing Petergate, interrupted only by the gates including the "Deanery's Back
Gatehouse". [54] A more fragmented arrangement and no gates are represented
toward the east. This omission of gates that were then standing suggests that
Speed may have been aware of the 1545 map.

The first surviving general plan of the Close showing its complete administrative
boundary belongs to the Archbishop's archives and dates to c. 1780.[55] The author
of this map is Thomas Atkinson, the architect of York Minster and of the
gateway of Bishopsthorpe Palace. It represents the main buildings as geometrical
shapes, enclosed within an ochre coloured line, marking the external boundary of
the Close. (Map 24) However, the gates of the Close and the adjoining city gates
are not in plan but are seen as standing buildings in ¾ perspective. They are all
similarly represented as stone-built arches, with moulded imposts, surmounted
by statues; the only difference is that the four gates of the Close are smaller in
size. The arches are slightly pointed, but at the same time the mouldings suggest
classical influences. In fact neo-classicism was the style of the eighteenth-
century city; Bootham Bar was refurbished in 1719 and in 1738 the statue of
Ebrauk, the mythical founder of York, was placed on its northern side.[56] Except
perhaps for the stone built West Minster gate, the gates of the Close appear to be
idealised, rather than realistic, representations of the timber framed structures

---

[54] In Speed's map of Chichester the close had a similar relationship with the city, however, the
city walls are in front. Tatton-Brown, 'The Buildings of the Bishop's Palace', p. 226.

[55] BIHR, CC. Ab/86 and BIHR, CC. Ab. 9 York, Archbishop Palace.

[56] RCHME, *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the City of York; Volume 2, The
Defences* (London, 1972), p. 116.

that we know them to have been. Moreover the Gate in Ogleforth was demolished at the beginning of the eighteenth century.[57] To understand this representation it is necessary to turn first to the maps suggesting a different discourse.

The maps that deny a separate identity for the Close from the city are the maps of York by Horsley (1697) (Map 20), Cossin (1722) (Map 22) and Drake (1736). (Map 21) All these maps show the city as flat geometry, with important landmarks and monuments represented standing. The city's gates are represented standing, but the Close's gates are not indicated at all. The standing cathedral is very prominent within the city, but it looks integrated in its topography. Despite the fact that the maps by Chasseaureau (1750) (Map 23) and Jeffrey (1772) are both flat maps with no emphasis on the city gates, the Close appears to be included in the city. Moreover the cathedral has been artificially isolated by graphically expanding the Minster Yard. The integration of the Close with the city in these maps was part of a discourse of post-Restoration urbanism.[58] In this context the map from the Archbishop's archives, by marking an invisible administrative boundary and by depicting the four gates of the Close as similar to the ones of the city, asserts the fact that the Close in the eighteenth century was still bounded and separated from the city. (Fig. 24)

The Close

So far the development of spatial writing and cartography from the sixteenth century has shown a preoccupation with boundaries connected to a developing concept of governance and of private ownership. However, space and boundaries were understood in terms of practice and performance of everyday activities rather than by representation. Representations are also used to promote a particular discourse about space and as such they could be contradictory. Since this study seeks to map and to visualise the built environment of the Close these are important considerations. Michael De Certeau argues that boundaries are

[57] See Chapter 2.5. 3, p. 120.
[58] See Chapter 6, pp. 276-8.

created by the enunciation of words and by graphic narratives. Therefore spatial writing in legal documents and the tracing of maps does not merely reflect but also set the boundaries. These narratives or images are composed of fragments of previous ones; past decisions about the landscape are thus reflected by boundaries. Moreover the setting of boundaries creates a "place", a theatre of action where different "tactics" or social "spaces", can be practised.[59] The evidence for the Close can now be assessed in the light of the relationship between spatial writing, the setting of boundaries and geographical perception in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

In 1285 the Dean and Chapter obtained the licence to enclose the churchyard and the cathedral precinct with a 12 feet high stone wall.[60] However, the notion of a Close appears from 1432 onwards. In the Fabric Rolls a list of rents is written under the heading *infra clausum*.[61] The name and the adverb suggest the existence of an enclosed place containing properties. This idea is reinforced by clauses in leases from the fifteenth century in which prebendal mansions were said to be located *infra clausum*; from the mid sixteenth century mansions and tenements were "within the Close".[62] The formula "within the Close commonly called Minster Garth" or simply "Minster Garth" was also used from 1577.[63] The term "Minster Garth" appears on the 1545 map of York to indicate the open area around the Minster; it was last used in 1613 after which "Minster Yard" was preferred.[64] (Map 18) The term garth indicates the open area of a cloister or alternatively a planted enclosure. A yard is an open area surrounded by walls or buildings.[65] The change of terminology suggests that in the seventeenth century this open area may have been regarded as less ecclesiastical and also as a more built up area.

---

[59] M. De Certeau, *L'Invention du Quotidian*, pp. 175-89.

[60] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* 1281-92, p. 161.

[61] YMA, E3/12.

[62] YMA, M2/5; YMA, Wa, fol. 1v. YMA, Wa-d.

[63] YMA, Wb, fols. 295v-296.

[64] RCHME, *City of York, South West,* p. xxviii fig. 1. YMA, Wc, fols. 194-195.

[65] Curl, *Dictionary of Architecture*, pp. 266 and 752.

The location clause "within the Close commonly called Minster Garth" suggests that there was conflation of two different meanings for the Close. This is reinforced by the fact that some properties located "within the Close" were also described in the same document as "abutting the Close".[66] Properties were located "within the Close" as an alternative of being located within a parish. This suggests that one of the meanings for the Close was of an administrative territorial entity with a social connotation of community. The other was of an open area, garth and then yard, defined by the frontage of the buildings facing onto it. This may reflect the fact that in the absence of a strongly defined external boundary, as a boundary wall, the Close could only be experienced by entering the gates and walking within.

Spatial information on the leases, such as location and abutting clauses, in conjunction with eighteenth and nineteenth-century measured maps enable the reconstruction of the nature and the physical contiguity of the external boundary of the Close. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, however, this was not visible but rather was composed of the garden walls or fences marking the rear boundaries of the properties that opened onto the Close. These were back-to-back tenements facing Petergate or Goodramgate, which were not "within the Close", but were located in the city of York, either within the parish of St Michel-le-Belfrey, Holy Trinity or St John's. The Close therefore was hidden behind rows of houses. In Chichester similar rows of houses are depicted in Speed's local map. These were built from the thirteenth century between the close, South Street and West Street and demolished in 1848-52.[67] From outside the city of York, the cathedral's towers rising above the city walls would have created the impression of a fortified place but from the city's streets only the gates provided access and a visual perspective of the enclosed space.

The land included in the Close was the open spaces of the Minster Yard and the prebendal mansions. The tenements with doors opening on the Minster Yard

---

[66] YMA, Wb, fol. 302; Wd, fol. 24; Wd, fols. 49v50. Wc, fols. 281v-282v.

[67] Tatton-Brown, 'The Buildings of the Bishop's Palace', pp. 225-246.

were also part of the Close. However, the houses that had doors towards the city streets and the ones that had entrances or windows on both the Close and the streets were not included in the Close. This is exemplified by the houses on both sides of the South Minster Gate and by the row of houses by St Michael-le-Belfrey.[68] All these belonged to the Dean and Chapter and were part of the Liberty of St Peter but not of the Close.[69] Prebendal mansions, however, were included in the Close even if they did open directly onto the city streets. This is the case with the prebend of Fenton and the Deanery. Former prebendal land was also included in the Close, as in the case of Cambhall Garth which was redeveloped in the fourteenth century as housing and shops facing both the street and the Minster Yard. This suggests that coherent criteria had been applied to establish the boundaries.

The establishment of boundaries reflects previous negotiations and decisions. In London, the Viewers often had to make decisions on seemingly awkward boundaries. These were the result of previous agreements between neighbours, the memory of which had been lost.[70] Administrative boundaries were also the result of negotiation between authorities. The fifteenth-century disputes between the Communality of Canterbury and the urban monastery of Christ Church are a good example. Around the precinct there were houses belonging to the monastery. These opened into the precinct and also had windows onto the street. A market was held in proximity of the monastery and the inhabitants of these houses displayed and sold goods from their windows. This created discontent in the city because since they were trading within the liberties of Christ Church, they did not have to pay taxes. The boundaries of the monastery were finally defined in 1493. It was agreed that all the houses having doors or windows opening towards the street were to be part of the city, in exchange the city would renounce any jurisdiction on lay houses facing the precinct.[71] The setting of the

---

[68] See Chapter 2. 2. 1, pp. 62-5.

[69] See Chapter 1.1, pp. 28-31.

[70] Orlin, 'Boundary', p. 353

[71] Green, *Town Life,* pp. 377-78.

administrative boundaries of the York Minster Close may have reflected previous, unrecorded negotiation with the city.

Boundaries and private property

In practice fences, palisades and garden walls composed the external boundary of the Close in York, as well as the boundaries between tenements. In the seventeenth century, fences and garden walls marked the boundary between the Deanery yard and tenements facing Petergate.[72] They also defined parcels of land leased out of the Deanery yard. A palisade fence was used to enclose a parcel of the Minster Yard in front of the Library, leased as a private yard to a shop.[73] The accurate description of all these boundary features in sixteenth and seventeenth-century documents indicates that they were considered important and meaningful.

Fir palisades formed part of the boundary of the Deanery gardens and those of the Subdeanery. Palisades were made of sharply-pointed stakes or poles and had been used in hunting parks since the medieval period to enclose wild animals. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries they continued to be used as garden features and could be quite valuable.[74] In the 1575 inventory of fittings not to be removed from the Subdeanery at the end of the lease, the poles in the garden were valued at 40s. This was as much as the new wooden staircase to the gallery and the fir floorboards in the parlour.[75]

Preoccupation with the definition of property boundaries in this period was reflected by the English settlers in New England where fences on boundaries established rights of land ownership. This was not left to the initiative of the individual settlers for there were laws and injunctions for land to be fenced issued by officials, both from the colony and from the government in England.

---

[72] See Chapter 2.4.1.

[73] See Chapter 2. 3. 2, p. 88-91.

[74] Seed, *Ceremonies of Possession*, pp. 20-5; see Chapter 2.2. 2, p. 77.

[75] See Chapter 2. 2 .2, p. 81.

In fact fences had long been used to demarcate boundaries, as they created rights of ownership through medieval English legal custom. By the fourteenth century, with the growth of the enclosure of lands, fences become significant not only of ownership but of private ownership in particular.[76]

Fences also defined private ownership in the urban context. For example in London in 1555 the Viewers resolved boundary disputes in backyards by marking the position of a fence to be erected between neighbours. However, in a densely built-up urban context fencing or walling needed to be carefully considered and negotiated. Reasonable access to other properties or shared facilities was not to be obstructed.[77]

The concept of private property was also reflected in the interpretation of the jurisdiction of the domestic domain. The equation between the "house" and the "castle" was first expressed by chief justice John Fineux in 1506.[78] The castle was a franchise, an immunity given by the King. The idea of the house as a franchise reinforced the idea of private property.

Interface between public space and landed private property in the Minster Yard

The Minster Yard can be defined as an open public space.[79] In fact it was maintained by the Fabric Fund and regulated by the Dean and Chapter. Moreover in this space the rights of the passers-by took priority over those of the tenants of the surrounding properties. For example from 1585 to 1667 the tenants of the

---

[76] Seed, 'Ceremonies of Possession', pp. 20-5.

[77] Orlin, 'Boundary', p. 355.

[78] Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space,* pp. 202-3.

[79] Harding, 'Space, Property', pp. 560-2; K. Giles, 'Public Space in Town and Village, 1100-1500', in K. Giles and C. Dyer, (eds), *Town and Country in the Middle Ages,* The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monographs 22 (2005), pp. 293-311; for public space in the sixteenth century, M. Reed, 'The Urban Landscape 1540-1700', in P. Clark (ed.), *Cambridge Urban History of Britain, 1540-1840,* vol. 2 (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 306-8.

houses by the cathedral south door had to clean the gutters and channels in front of their property without causing any nuisance to passers-by.[80]

The access to shared facilities complicated the relationship between public space and private property.[81] In the Close the Masons' well was within a private yard on the back of the Masons' Lodge, leased in 1584. The use of the well, however, was communal and the tenant had to allow free and convenient access for all people who needed its water, according to custom and without any hindrance or charge.[82] Therefore there were areas that while not being public were shared by several people.

Moreover, public space and private property could become enmeshed in each other so that effort was taken in maintaining the boundary between the two. In the Minster Yard, strips of land in front of or beside shops were leased separately, even if these were very narrow. This possibly allowed for the shop counters to extend towards the street or for merchandise to be displayed on outside stands without encroachment. Alternatively, these strips may have created private access to a doorway, especially if bays were subdivided between several occupiers.[83] On one occasion a strip measuring up to one foot in width and already built-up, was leased separately from the encroaching building.[84] It is evident that the Dean and Chapter were carefully controlling encroachment in the open area of the Minster Yard.

Some areas in the Minster Yard appear to have been more frequented and others more secluded. Some of the principles of Hanson and Hillier's theory of access analysis may be helpful here to understand the relationship between freedom of transit and control of space.[85] Even without a formal application of this theory, it

---

[80] See Chapter 2. 3. 2.

[81] Orlin, 'Boundary', p. 367; Harding, 'Space, Property', pp. 560-1.

[82] See Chapter 2. 3. 1; YMA, Wb, fols. 333v-334. See Chapter 6.4, p. 337.

[83] See Chapter 2. 3. 2. p. 91.

[84] See Chapter 2. 2, 1 p. 63-4.

[85] See Chapter 1. p. 38.

is evident from the map that in the portion of the Minster Yard to the south and to the east of the cathedral, there is a multiplicity of annular patterns of circulation. For instance it was possible to enter the Close at the West Minster Gate, cross it and exit at one of the other gates. Public buildings, commercial and collegiate activities were located in these areas, which were accessible to different groups of people coming from outside the Close. In contrast Precentor's Court and Minster Court were secluded residential areas, containing mansions with large gardens, without shops or public buildings. These cul-de-sacs formed a dendritic pattern of access, which did not allow free circulation and transit. Therefore access to these areas to non-residents, while there is no evidence that it was ever prohibited, seems to have been discouraged by their position in space. On the other hand the establishment of certain kinds of activities may have been discouraged by this pattern of access.

The seclusion of the area to the north-east of the cathedral, however, seems to have been reinforced by the careful selection of the tenants. Not only were the mansions, gardens and the coach house in Minster Court leased to gentry or members of the Church of York, but also the garden and the little house to the south of the Chapter House were leased to prominent tenants in the Close, with the agreement that these could not be sublet or alienated to anyone without the consent of the Dean and Chapter.[86] This little building was used for gardening related activities and the Dean and Chapter may have wished to prevent a change in use, perhaps with poor occupiers residing in this part of the Close. In fact the eastern part of the Close and its East Gate were in proximity of an area of small houses and cheap tenements, which attracted a population often on the margins of society, such as masterless or unfranchised crafts people and single women working as prostitutes.[87] One of these developments was Cambhall, which was

---

[86] See Chapter 2. 5. 1, p. 113-4.

[87] Rees Jones, 'Historical Background to the Aldwark/Bedern Area', p 58; S. Rees Jones, 'The Household and the English Urban Government in the Later Middle Ages', in M. Carlier and T. Soens(eds), *The Household in Late Medieval Cities: Italy and North Western Europe Compared* (Garant, 2001), p. 71-87; P. J. P. Goldberg, *Women Work and Life Cycle in a Medieval Economy: Women in York and Yorkshire 1300-1520* (Oxford, 1996), pp.151-2.

opening into the Close. For this reasons the Vicars Choral were selecting their tenants and the Dean and Chapter were also cautious.[88]

Boundary walls and authority

As mentioned above in 1285 the Dean and Chapter obtained the licence to enclose the precinct with 12 feet high stone wall, however there is no evidence that this structure was ever built.[89] The only mention of a boundary wall was documented in Petergate in 1424.[90] The purpose of this wall may have been to separate the land of the Dean and Chapter from the land of the Mayor and Commonality of York before the fifteenth and sixteenth century dense redevelopment of this area. Therefore this is so far the only information on a medieval boundary wall of the Close. [91]

Masonry boundary walls defined the two most important mansions in the Close: the Archbishop's Palace and the Deanery, located respectively to the north and to the south of the cathedral. Stone and crenellated walls were an enduring symbol of authority and were still built around the forecourts and gardens of sixteenth and seventeenth-century mansions.[92] In Speed's map great prominence within the city and the Close is given to the Archbishop's Palace, depicted just before its conversion into Ingram's Palace. The Archbishop's chapel is particularly emphasised and was perhaps still seen as a symbol of Episcopal authority.[93] However, in Ingram's redevelopment of the palace in 1617 the chapel was converted into a stable. It is not possible to establish if this was a deliberate and ideological decision or simply a utilitarian one, however, both its original

---

[88] Rimmer, 'Small Houses', pp. 187-8, for control on tenants in Cambhall.

[89] *Cal. Pat. Rolls* 1281-92, 161. C. Coulson, 'Hierarchism in Conventual Crenellation. An Essay in the Sociology and Metaphysics of Medieval Fortification', *Medieval Archaeology* 26 (1982): 84-6, discusses the symbolic value of the licence to enclose and that this was not necessarily followed by the construction of a boundary wall.

[90] See Chapter 2. 3. 3, pp. 94-5.

[91] Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 2, p. 196. YCA, I: 80A.

[92] P. Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden. Architecture and Landscape in the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries* (New Haven and London, 2005), pp. 35-65.

[93] Miller, *The Bishop's Palace*, pp. 216-52.

meaning and the balance between the two religious powers within the Close were then lost.

The crenellated Deanery wall, built at some point after the licence of 1301, occupied a prominent position in front of the cathedral and on the corner of Minster Gates and Petergate.[94] Parallels for the location of the deanery by the close gates and by a street of the Roman town, are found in France.[95] Toulouse is one of the best understood examples; the deanery there is located by the close gate on the *decumanus maximus* and by the city gate. Therefore the dean not only lived in a prominent, highly visible position with respect to the city and the cathedral, but also symbolically controlled access to the inner parts of the close. In York the Deanery was on the corner between the *cardo* and *decumanus maximus* of the Roman Fortress, moreover it was built above the Roman *Principia.* (Fig. 1 and 2) Its position was thus quite prestigious. In the seventeenth century the Dean was the highest dignitary in the Close and with the loss of the rival Archbishop's focus of power, a redeveloped and expanded Deanery was a continuing symbol of his authority.

Mediating the boundaries: gates and access

Four medieval gatehouses provided access to the Close and continued to be used during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Gatehouses during this period were still relevant because they were built as an imposing entrance to a mansion, both in the country and the towns. Somerset house in the Strand, built in the mid-sixteenth century, is an example.[96] Medieval gatehouses were kept in the redevelopment of monasteries after the Dissolution at Battle Abbey, East Sussex and St Mary's Abbey in York.[97] Alternatively they were built with recycled material left after the destruction as at Titchfield Abbey, Hampshire, or were

---

[94] See Chapter 2.4, pp. 97.

[95] Casez, *Saint-Étienne de Toulouse*, pp. 52-3.

[96] Henderson , *The Tudor House and Garden* , p. 35-71.

[97] Howard, *The Buildings of Elizabethan*, p. 22; RCHME, *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the City of York; Volume 4, Outside the City Walls East of the Ouse* (London, 1975), pp. 15-6.

even dismantled and rebuilt in a different location, as at Hinchingbrooke in
Huntingdonshire, where the gateway from Ramsey Abbey in the same county
was moved.[98]

Gates were also relevant in institutional and urban contexts. In York the
Common Hall Gate by the Guildhall was completed in 1533.[99] Collegiate
institutions in Oxford and Cambridge built imposing gatehouses in this period. In
London, despite the fact that the city walls were obsolete because there was no
threat of invasion and houses and industrial activity were encroaching, the city
gates were rebuilt between 1586 and 1617. Gates were a place of display
communicating the authority of the cities and their connections. In Lincoln the
Stonebow, a gateway by the Guildhall, was completed in 1520 and its outer,
south face had a display of iconography including the city arms and those of
James I which were added during the king's visits in 1605 and 1617.[100] In York
banners with the king's arms were displayed on the gates in occasion of royal
visits in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[101] In London city gates, even if
still medieval in form, began to incorporate elements of classical architectural
language.[102] In York the city gates' classical language was an eighteenth-century
development. However, the Bootham Bar was painted in white and terracotta
with gilded details in 1602 and again in 1633 in the occasion of royal
visits.[103]This polichromy may have represented a pictorial attempt to
"classicise"medieval gates. The Bootham Bar, in fact, was the entrance into the
city from the King's Manor, the seat of the Council of the North.[104]

---

[98] Howard, *The Buildings of Elizabethan*, pp. 22 and 27.

[99] Chapter 6.1, p. 283.

[100] J. O. R. Stewart and J. J. Cooke, *The Stonebow and Guildhall* (Lincoln, 1990), pp. 2-7.

[101] RCHME, *The Defences*, pp. 116-7.

[102] J. Schofield, 'The Topography and Buildings of London ca. 1600', in L. C. Orlin (ed.),
Material London (Philadelphia, 2000), p. 300; Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden,* pp. 38
and 42.

[103] RCHME, *The Defences*, pp. 116-7.

[104] Chapter 5.1.

Gates were also kept in secular cathedrals such as Salisbury and Chichester, as well as in the monastic cathedral of Norwich.[105] In York the West Minster Gate was built in the fourteenth century.[106] This stone gate with a round-headed arch was the architectural response of the Dean and Chapter to the gateways of the Archbishop's Palace and to the Bootham Bar of the city.[107] They expressed their authority and the seat of their jurisdiction in this way.[108] Since it almost faced the west front of the cathedral, this gateway was the ceremonial entrance to the Minster Close.[109] It would have been used to access the Archbishop's or Ingram's Palace and since it was a carriage entrance it would have been the preferred access by people coming from outside the city to the Close for the assize, court business or worship in the cathedral. Lawyers and clients in transit between the seat of the Presidency of the Council of the North in the King's Manor and the office of the Secretary of the same Council would have also used this gate.[110] Building materials and goods coming to St Leonard's landing on the river continued to be carried through here to the Minster Yard also.[111] The fact that it was called "Farr Minster Gate" indicates that it was perceived as away from the centre, in contrast with the South Minster Gates which were called simply "Minster Gates". This suggests that use rather than monumentality determined the idea of centrality in the Close. In fact the South Minster Gates were on the axis connecting the city with the cathedral's south transept and the Deanery. (Fig. 1 and 2, Map 5)

---

[105] Tatton-Brown, 'The Buildings of the Bishop's Palace', pp. 228; Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close,* pp. 44-55; RCHME, *Salisbury*, passim.

[106] See Chapter 2.2.1, p. 58.

[107] RCHME, *The Defences*, p. 116 and for the Archbishop's gateway Figs. 4 and 44.

[108] K. Giles, 'Documentary and cartographic research', in Field Archaeology Specialists, 'Dean's Park, archaeological excavations 1997-8', Unpublished Report (York, 2000), p. 75.

[109] Brown, *York Minster*, pp. 118-22.

[110] Moody, *The Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby*. Lady Hoby's visits to York were centred between the Minster and the King's Manor.

[111] The first mention of material carried from St Leonard's landing on the river Ouse to the *cimiterium* occur in the Fabric roll E3/2 and continues to appear regularly in the accounts. The last recorded mention for the period covered by this study is in YMA, E3/63/1.

The other three gates of the Minster Close were timber-framed. The choice of this material rather than stone suggests that the Dean and Chapter carefully balanced their display of power and lordship when they built them in the fourteenth century. Coulson suggests that there is a relationship between conventual fortification and mob violence. [112] This is a consequence of fortification usually rather than a cause. Anger was directed towards the imposing stone gatehouses, even if these were the strongest point of fortification. A timber framed gate is an urban barrier but it is not a fortification since it could be easily burned in a riot. Moreover the material and the technique were similar to those of domestic and corporate buildings in the city and therefore these gates were also a display of urban style.[113] The South Minster Gate, facing Stonegate, was the main gateway opening towards the city. The street connected the civic centre with the Minster and it was the processional road for the city dignitaries from the Guildhall, located in St Helen's Square, to the south transept of the cathedral. The Corpus Christi procession performed three stations of the Mystery Plays along this street from the fourteenth century to the 1570s.[114] The guild of St Christopher had an altar in the Minster from 1396, the year of its incorporation. This was a guild connected with the city government and its charity consisted of the maintenance of highways and the building of such infrastructure as the Guildhall. The Dean and Chapter were involved in appointing suitable chaplains and oblations collected at the altar were given to the Fabric Fund. Business meetings of the council were held behind St Christopher's altar until 1533. In this year the new chapel at the Common Hall Gate was completed. This was on the site of the present Mansion House, at the opposite end of Stonegate from the South Minster Gate. [115]

---

[112] C. Coulson, 'Hierarchism in Conventual Crenellation. An Essay in the Sociology and Metaphysics of Medieval Fortification', *Medieval Archaeology* 26 (1982): 84-6.

[113] J. Schofield and G. Stell, 'The Built Environment 1300-1540', in D.M. Palliser (ed.), *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain 600-1540,* vol 1 (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 389-390; K. Giles, *An Archaeology of Social Identity,* pp. 31, 41, 43, 63-4.

[114] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, p. 220. Palliser, *Tudor York*, p. 232.

[115] E. White, *The St Christopher and St George Guild of York*, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 72 (1987), pp. 2-10.

Civic space therefore extended into the cathedral. The Stonegate axis was very important in the relationship between the Chapter and the city; the boundary into the Close was crossed at South Minster Gate. This was provided with high quality carved wooden doors.[116] The carvings were probably the arms of the Liberty continuing the medieval practice of displaying arms on gates.[117] An incident, which occurred in 1802 suggests that this was the entrance from which the city authorities approached the Close. An officer of the city entered unheralded through the South Minster Gate. He unlocked the chain and proceeded to read the royal proclamation of the peace of Amiens by the south transept. The Chapter authorities were much offended. This suggests that there was a protocol for the city authority approaching the Close, but it is not clear how early this was established.[118]

The cathedral's south door may have been the one favoured by the city dignitaries going to services or doing business in the Minster. There is evidence for a similar use in Pisa, a city where the cathedral transept also opens towards the *decumanus maximus* and the civic centre of the city. In Pisa around the doorway of the thirteenth-century transept used by the city dignitaries, there was the maximum concentration of *spolia*. These were Roman marbles with inscriptions imported from Ostia and Rome and were used to define the city's antique identity. [119]

Gates continued their function as deterrent to intruders in the sixteenth and seventeenth century. Ordinances of great households and literature concerned with security reveal that there was much preoccupation with vagrants and

---

[116] See Chapter 2. 3. 3., p. 93.

[117] Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden*, p. 67.

[118]D.M. Owen, 'From the Restoration until 1822', in G.E. Aylmer and R. Cant (eds), *A History of York Minster* (Oxford, 1977), p. 269.

[119] S. Settis, 'Continuita', Distanza, Conoscenza. Tre Usi dell'Antico', in S. Settis (ed.), *Memoria dell'Antico nell'Arte Italiana*, vol. 3 (Torino, 1986), pp. 374-487. However, in Pisa the relationship with the city was different. Italian cathedral complexes are a symbol of civic identity. The building of the cathedral in Pisa was funded by the city-state.

beggars and their presence at the gate was seen as threatening.[120] Begging was a
serious problem in York; the hope for alms given in the street attracted many
beggars into the city. During Assize days in 1599 Bootham had to be patrolled
and cleared of beggars to allow the judges to cross from the King's Manor to
Bootham Bar.[121]

The porter or keeper of the gates had the duty of closing the gates at night and of
surveillance. He also had to open the gates at night on request and free of charge
according to the custom and the cathedral's statutes.[122] Small repairs to the gates
and new keys made throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and even
new doors made for the gate in Ogleforth in 1693, are witness to the continued
locking of the gates.[123] The Portership of the Gates of the Close was an office
given by the Dean and Chapter for life and included duties as the cathedral's
verger. In the sixteenth century the first recorded keeper was Henry Jameson,
followed in 1547 by Richard Galthrope, gentleman of York and servant of the
Archbishop.[124] William Gibson (tailor) was appointed in 1575, followed by the
goldsmith William Rawson in 1581, by John Blanchard (weaver) in 1608-1618
and by Leonard Swan (chapman) from 1619 suggesting that the residents of
Minster Gates were somehow expected to collaborate in running the Close.[125] All
these were resident in tenements in Minster Gates. The porter was paid 40s a
year and had the income of two shops and a house within the West Minster Gate.
This was in the gatehouse to the east of the gate. In addition two chambers above
the same gate were used to keep the tools and stands for the two yearly fairs held
in the Minster Yard.[126] The revenues from these events were also part of his
income. The office of the Portership may have been given as employment after

---

[120] Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden,* pp. 35-6; Fumerton, 'London's Vagrant Economy',
pp. 206-26.

[121] Palliser, *Tudor York*, p. 286.

[122] J. Raine (ed.), *The Statutes of the Cathedral Church of York* (Leeds, 1900), p. 78.

[123] YMA, E3/51-53-54-55-56-58-60.

[124] YMA, Wb, fols. 36v-37; Wb, fol. 282; YMA, E3/59; E3/62/1; YMA, Wc, fol. 270; YMA,
E3/62/3; E3/63/1.

[125] YMA, E3/59; E3/62/3, "late William Rawnson".YMA, Wc, fol. 270.

[126] See Chapter 5.1, p. 243.

retirement to trusted tenants in the Close or it may have been undertaken by them as a service to the community.

The gates of the Close had a residential use. They had chambers on the upper floor accessed by neighbouring properties. The "Deanery Back Gatehouse" had lodgings with garderobes. In the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries these would have housed members of the Dean's household or have been used for hospitality of the retinue of important guests.[127] In the seventeenth century they were leased with a neighbouring property, therefore by then hospitality was probably offered in the redeveloped and expanded Deanery house. The seventeenth-century Deanery had its own porter's lodge facing towards the Minster Yard; this feature was introduced in England in the late sixteenth century and became common in the seventeenth century.[128]

Prisons since the medieval period were often associated with gatehouses in urban, monastic and palatial contexts.[129] In York, Monk Bar was used as a prison for recusants from 1583.[130] Peter Prison was located immediately to the west of the West Minster Gate and the Archbishop's prison was by the Palace gateway. The custodian of the Archbishop's Palace in the sixteenth century had the role of gaoler for the people of the dioceses imprisoned there. This office must have been honorific because it was given to a gentleman, formerly in the service of the Archbishop, then to a goldsmith and to a notary.[131] The association of prisons and gatehouses meant that prisoners were not excluded from a gated enclosure but were kept on the boundary; therefore they had a liminal position. This could be a metaphor for the liminal position within society of people waiting for

---

[127] Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, pp. 54-7; M. Wood, *The English Medieval House* (London, 1965), pp. 167-188.

[128] Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden*, pp. 53-62.

[129] A. Brodie, J. Croom and J.O. Davies, *English Prisons. An Architectural History* (Swindon, 2002), pp. 12-3; Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden,* pp. 68-69; B. Weinreb and C. Hibbert, *The London Enciclopedia,* (London, 1983), p. 305, for Westminster Gatehouse Prison.; Stewart and Cooke, *The Stonebow,* pp. 6-7.

[130] RCHME, *The Defences*, p.125.

[131] YMA, Wa, fol. 39v; Wb, fol. 103; Wb, fols. 275v-276; Wb, fols. 308-308v.

judgement or sometimes waiting for execution, thus on the border between life and death. Perhaps prisons and executions by the city gates were intended as powerful deterrents from crime in a society where conflict and punishment were not restrained or institutionalised but were publicly acted out.[132] The continuing importance of the location of prisons in the sixteenth century is demonstrated by the fact that they were relocated in or connected with town halls to reinforce the idea of these buildings as seat of power.[133] This relocation may seem more central than liminal, however, since Tittler also suggests that town halls were metaphoric doorways to the community, the liminality of prisons remained.[134]

Conclusion

After the Reformation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the York Minster Close maintained its boundaries and its identity as a gated enclosure separated from the city. The closure of the gates at night and the surveillance in daytime meant that the Close was a very controlled environment. Its inhabitants and visitors would have been unable to move around without being seen or checked upon. Surveillance is about power and control and during the sixteenth and early seventeenth century this was encouraged at every level of society.[135] The Close was a permeable, mitigated enclosure since there were houses with double entrances and two alleys which could have been used as alternative routes eluding the surveillance at the gates. However, the Dean with his private gatehouse opening directly outside the Close, was perhaps the only resident within the Close officially free from the surveillance at the gates. Therefore he was really in charge of this space.

---

[132] C. Muldrew, 'From a 'Light Cloak' to an Iron Cage: Historical Changes in the Relation Between Community and Individualism', in A. Shepard and P. Withington (eds), *Communities in Early Modern England* (Manchester 2000), pp. 156-179; Henderson , *The Tudor House and Garden,* pp. 68, fig. 87 prisoners escaping and executed outside London's Newgate prison in 1612.

[133] R. Tittler, *Architecture and Power. The Town Hall and the English Urban Community c.1500-1640* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 122-27.

[134] Ibid., p.129.

[135] Orlin, *Locating Privacy*.

CHAPTER 4. Relocating the Holy

York Minster as a secular cathedral did not undergo radical institutional changes during the Reformation.[1] However, there was a redefinition of religion and of the idea of sacred space. This was achieved through a threefold process of selective destruction of material culture, continuity and the establishment of new practices of space. Iconoclasm, directed towards imagery and ritual objects of the traditional religion, had a prominent role in the redefinition of the sacred landscape. Moreover the liturgical changes of the first two decades of the Reformation had an impact on the resident communities and on the ones visiting the Close. Their disappearance or contraction was reflected by important changes in the cathedral landscape. The focus of this section will be the process of adaptation of the space of the Close for the needs of the Reformed religion. Changing ideas about the nature of sacred space will also be explored, as well as the relocation elsewhere of some of the practices previously contained within the cathedral precinct.

The Reformation of York Minster: institutions and resident liturgical communities

Compared with other secular cathedrals, where the number of canons was substantially reduced, the institutional continuity in York Minster was remarkable. By 1550 only six of the wealthiest prebends out of a total of 36 had been lost to the Chapter.[2] The new Statutes ordered by the king in 1541 were not innovative in respect of the medieval ones; however, they tried to encourage the canons to be in residence, especially since many of the medieval canons were absentee Italians appointed by the Pope. One of the aims of the Statutes was to increase the control of the educated clergy upon the cathedral liturgy, rather than rely on the vicars' choral. In addition, the absentee canons were required to make

---

[1] Cross, 'From the Reformation', pp. 193-232.

[2] Ibid., p. 196.

a financial contribution towards the appointment of learned preachers.[3] However, the number of canons residentiariy only increased to three or four at a time.[4]

Despite the fact that Archbishop Lee and Dean Hidgen were not enthusiastic reformers, they continued in office.[5] However, in 1539 Richard Layton was appointed prebendary of Ullerskelf and subsequently dean.[6] He was in office until 1544 and was mostly in residence. Layton was a prominent crown commissioner involved in the dissolution of monastic houses all over England between 1536 and 1539. His letters to Cromwell show his concern with the financial side of the Dissolution, such as the poor management of some of the minor houses and the concealment of precious and sacred objects by wealthier ones.[7] For this reason the abbot of Glastonbury was prosecuted and executed as a traitor. However, Layton was also involved in doctrinal matters and in his injunctions to Oxford University condemned scholasticism. He was responsible for encouraging the destruction of scholastic texts from the college libraries. In 1535 he suggested to Cromwell that he should be sent to carry out a visitation of the diocese of York, claiming to be the best equipped to deal with stubborn and superstitious northerners.[8] In 1536-7 he was involved in taking confessions and in the trials of the prisoners of the Pilgrimage of Grace, making many enemies, Archbishop Lee among them. The appointment of such an unpopular man as Dean, therefore, was an attempt by Cromwell to push the religious reforms in York Minster. In 1544 Robert Holgate was the first committed Protestant to be appointed archbishop. As President of the Council in the North, his role was to establish the Protestant religion, implementing the decisions of the crown.[9] His

---

[3] Ibid., p.198.

[4] Cross, 'From the Reformation', p.198.

[5] Ibid., pp. 196-7.

[6] Cunich, P. 'Layton', in H. C. G. Matthew and B. Harrison (eds), *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* Vol. 32 (Oxford, 2004), pp. 934-6.

[7] G. H. Cook, *Letters to Cromwell and Others on the Suppression of the Monasteries* (London, 1965), pp. 241-5.

[8] Cook, *Letters to Cromwell*, p. 130.

[9] A. G. Dickens, *Robert Holgate Archbishop of York and President of the King's Council in the North*, St Anthony's Hall Publications 8 (1955).

main strategy for establishing the Reformation was the promotion of the education of the minor clergy and of the new generations.

After the appointment of Holgate some of the prebendaries were also Evangelical.[10] Because of this, clerical marriage became an issue and there was considerable hostility in York towards the wives of clergy.[11] Archbishop Holgate wrote a very revealing apology in the Marian period for, amongst much else, having married in the previous reign.[12] At the beginning of Mary's Catholic restoration none of the prebendaries resigned, but seven were deprived because they had married. In 1559, however, the canons were asked to swear an oath recognising Queen Elizabeth as the supreme governor of the English church. Nine of them refused to subscribe and were deprived, three others quit or were deprived of their prebends on theological grounds by 1571. From then on, a Protestant liturgical community was firmly established in York Minster.[13]

Historiography of the Reformation

In Britain the historiography of the Reformation from the second half of the twentieth century became less interested in theological debates, which had raged in previous centuries. Research focused on the social and anthropological history of the process of reform instead, but still from a religious perspective.[14] The main scholars, Dickens and Elton, argued whether or not the Protestant religion was readily accepted or imposed from above.[15] This social history was a positivist one, regarding Protestantism as a sign of progress in respect of the established "traditional" religion. At the beginning of the Reformation the York Minster clergy were seen as apathetic because they did not actively promote reform. The

---

[10] J.C.H. Aveling, *Catholic Recusancy in the City of York*, Catholic Record Society Publications, Monograph Series, 2 (1970), pp. 305-6 and Appendix II.

[11] Cross, 'Exemplary Wives', pp. 170-1.

[12] A. G. Dickens (ed.) *Archbishop Holgate's Apology*, The English Historical Review, 56 (1941), pp. 450-9.

[13] Aveling, *Catholic Recusancy*, pp. 305-6 and Appendix II.

[14] R. Tittler and N. Jones, *A Companion to Tudor Britain* (Oxford, 2004), p. 203, for a discussion on historiography and current direction of scholarship.

[15] A. G. Dickens, G. R. Elton, and F. Wormald, *The English Reformation* (London, 1964).

population of York and of the Northern region was passive or resistant in abandoning traditional beliefs. This was considered as a sign of backwardness, ignorance and poverty. Although mitigated by a compassionate understanding of the harsh life and high mortality of mid – Tudor England, this view continued the discourse of the Reformation.[16] Cromwell's commissioners not only attacked the "traditional" religion, but also actively promoted the idea of a backward and barbaric North.[17]

More recently "revisionist" scholars, especially Eamon Duffy, have demonstrated the vitality of late medieval "traditional" religion. [18] This challenges the construction of an "ignorant" traditionalist and a "progressive" Protestant, hence idea of Reformation. It is now recognised that the acceptance of Protestantism happened at different paces in different places. At least a generation had to pass before the majority of the population abandoned traditional beliefs and Protestantism became fully established.[19] In York, despite a degree of conservatism and recusancy, by the end of the 1570s the population was in the majority Protestant.[20] Moreover it is now accepted that the process of religious redefinition lasted much longer that the period of the radical reforms preceding the Elizabethan establishment. The "long Reformation" extended well into the seventeenth century and included the period of the Civil War until

---

[16] Tillott, *VCH York*, p. 159; A. G. Dickens, *The Marian Reaction in the Dioceses of York, Part II*, St Anthony's Hall Publications 12 (1957), p.3, the author observes that these terms have been perhaps used too often by himself and by his colleagues to define the population of the North.

[17] G. H. Cook, *Letters to Cromwell*, p.130.

[18] E. Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars. Traditional Religion in England c.1400-1580* (New Haven and London, 1992), pp. 1-2. The term "traditional"was introduced by Eamon Duffy as an alternative to "popular", arguing that there was not a substantial divide between the religion of the clerical and educated elite and the one of other people; B. R McRee, 'Traditional Religion', in R. Tittler and N. Jones (eds), *A Companion to Tudor Britain* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 207-9.

[19] Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, 591-3; J.J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford, 1984); C. Haigh, *The English Reformation: Religion, Politics and Society under the Tudors* (Oxford, 1997); P. Collinson, *The Birthpangs of Protestant England* (Basingstoke, 1988).

[20] Aveling, *Catholic Recusancy,* pp. 48-76; Palliser, *Tudor York*, p. 248; W. Sheils, 'Catholics and Recusants' in R. Tittler and N. Jones (eds), *A Companion to Tudor Britain* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 254-70, distinguishes between the recusants and new converts by Jesuit missionaries, such as the wayward and rebellious sons of Archbishop Matthew and of Henry Swinburne, judge in the Ecclesiastical Commission, see Cross, 'Exemplary Wives', pp. 177-8.

1662.[21] This is a useful time scale for the change of religious meanings in the Minster Close. It will be explained throughout this section how these were progressively redefined during the several decades up to the onset of the Civil War. Moreover it is not always possible to establish if episodes of iconoclasm occurred during the sixteenth century or during the Civil War. Parliamentarians' iconoclasm may have been more destructive than the sixteenth-century one, obliterating what was left of the medieval visual culture.[22]

Antiquarian and archaeological studies of the Reformation have traditionally concentrated on the destruction of religious buildings, shrines and fittings.[23] From the seventeenth century the interest in medieval architecture in the form of ruins and sculptural fragments became part of the development of antiquarianism.[24] Moreover the conservation of monastic sites as isolated ruins surrounded by lawns, implemented by the government's Office of Works in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, has reinforced the idea of a drastic destruction of medieval buildings.[25] However, in the past decade, the potential of archaeology and history for developing an anthropological understanding of the Reformation has been demonstrated.[26]

---

[21] E. Duffy, 'The Long Reformation: Catholicism, Protestantism and the Multitude'' in N. Tyacke (ed.), *England's Long Reformation 1500-1800* (London, 1998) pp. 33-70 ; P. Collinson, 'Comment on Eamon Duffy's Neale Lecture and Colloquium', in N. Tyacke (ed.), *England's Long Reformation 1500-1800* (London, 1998), pp. 71-86; Collinson agreed that the Reformation extended to the seventeenth century, but he rejected Tyacke suggestion to extend the period to include the eighteenth century.

[22] See below in this section.

[23] D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist, 'Introduction. History from Below', in D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003), pp. 1-3; R. Sweet, *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth Century Britain* (Hambledon and London, 2004), pp. 238-43; Drake, *Eboracum.*

[24] Sweet, *Antiquaries*, pp. 231-276; B. G. Trigger, *An History of Archaeological Thought* (Cambridge, 1989); G. Parry, *The Trophies of Time. English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 1995).

[25] S. Thurley, *Archaeology and Artifice: the Office of Works and the Fabrication of Medieval History*, The Beatrice Cardi Lecture (York, 14 September 2007).

[26] D. Gaimster, R. Gilchrist, *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003).

It has recently been argued that the concept of sacred space is central to the post-revisionist study of the Reformation and several studies have developed this theme.[27] The first to theoretically articulate a distinction between sacred and profane space, was the anthropologist Emile Durkeim. The meaning and nature of sacred space was further explored by Eliade, who suggested that the sacred was defined by space, time and cosmology.[28] Several studies have demonstrated how sacred space in medieval cathedrals structured everyday life. It was constructed by material culture such as the built environment, iconography and its placement in space, and by boundary control [29] However, the sacred was not only constructed by material signs but also by rituals; sensorial experiences, such as sound and smell and philosophical and legal conceptions.[30] Sacred space therefore must be studied within the wider interdisciplinary context provided by textual and literary sources.[31] Both Durkeim and Eliade suggested a dichotomy between sacred and profane space. However, the boundaries between sacred and secular appear fluid in the medieval cathedral. The precincts and even the holiest place, the cathedral church, were shared by liturgical, secular and social activities.[32] Roberta Gilchrist has suggested that a cathedral's sacred space was permeable to various degrees and its boundary was articulated by the interaction between the liturgical and secular communities.[33] The medieval concept of sacred space, defined as one where the presence of the divine was stronger than

---

[27] W. Coster, A. Spicer, *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2005); A. Spicer, S. Hamilton, *Defining the Holy. Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2005); A. Spicer, *Calvinist Churches in Early Modern Europe* (Manchester and New York, 2007).

[28] E. Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (New York, 1912); M. Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane* (New York, 1959).

[29] D. M. Hayes, *Body and Sacred Place in Medieval Europe, 1100-1389* (New York and London, 2003); R. Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close*, pp. 236-7; Gilchrist, *Contemplation and Action*; Graves, *The Form and Fabric of Belief*.

[30] Hayes, *Body and Sacred Place*; S. Hamilton, A, Spicer, 'Defining the Holy: the Delineation of Sacred Space' in A. Spicer and S. Hamilton (eds), *Defining the Holy. Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 7-8.

[31] T. Insoll, *Archaeology, Ritual, Religion* (London, 2004); Hamilton and Spicer, 'Defining the Holy' pp. 5-22.

[32] Hayes, *Body and Sacred Place*, pp. 53-69; M. Camille, *Image on the Edge: The Margins on Medieval Art* (London, 1992).

[33] Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close,* pp. 236-7.

that in other places, was rejected by the theorists of the Reformation. However, recent studies have questioned the disappearance of this idea of sacred, suggesting a degree of its continuity and redefinition.[34] Throughout this section the processes of continuity, change, resistance and redefinition of the idea of sacred in the cathedral landscape of York will be explored.

The Minster Close: sacred space and sanctuary

From the twelfth century onwards monastic churches and cathedrals formed the centre of a sacred landscape. Zones with different degrees of holiness radiated from the high altar, considered the most sacred place, towards the city and the hinterland.[35] The precincts of secular cathedrals were defined as sacred spaces by religious authorities. For example the precinct of the new secular cathedral in Chichester was given privileges by a Papal charter in 1260.[36] From the late twelfth century, secular authorities reinforced this demarcation by granting privileges of immunity for protection of the sacred space. The justification for granting Royal licences to enclose English cathedral precincts specifically mentions the need to protect consecrated land from sacrilege and the safety of sacred persons.[37] Moreover, cemeteries and open areas around churches had been

---

[34] B. Heal, 'Sacred Image and Sacred Space in Lutheran Germany' in W. Coster and A. Spicer (eds), *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 39-59; C. Grosse, 'Places of Sanctification: the Liturgical Sacrality of Genevan Reformed Churches, 1535-1566', in W. Coster and A. Spicer (eds), *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2005), pp.60-80; A. Spicer, '"What Kinde of House a Kirk is": Conventicles, Consecrations and the Concept of Sacred Space in Post-Reformation Scotland', in W. Coster and A. Spicer (eds), *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 81-103; M. Aston, 'Public Worship and Iconoclasm' in D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003), pp. 9-28; V.Harding, *The Dead and the Living in Paris and London 1500-1670* (Cambridge, 2002); W. Coster, 'A Microcosm of Community: Burial Space and Society in Chester, 1598 to 1633', in W. Coster and A. Spicer (eds*), Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 124-43; D. MacCulloch, *Reformation. Europe's House Divided, 1490-1700* (London, 2003), p. 560.

[35] Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, on the formation of Cluny 'sacred ban'. Hamilton and Spicer,'Defining the Holy', pp. 5-7 for discussion and recent bibliography. J. Howe, 'Creating Symbolic Landscape: Medieval Development of Sacred Space', in J Howe and M. Wolfe (eds) *Inventing Medieval Landscapes: Senses of Place in Western Europe* (Gainsville, 2002), p. 215.

[36] Tatton-Brown, 'The Buildings of the Bishop's Palace', p. 225.

[37] Coulson, 'Hierarchism', pp. 72-3.

consecrated land since the early medieval period.[38] At York Minster a late seventh/eighth century Anglo-Scandinavian cemetery was located under the south transept of the Gothic cathedral, attesting to the early origins of the area around the cathedral as sacred space.[39]In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the area to the south and west of the cathedral was defined as *"cimiterium infra clausum"*, *"cimiterium ecclesie Beati Petri infra clausum"* and *"cimiterium monasterii"* and the West Minster Gate was called *"porta cimiterii"*.[40] The term *"in cimiterio"* and *"infra Clausum"* seem to have been interchangeable and not restricted to that area. For example the mansion of Grendall, to the east of the cathedral, in 1492 was located *"in cimiterio"*, while the neighbouring mansion of Warthill in 1494 was said to be located *"infra Clausum"*. [41] The connotation of consecrated land therefore seems to have been extended throughout the Close. There is no evidence to establish whether the whole open area around the cathedral was used as a cemetery in the medieval period. However, in the sixteenth century the burial ground was restricted to the areas to the east and west of the church of St Michael-le -Belfrey, where it continued until 1715.[42] From 1549 the Latin term *"cimiterium"* was abandoned and replaced with "Minster Garth".[43] The abolition of the funerary connotation of the Minster Yard may reflect the initial rejection by the Protestant religion of the idea of consecrated space, or the cessation of burial around the cathedral.

In the late medieval cathedral Close the same space was shared by liturgical and mundane activities. The prebendal mansions were the houses of consecrated persons, but they were also places for hospitality and consumption. The *"cimiterium"* in York Minster was the building yard not only for the cathedral,

---

[38] H. Gittos 'Creating the Sacred: Anglo Saxon Rites for Consecrating Cemeteries', in S. Lucy and A. Reynolds (eds) *Burial in Early Medieval England and Wales* (London, 2002), pp. 195-208; H. Gittos, *Sacred Space in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 2001).

[39] Phillips and Haywood, *Excavations at York Minster,* pp. 75-92, 191-4.

[40] See Chapter 2. YMA, E3/10,12 1432; YMA, M2/5, f. 28.

[41] YMA, M2/5, fols. 343v-344; fols. 349-349v.

[42] See Chapter 2. 3. 3. p. 99, for burial to the east of St Michael-le-Belfrey.

[43] See Chapter 3, p. 150 for "yard" and "garth"; YMA, E3/47.

but also for the Dean and Chapter estate in the city.[44] Even a large communal latrine block built in the late fourteenth century and located in a prime position to the south-east of the cathedral was not considered offensive to the sacred space.[45] Other secular activities were located inside the cathedral, such as the Courts of the Dean and Chapter and the Archbishop's in the north transept.[46] Prisoners, however, as liminal bodies and potentially polluting, were kept in prisons by the gates on the margin of the sacred space.[47] The York Corporation held council meetings by St Christopher's altar, using the liturgical space around a chantry altar as civic space.[48] The sacred space in the Close, therefore, was overlaid by several secular spaces defined by the performance of activities, rather than by material boundaries.

Although both liturgical and secular activities were found in the cathedral and its precinct, sacred space was defined and protected by powerful taboos. In fact since the twelfth century the idea of sacred space was also constructed by creating anxieties about material contamination and moral pollution.[49] Drawing blood and violent crimes against the person would have desecrated this space. Offenders would have been excommunicated by the pope and thus excluded from the community of the Church. In the thirteenth century the definition of the sacred and what constituted sacrilege was discussed by philosophers such as Aquinas and theologians as Durandus.[50] In the 1230s Pope Gregory IX even tried to prohibit trials for murder in Consistory Courts, on grounds of moral

---

[44] See Chapter 6.3. p. 331-3.

[45] Rimmer, 'Small Houses', p. 31; YMA, VC, 6, 9, 4; a latrine was built by the Vicars Choral in 1396 at the east of the cathedral, between the mansion of Wistow and Strensall. Thanks to Jayne Rimmer for this information. Possibly it was located in the area later truncated by the construction of the Lady Chapel.

[46] See Chapter 5.1.

[47] See Chapter 3, p. 165, for prisons.

[48] See Chapter 3, p.162.

[49] Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, pp. 177-9.

[50] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica,*(ed.) Fathers of the English Dominican Province (London and New York, 1964), II, II, 99. For Durandus see Hayes, *Body and Sacred Place*, pp. 61-2.

pollution.[51] In the Minster Close the preoccupation with pollution is expressed by the wording of the Royal licence to enclose in 1285 and by the ones of the Dean's 1300 request to enclose the path from Petergate. The word *immunditiae,* which means dirty and polluted things, summarise a catalogue of criminal and impure activities from which the *cimiterium* needed to be protected.[52] Anxieties about moral pollution and desecration may have been counterbalanced by purification rituals on the boundaries.[53] A fountain or spring attested in 1370 at the entrance of the Close in Minster Gates was not only an urban facility but may have been used for ritual cleansing. [54] It may have had a similar function to the stoups of holy water at the cathedral's entrances. Hand washing was symbolic of moral cleansing in the medieval world.[55] This idea was of ancient origins, since from antiquity water basins were located on the boundaries of civic and religious areas.[56] Another fluid purifying moral pollution was the scented oil believed to spill from St William's body within the cathedral. It had the miraculous power to heal wounds and to restore bodies mutilated by violent acts.[57]

Connected with the idea of sacred space since the Hellenistic and Roman times was the idea of legal sanctuary.[58] This was a privilege granted to a holy place that resulted from the negotiation between several religious and secular authorities. Because of the ban on violent acts, force could not be used to apprehend people trying to escape justice of another jurisdiction. As both the seat of the immune jurisdiction of the Liberty of St Peter and the one of the exempt Peculiar

---

[51]Hayes, *Body and Sacred Place*, pp. 61-2.

[52] *Cal. Pat. Rolls, 1281-92*, 161; *Cal Pat Rolls* 1301-07, p 19; Coulson, 'Hierarchism', p. 73; for examples in other cathedral closes.

[53] M. Douglas, *Purity and Danger,* 2nd edn (Abingdon and New York, 2002).

[54] See pp. 94 and 345.

[55] P. Graves, 'From an Archaeology of Iconoclasm to an Anthropology of the Body. Images, Punishment and Personhood in England, 1500-1660', *Current Anthropology*, 49 (2008), p.44.

[56] J. M. Camp, *The Athenian Agora : Excavations in the Heart of Classical Athens, New Aspects of Antiquity* (London, 1986); F. Coarelli, Il Foro Romano (Roma, 1983).

[57] C. Norton, *St William of York* (Woodbridge, 2006).

[58] Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space.* Explains the formation the "sacred ban" surrounding Cluny Abbey and trace the historical development of the idea of sanctuary from late antiquity until the sixteenth century.

Jurisdiction of the Dean and Chapter, the Minster Close was a sanctuary where asylum from other jurisdictions could be sought. [59] In particular, offenders could escape the justice of the City of York by crossing the boundary into the Close. This created much tension between the City Corporation and the Minster. [60] The entrance to sanctuaries was often signalled by landmarks such as gates or crosses; however, passing through the gates did not necessarily guarantee right of asylum. [61] Ceremonial rules for obtaining asylum may have been devised to limit the resentment between jurisdictions in urban sanctuaries. [62] Examples from the cathedral close of Vienne and Lyon in southern France show how the conflict was resolved between the bishop's jurisdiction and that of the chapter. The prisoners transiting to the bishop's prison within the Close could have asked the chapter for asylum. The fourteenth and fifteenth-century cathedral statutes repeatedly tried to resolve this problem. [63] In Vienne it was agreed that to prevent the bishop's prisoners asking asylum into the sanctuary they should be preceded by a herald shouting at the canons to keep away. In Lyon the prisoners were prevented from seeking sanctuary unless they were conducted into the close through two specific gates. In York similar rules for asylum seeking may have applied, such as entering the sanctuary only in designed locations. This could explain the prominence given to the gateways of the West and South Minster Gates in the 1545 map. The omission from the map of the East and Ogleforth Gates suggest that these two entrances might not have been used for seeking sanctuary.

An incident occurring in 1490 seems to confirm the prominence of the South Minster Gates for seeking asylum. It also demonstrates how the ideas of sacred

---

[59] For jurisdiction in the Close see Chapter 1. For cathedral sanctuaries see Lehmberg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals,* p. 291; Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close,* p. 240.

[60] C. B. Estabrook, 'Ritual, Space, and Authority in Seventeenth-Century English Cathedral Cities', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32: 4 (2002), pp. 593-620.

[61] J. C. Cox, *Sanctuaries and Sanctuary Seekers* (London, 1911), pp. 126-30; D. Hall, 'The Sanctuary of St Cuthbert', in Bonner, G. Rollason, D. and Stancliffe, C (eds), *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community to AD 1200* (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 426-7.

[62] S. McSheffrey, 'London Sanctuaries', forthcoming.

[63] Esquieu, *Autour des Nos Cathédrales*, p. 146.

place, moral pollution and sanctuary were interconnected and still potent. Two sergeants of the sheriffs of the city Corporation wounded a man in trying to prevent him entering the sanctuary at the Minster Gates.[64] The Dean and Chapter immediately gave them a penance to avoid excommunication. They were to repent publicly before the procession on Sunday next. The urgency with which the penance was administered suggests that the Close was still considered a sacred space by the clergy and that its pollution by drawing blood resulted in sacrilege. The theology of sacrilege would have been known by them, since in 1529 a volume of the *Summa Theologica, II-II,* regarding sacrilege and its remedies was part of the library of the cathedral theologian Dr Melton.[65] The defiant City Corporation, however, ordered the sergeants not to perform the penance. This attitude suggests that the anger towards the Dean and Chapter's imposition was more powerful than the fear of social or spiritual consequences for the offenders. The opinions of the sergeants were not recorded. However, this reaction may also indicate that the Dean and Chapter's action may have been perceived as motivated by their wish to affirm their spiritual privileges over space; in the late Middle Ages there was a renewed clerical emphasis on separating the boundaries of the sacred space from those of the secular world.[66]

At the onset of the Reformation the legal interpretation of privileges of immunity was changing, giving more power to the crown. Statutes limiting the right of sanctuary were passed in 1529 and 1536.[67] In 1540 Henry VIII wished to abolish them altogether; however he was persuaded to create royal sanctuaries for debtors in the manner of the Roman Emperors. York was one of the eight cities selected and the designed area of sanctuary was Davy Hall in the city centre.[68]

---

[64] Palliser *Tudor York*, p. 234; A. Raine, *York Civic Records*, Vol 2, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series (1939-53), p. 61.

[65] Cross, *York Clergy Wills*, p. 18.

[66] D. M. Hayes, 'From Boundaries Blurred to Boundaries Defined. Clerical Emphases on the Limits of Sacred Space in England and France during the later Middle Ages', in A. T. Smith and A. Brookes (eds), *Holy Ground: Theoretical Issues Relating to the Landscape and Material Culture of Ritual Space Objects,* BAR International Series, 956 (2001), pp. 85-90.

[67] Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, p. 207; Lehmberg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals*, pp. 291-2.

[68] Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, p. 207.

(Map 18) This was the court and gaol of the larderers of the Forest of Galtres, under Forest Law a jurisdiction already under the direct control of the king.[69] Cathedrals and a limited area around them kept the right of asylum only for debts and for a limited time. Despite their growing unpopularity and an attempt by the parliament to abolish them in 1566, sanctuaries continued until the reign of James I.[70] In York, given the proximity of the new sanctuary of Davy Hall and its more extensive benefits, the significance of the Close as a place of asylum from other jurisdictions must have declined.

In conclusion; at the onset of the Reformation the Minster Close was a sacred space and a sanctuary. It was defined by material landmarks, by rituals and by prohibitions and rules about moral pollution. Within the Close sacred space was overlaid by several secular spaces. These were defined by material culture and by the performance of activities, rather than by material boundaries. At the Reformation the privilege of legal sanctuary were reduced. Philosophical ideas about sacred space and sacred things were rejected by the Protestant religion, as the destruction of Scholastic books in the libraries demonstrate. The process of redefining the meaning of sacred space in the Close will be discussed in the remaining of this section.

Iconoclasm

The secular cathedral of York was not affected by the destruction and reshaping of the built environment on the scale seen in most monastic cathedral establishments. However, there was a process of iconoclasm against the images and objects deemed to be symbolic of the traditional religion. The understanding of Reformation iconoclasm in the past decades has moved from theological explanations to social ones. A larger field of destruction has been considered, to

---

[69] Norton, *St William of York*, p.174.

[70] D. Thornley, 'The Destruction of Sanctuary', in R. W. Seton-Watson (ed.) *Tudor Studies presented to A. F. Pollard* (London, 1924), pp. 182-207; E. W. Ives, 'Crime, Sanctuary and Royal Authority under Henry VIII', in M. S. Arnold (ed.) *On the Laws and Customs of England* (Chapel Hill, 1981), pp. 296-320.

include not only images but also sacred objects and buildings.[71] The debate on iconoclasm in art and culture during the past decade has been stimulated by the work of Dario Gamboni and of Bruno Latour.[72] The ground breaking exhibition *Iconoclash* has been defined by Latour as "an archaeology of hatred and fanaticism".[73] This aspect of Reformation iconoclasm has been explored by Koelner, Graves, Aston and MacCulloch.[74] However, Latour also suggests that sometimes the motives of the iconoclasts are not so clear. When the destruction is not motivated by hatred, the intention and the action of the iconoclast may be at odds.[75] The resulting defaced image therefore appears ambiguous and it may leave the viewer perplexed. Some of the earlier episodes of iconoclasm in the Close, in the 1540s, may illustrate this point.

As a consequence of the Act of Ten Articles in 1536 and the even more radical Act of Six Articles of 1538, the cult of saints and the practices of pilgrimage were condemned. In his injunctions to the Dean and Chapter in York (1538) Archbishop Lee ordered the removal from the cathedral of images that were object of pilgrimage, however he did not request their destruction.[76] In his visit to the North of England in 1541, Henry VIII realised how reluctant people and clergy were in abandoning the traditional cults of saints. He visited Lincoln

---

[71] R.K. Morris, 'Monastic Architecture: Destruction and Reconstruction', in D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003), pp. 235-51; Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close,* p. 209; Howard, *The Buildings of Elizabethan,* pp. 13-45; S. Ward *'Dissolution or Reformation?',* in D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003), pp. 267-79. See Chapter 3.3 for building in the Close.

[72] D. Gamboni, *The Destruction of Art: Iconoclasm and Vandalism since the French Revolution* (London, 1997); B. Latour, P. Weibel, *Iconoclash: Beyond the Image Wars in Science, Religion and Art* (London and Cambridge MA, 2002).

[73] B. Latour, 'What is Iconoclash? Or is there a World beyond the Image Wars?', in B. Latour and P. Weibel (eds), *Iconoclash: Beyond the Image Wars in Science, Religion and Art* (London, and Cambridge MA, 2002), pp. 14-37.

[74] J. Koerner, 'The Icon as Iconoclash', in B. Latour and P. Weibel (eds), *Iconoclash: Beyond the Image Wars in Science, Religion and Art* (London and Cambridge MA, 2002), pp. 164-213; Graves, 'From an Archaeology of Iconoclasm', pp. 35-57; M. Aston, *Faith and Fire: Popular and Unpopular Religion 1350-1600* (London and Rio Grande, 1993); MacCulloch, *Reformation,* pp. 559-60.

[75] Latour, 'What is Iconoclash?', pp. 14, 28-30.

[76] Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, pp. 406-12.

where he found that the shrines had not been destroyed despite his orders. From Hull he ordered the bishops to destroy all relics, shrines and objects of pilgrimage. In a meeting in the York Minster Chapter house Archbishop Lee subsequently ordered the destruction of the cathedral shrines.[77]

Iconoclasm of St William's shrines

The official resident saint in the Minster was St William.[78] His cult was the focus of pilgrimages since the twelfth century and enjoyed a national revival in the fifteenth century.[79] The two shrines of St William venerated in the cathedral are documented by the written sources and by two sets of stone sculptures conserved in the Yorkshire Museum.[80]The tomb-shrine was located at the centre of the nave at the east end and comprised of the original tomb surmounted by a stone shrine-base, erected probably in the 1330s.[81] This was a limestone structure with ogee arches, probably supporting a reliquary. In the spandrels were the symbols of the four Evangelists and images of people healed by St William. The shafts and other architectural components were carved with niches containing figures of saints, six of which survive. (Fig. 75-78)

A new shrine-base was completed in 1472 and was located in the choir, behind the high altar's painted and gilded wooden screen.[82] (Fig. 68, 69, 72-4) It was carved of black magnesian limestone and supported the saint's *feretrum* made of gilt silver and precious stones. The head reliquary of St William, supported by sculpted angels, was carried in procession at Pentecost.[83] The *feretrum* was still

---

[77] Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars,* p. 431; Cross, 'From the Reformation', p. 198.

[78] C. Norton, 'Richard Scrope and York Minster', in P. J. P. Goldberg (ed.), *Richard Scrope, Archbishop, Rebel and Martyr* (Donington, 2007), p. 171. The tombs of charismatic clergy could become venerated as shrines, as in the case of Archbishop le Scrope.

[79] Norton, *St William of York,* p. 202; T. French, *York Minster: the St William Window*, CVMA, 5 (1999), pp. 8-9.

[80]C. Wilson, The Shrines of St William of York (York, 1977).

[81] Brown, *York Minster*, p. 123; C. Norton, 'Richard Scrope', p. 203. The structure of the shrines is currently being studied by Prof. C. Norton.

[82] Wilson, *The Shrines of St William*, pp. 18-19.

[83] Wilson, *The Shrines of St William,* p. 24, n. 29*;* Norton, 'Richard Scrope', p. 203.

being carved and gilded in 1526 and in 1528 satin cloth was bought for the head
reliquary, perhaps for a canopy.[84] The stone base is the largest of the surviving
medieval examples in England and consisted of a series of recessed vaulted
praying niches, decorated by blind tracery.[85] Between the niches and in the
spandrels above, there were an estimated 63 statues within smaller niches, most
of them fastened on plinths. Only one of these statues survives. In the following
paragraph the archaeology of destruction and deposition of these structures will
be discussed.

Blocks of sculpted stones composing the greater part of the two shrines emerged
over the course of two centuries. They were found during several campaigns of
building works on the site of the prebendal mansion of Fenton.[86] The first pieces
of the fifteenth-century choir-shrine emerged in 1680 during the excavation of
foundation trenches for building works in front of 10 Precentors' Court.(Map 11)
In 1541 this site would have been the courtyard of the medieval mansion of
Fenton. More stones were concealed between two walls of the house. These
would have been within the northern hall of the mansion. Further pieces were
recovered from interior walls during building alterations in 1882-3. The main
group of sculptures, belonging to both the tomb-shrine and the choir-shrine, were
recovered in 1835 during the excavation of a drain. The excavation was located
inside and to the east of the garden of 9 Precentors' Court.[87] (Fig. 70) In 1541
this site would have been within the courtyard of the medieval mansion. A map
of the excavation with the position and depth of the stones was made by the

---

[84] YMA, E3/38-39; Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, pp. 212-35.

[85] Wilson, *The Shrines of St William,* p. 18; Brown, *York Minster,* p. 237; Norton, 'Richard Scrope', pp. 204-5.

[86] For general information on the retrieval of the fragments and their acquisition by the Yorkshire Museum see Wilson, *The Shrines of St William,* p. 11. More detailed information was obtained in: York Museums Trust (Yorkshire Museum), Accession Register; BIHR, Map 24; C. Asher, 'The Shrine of St William of York. Recording, Reconstruction and Interpretation', Unpublished Undergraduate Dissertation. University of York (2009), fragments of the choir-shrine were reused in the external walls of 10 Precentors' Court. Further fragments were reused in the eighteenth century mouldings on the ceiling of a ground floor room. Many thanks to Clara Asher for this information.

[87] BIHR, Map 24; York Museums Trust (Yorkshire Museum), Accession Register.

builders.[88] Thirteen worked stones belonging to both shrines were found laid side by side, face down on a bed of sand. These were complete blocks, meaning that the shrine was dismantled by experienced masons, without being fragmented. The average size of the blocks was c. 0.60m by 0.50m by 0.10m. A group of smaller blocks, at first identified as a lattice window arch, belonged to the altar at the side of the choir-shrine. The average depth below ground of the top of the stones was 2 feet and 6 inches (0.75 m). More stones were recovered in 1927-8 when a drain was cut on the same site. Were the sculptures buried in 1541 or were they laid down as a paving of a courtyard and then covered by later deposits? This is a very important consideration for understanding the intentions of the iconoclasts. The rescuing excavations were not stratigraphical, therefore it is necessary to assess the archaeology of the area with the available sources. If the soil level in 1541 was c. 0.75m lower than in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, the sculptures would have been exposed and may have indeed served as paving. However, there is evidence suggesting otherwise. As mentioned above, in 1680 the sculptures were already buried. The next major alteration in the area was in the 1730s when a wing of the mansion of Fenton was redeveloped into the house at 9 Precentors' Court. A garden wall was built above the buried sculptures. While it is possible that a deep layer of make-up soil was deposited there during redevelopment, another feature suggests that the medieval and twentieth century levels in that area of Precentors' Court were more or less the same. To the east of this yard, a correctly proportioned latrine arch of the Subdeanery, documented in 1365, was still clearly visible above ground in 1912.[89] (Fig. 71) This suggests that the soil level could not have been risen up to 0.75m and therefore the sculptures had been buried. Moreover, the main groups of sculptures found in 1835 and 1882 were considered of cultural value and immediately donated to the Museum.[90] The pristine condition and the sharpness

---

[88] York Museums Trust, (Yorkshire Museum), Accession Register.

[89] See Chapter 2. 2.2, p. 76-7.

[90] York Museums Trust, (Yorkshire Museum), Accession Register. This is a good example of "positive cultural redefinition" of *spolia* of iconoclasm. See F. Rambelli, E. Reinders, 'What does Iconoclasm Create? What does Preservation Destroy? Reflection on Iconoclasm in East Asia', in Boldrick, S., Clay, R. (eds) *Iconoclasm: Contexted Objects, Contexted Terms* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 18-24.

of the tracery mouldings of most fragments of the fifteenth-century choir-shrine suggests that they had not be exposed to wearing or to outdoor conditions. The level of conservation of the sculptural details in the tomb-shrine also suggests that they were not exposed or worn. It could therefore be argued that the shrines were deliberately buried and that any defacement would have most probably occurred before their burial. By contrast, according to the antiquarian Thoresby, the fragments, which emerged in the seventeenth century were sold on the antiquarian market and to stoneyards.[91] Before being deposited in the Yorkshire Museum, many of these were reused as garden features and even as decoration in the façade of Georgian houses.[92] In contrast with the other group these pieces appear fragmented, worn and damaged.

An interpretation on the iconoclasm of St William's shrines can now be attempted. A first phase may have consisted in the removal of the statues that were fastened to the structure and the defacement of those that were bonded to it and could not be removed. It is likely that this event happened between 1538, when Archbishop's Lee issued an injunction to remove the images, and the demolition of the shrines in 1541. Given that Dean Layton was elected in 1539, he would have requested the implementation of the injunction. In the choir-shrine the statues appear to have been neatly removed from their plinths. (Fig.72) Dowels for the brackets that fastened them to the shrine are still visible. Only one statue remains *in situ* and appears to have been carved from a stone bonded to the structure. It is the image of an archbishop, recognisable because he wears a *pallium*.[93] The head has been neatly chiselled away from the neck, as well as one of the hands holding the staff. The other hand holding another staff is intact, but the object has been obliterated. (Fig. 73) Other figures integral with the architecture of the shrine were also kept. Two angels had facial features slightly smoothened, but the eyes and the smile are intact. (Fig. 74) Similar smoothening

---

[91] R. Thoresby, *Ducatus Leodiensis* (ed.) T.D. Whitaker (Wakefield, 1816), p. 115.

[92] York Museums Trust, (Yorkshire Museum), Accession Register, p. 154

[93] Thanks to Andrew Taubman for his comments and suggestions.

of an angel's face can be observed in Archbishop de Grey's tomb in the cathedral south transept.

In the tomb-shrine the images were carved into the architecture and therefore they could not be removed. In the spandrels the symbols of the Evangelists, including St Matthew's angel, were not defaced. (Fig. 75) The images of healed pilgrims were also left untouched. The six surviving images of saints were all defile. A small chisel was used to remove part of their bodies. Only the surface of these, however, was scalpelled away. The defacement is so modest that it led Wilson to suggest that the breakage of the images must have occurred incidentally when dismantling the shrines.[94] A male figure, identified as St Bartholomew, has its head intact while the lower part of its body has been defaced, presumably because the symbol of his martyrdom, his own skin, was placed there. A portion of it is still hanging from his forearm. (Fig.76) A female saint next to him had both face and hands chiselled away, but another female saint is complete, just one of her forearms has been removed. (Fig. 77a and 78 b) Another saint has both hands and eyes intact. (Fig. 77b) Two male figures had their faces chiselled away but their hands are still there. One is holding a bunch of harrows in the right hand and is making a blessing sign with the left hand. (Fig. 78a) It was identified by Wilson as St Edward, however, it could be interpreted as the fourteenth-century iconography of St Sebastian, specialising in protection against the plague.[95] The other saint, identified as St Cuthbert, is holding a wand in the right hand and a crowned head on the left.[96] Some of the pieces appear to be worn, but it is not possible to establish on a visual examination if this occurred during their burial and storage or if it was further deliberate damage.

---

[94] Wilson, *The Shrines of St William*, pp. 11-12.

[95] See for instance Taddeo di Bartolo painting (1400-10) 'St Sebastian', Museo e Gallerie Nazionali di Capodimonte (Naples, Italy).

[96] York Museums Trust, (Yorkshire Museum), Accession Register, p. 154. A systematic study of the iconography of these sculptures is in progress and is outside the scope of this research.

The defacement of these images was not random. Biblical iconography, such as human figures representing the symbols of evangelists was left intact, while figures of saints not connected with the New Testament were the object of iconoclam. However, the figure of the apostle St Bartholomeus was defaced, perhaps because, according to the *Golden Legend*, he was a powerful healer. It appears that in both shrines what had been consistently removed were the attributes, the symbols which made these images recognisable as saints and in particular specialist healing saints, supporting the resident healer saint St William. Parts of their bodies were affected not randomly but in a way specific to each figure. When hands were carrying the most symbolic object for identification of the image they were both removed. If only one hand was carrying a symbol only this was removed, as in the case of the archbishop's image on the choir-shrine. When the head-dress was the most important attribute to the saint's identity, face and head were removed. However, when the head-dress was not the most significant attribute, the face was left intact, including the eyes. The importance of the attributes for recognising saints is demonstrated by the Minster inventories of 1500 and 1509. The description of devotional images in the cathedral comprised of the name of the saints. This was immediately followed by the specification of their attributes, as if their nominal identification needed to be supported by evidence.[97] Pam Graves has recently argued that the iconoclastic attack to images was directed on determinate parts of the body. There were biblical precedents for the mutilation of hands and heads of idols. Moreover this ritual punishment directed towards the images of saints was similar to the capital punishment of the time. It was motivated by collective hatred and personal retribution against images that were then perceived as powerless in giving protection.[98] The eyes were particularly targeted because of ideas of visual perception in the late Middle Ages. According to Michael Camille the gaze of the eyes had the power to do heal or to harm, according to the nature of the object.[99] Thus the power of these images needed to be obliterated.

---

[97] Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, pp. 212-35.

[98] Graves, 'From and Archaeology of Iconoclasm', pp. 35-57. MacCulloch, *Reformation,* pp. 559-60.

[99] Camille, *Image on the Edge*.

However, some of the saints in St William's Tomb shrine still have their eyes. Therefore it seems that the iconoclasts did not find these particularly disturbing. Others have their hands intact. Yet the mutilation does not seem to have been indiscriminate. Perhaps the iconoclast did not act out of anger or wished to punish these images. For this particular episode of iconoclasm I disagree with Graves' thesis. On the other hand Graves also suggests that there is a need to research and to differentiate episodes of iconoclasm during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. For example the shrine of Little St Hugh in Lincoln was subject to two episodes of iconoclasm.[100] The sixteenth-century episode left the shrine *in situ* with the faces of the images chipped over and smoothened. Only in the seventeenth century, during the parliamentarian iconoclasm, was the shrine torn down and broken. Therefore the theory of hatred and capital punishment is not a convincing explanation for the iconoclasm of the shrine of St William. It could be suggested that the York Minster iconoclasts were defacing the images as required by the injunctions, targeting their identity. As in Lincoln it does appear that the intention was to cause as little damage as possible rather than inflicting a ritual humiliation to the images of saints and to precious art works.

In contrast with the events in Lincoln, in York St William's shrines were dismantled in 1541 under the direction of Dean Layton.[101] He was then resident Dean and since he was an intransigent reformer, the burial of the shrines in the yard of the prebendal mansion of Fenton is intriguing. Concealment against the wishes of the dean, considering his reputation, would have been a dangerous enterprise. It is possible, however, that Layton was only interested in recovering the gold and silver of St William's reliquaries and as long as the shrines were destroyed, he was not interested in their disposal. After all, his action in the dissolution of the monasteries was stern but reasonable.[102] He was probably not opposed to the images of saints in themselves because according to the 1544 probate inventory of his house he displayed several paintings on canvass in his

---

[100] Graves, 'From and Archaeology of Iconoclasm', pp. 37-8; P. Graves, 'Lincoln Architectural Fragments: Current Research', *Lincoln Archaeology* 5 (1994), pp. 47-9.

[101] French, *St William Window*, pp. 7-8.

[102] Cook, *Letters to Cromwell*, passim.

parlour and great chamber. He had two pictures of St John the Baptist, one of St. Mary and one of St Margaret. [103] The shrines were dismantled and the stones were carried through the Minster Yard to the yard of the prebend of Fenton. The prebendary of Fenton, or a resident canon who may have occupied the mansion, may have known about this operation.[104] However, since the late fifteenth century the prebendal house was used for the needs of the cathedral crafts community. For instance the carpenters' workshop was located in the mansion's hall.[105] The burial of the shrines was not a small operation that could be carried out discretely at night time. It would have involved the excavation of an estimate of at least 20 cubic meters of soil, requiring the work of many people for many days. The bed of sand on which the sculptures were laid would have also required a considerable movement of material. Moreover hiding sculptures between two walls of the northern hall of Fenton would have required skilled masons on site. Unless this was orchestrated by the craft community as a voluntary operation someone must have paid for this work. The Fabric Accounts for the year are missing, but would Dean Layton have approved the funding? It is possible that other clergy may have directed the operation and contributed financially. The Vicars Choral were traditionally devoted to St William and responsible for the shrines.[106] They also were usually appointed as Keepers of the Fabric of York Minster and may have participated in this operation.

Why were the shrines concealed? One reason could be that there was the hope of reinstating these in case of a restoration of traditional religion. Under Mary, however, the cathedral altars and many images were reinstated, but not the

---

[103] Cross, *York Clergy Wills*, pp. 58-64.

[104] See Chapter 6.1, 287-8 for residential status of the mansion.

[105] See Chapter 2. 2. 2 pp. 74-6.

[106] Harrison, *Life in a Medieval College*, pp. 305-6; E. A. Gee, 'The Topography of Altars Chantries and Shrines in York Minster', *The Antiquaries Journal* 64 (1984), p. 342; R. Oakes, 'Pennies to Heaven: the Nature and Public Donations made to the Fabric fund of York Minster 1469-1485' (University of York, Unpublished MA Dissertation, 2003), p. 49; S. Rees Jones, 'God and Mammon: the Role of the City Estate of the Vicar Choral', in R. Hall and D. Stocker (eds), *Vicars Choral at English Cathedrals. Cantate Domino. History, Architecture and Archaeology* (Oxford, 2005), p. 197-9.

shrines.[107] The fact that the sculptures were not simply buried but carefully laid on a protective bed of sand suggests that this may have been the original intention. Alternatively this may have just been a sign of reverent burial for some of the most sacred objects of the traditional religion. Similar tactics of concealment are known to have happened in other cathedrals and churches. There are countless instances of images buried or hidden in sacred precincts or in parish churches' walls and floors.[108] The reinstatement of the images may not always have been the aim of these operations, since in some cases objects were deliberately broken before burial. A ritual killing of objects has been suggested to explain these instances.[109] However, these may have been also protective tactics from violation and sacrilege, as has been suggested for baptismal fonts.[110] The guidance issued by catholic colleges for English priests in Douai and Rehims sheds light on this issue. The breaking of sacred things was prescribed to prevent sacrilegious re-use.[111]

What these instances of disposal have in common is that sacred objects were buried or concealed in a previously consecrated space. Since precincts were consecrated land, this may have simply been a practical matter. However, evidence suggests that the choice of a sacred place may have been deliberate. In his *Summa Theologica* Thomas Aquinas discusses the degree of holiness of sacred things, the concepts of sacred space and what constitutes sacrilege. His theology was very influential in the late medieval church, and the York clergy

---

[107] Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, pp. 490-1, 545-7

[108] Aston, 'Public Worship and Iconoclasm', pp. 20-1; Ward, 'Dissolution or Reformation?', pp. 267-79.

[109] The killing of things was suggested by Tarlow and Graves applying Chapam and Hamilakis observation for Bronze Age Greece. Tarlow also suggested an apotropaic reuse of the sculptures, however, this was not a use likely to have happened early in the Reformation, when the images were too charged with meanings. S. Tarlow 'Reformation and Transformation: What Happened to Catholic Things in a Protestant World?' , in D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003), pp. 108-121; and Graves, 'From and Archaeology of Iconoclasm', p. 36.

[110] D. Stocker, '*Fons et Origo*: the Symbolic Death, Burial and Resurrection of English Font Stones', *Church Archaeology* 1(1997), pp. 17-25.

[111] P. J. Holmes, *Elizabethan Casuistry*, Catholic Record Society 67 (1981), p. 18.

was certainly aware of his teaching. [112] The most sacred things according to Aquinas were the altars and the vessels for the Eucharist, followed by the images and relics of saints. Every contact with these things must be carried out with reverence and respect. According to Aquinas violation did not degrade the sacred things but the perpetrator, resulting in sacrilege and excommunication. The instructions given to the Roman Catholic priest in Douai and Rheims show than in 1578-9 these issues were still relevant.[113] The land a church was built upon was still consecrated even if the building was destroyed or converted for Protestant worship. Moreover, consecration was indelible and sacred objects previously converted into utilitarian or degrading uses could be restored to ritual use without further action. If this was not possible, burning was the way to dispose reverently of sacred things, moreover, according to Aquinas doctrine burial of sacred things in sacred places was not sacrilegious.[114] Despite abstract theological debates, behaviour towards violation of sacred space and sacred things may have been influenced by other factors. I have discussed above how pre-Reformation sacred space in the Close was defined also by ideas about pollution and violence and that any violation needed to be ritually purified and reconcilied. It could therefore be suggested that at least in the first decade of the Reformation, when the concept of sacred was still strong, concealment of objects in churches and church precincts may have represented a reverent and ritualised way of disposal.

The destruction of the shrines presented the Minster's reluctant iconoclasts with another problem. The reliquaries contained human remains that, as already mentioned, were considered amongst the holiest things in the cathedral. Another set of archaeological evidence sheds light on their disposal. Before the new pavement designed by Burlington was laid in 1736, William Drake discovered in

---

[112] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Part I-II, 101; Part II-II, 99.

[113] Holmes, *Elizabethan Casuistry*, pp. 18-9, 25, 110-111.

[114] R. L. Williams, 'Forbidden Sacred Spaces in Reformation England', in A. Spicer and S. Hamilton (eds), *Defining the Holy. Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 96, 104 ; Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Part I-II, 101; Part II-II, 99.

the centre of the nave a structure that he identified as St William's tomb.[115]
Archaeological excavations in 1970s have suggested that this interpretation was
correct. A reused Roman gritstone sarcophagus, indicating perhaps the
Romanitas of an Archbishop of Norman origin, was closed by a medieval lid.
Inside the Roman sarcophagus there was a lead coffin containing two sets of
bones and a silk cloth. The first set was an incomplete skeleton of an adult male,
who had led an active life. The other set were of a new-born baby, who was
buried when the male individual was already a skeleton.[116] (Fig. 79) A marble
slab covering this structure at pavement level was identified by Drake as an
upturned altar-table, because it had a scalloped edge. This was missing and
probably removed when the new nave floor was made.

The archaeologists have reconstructed the sequence of events as follows. St
William's bones, translated in 1284, were probably redistributed in several
reliquaries such as the portable shrine and the head shrine.[117] In 1541, when the
shrines were dismantled and the precious reliquaries appropriated by the Crown,
the saint's incomplete skeleton was recomposed in the sarcophagus. The silk
cloth wrapped around some of the smaller bones was perhaps the one bought in
1528.[118] The new-born baby may have been buried at the time of the re-
deposition of the bones or later in the sixteenth or seventeenth century. After the
Reformation the attitude towards children's burials changed as they were
increasingly commemorated with the adults and not segregated in special areas.
However, it appears that in northern and western England the custom to bury
children on the site of former friaries continued after the Dissolution. Roberta
Gilchrist suggests that friars may have been considered by popular tradition the
protectors of children. Perhaps St William had a similar role in York and the

---

[115] Drake, *Eboracum*, p. 420.

[116] Phillips, *Excavations at York Minster,* pp. 125-7, p. 124 plate 106, showing that where the
baby's body was deposed the adult's bones were much more decayed.

[117] Norton, 'Richard Scrope', p. 203.

[118] YMA, E3/38.

parents may have wished to put the baby under the protection of the saint. [119] The altar stone recorded by Drake may have been added after the dissolution of the chantries. It would have been very appropriate for the holiest of sacred object, according to Aquinas, to cover the holy relics.

In conclusion the two shrines of St William were object of two episodes of iconoclasm. The purpose of the first was to comply with the *Injunctions*, removing the images or depriving them of their identity to discourage pilgrimages. The hand of the iconoclasts had been delicate and their intention may have been to inflict the minimum damage. The second episode consisted of the demolition and burial of the shrines and of the composition and reburial of the saint's body in the original sarcophagus. These actions suggest that despite the appointment of a reformer Dean, in the early years of the Reformation beliefs about sacred things were still held by the community of York Minster. Solutions were found to comply with unavoidable orders, while at the same time acting in accordance with established beliefs towards sacred objects and sacred space. It also could be suggested that people working at the Fabric of the cathedral may also have appreciated the artistic values of these sculptures. However, as the Reformation progressed further episodes of iconoclasm show a change in attitude.

Iconoclasm and "negative cultural redefinition"

The exterior space of the Close was also changed by iconoclasm. It is not possible, however, to establish when the architectural sculptures on the exterior of the Minster were removed or defaced. On the cathedral west front there are three orders of niches with pedestals for sculptures. Sarah Brown argues that there is no evidence to suggest that all of them would have contained statues.[120] The sculptures in the spandrel above the west great doorway, much restored and

---

[119] R. Gilchrist, '"Dust to Dust" Revealing the Reformation Dead', in D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003), pp. 408-10.

[120] Brown, *York Minster*, pp. 121-2.

reinterpreted in 1802-16, were also defaced.[121] On the exterior of West Minster Gates the fifteenth-century recessed canopied niches might have been occupied by sculptures. These would have indicated to incoming people the religious nature of the Close. Liminal images may have occupied these niches, such as St Peter, the Minster's patron saint and holder of the keys of Heaven. Mary in her role of *Ianua Coely*, the gate of Heaven and of the Heavenly Jerusalem, may have also been located here.[122] The revived cult of St William in the fifteenth century suggests that he may also have been represented here, welcoming the pilgrims to his shrine. A statue of St William was certainly located on the doorway of the eponymous college and was removed at some point.[123]

It is not possible to establish the quantity of stone debris generated by iconoclasm in the cathedral. However, it could be suggested that there were architectural *spolia* of the Reformation in the early-seventeenth century Close. The 1619 lease of the Palace to Arthur Ingram states that "nothing but an arch and a prison and an old chapel were left of the Palace and the ground was full of old stones".[124] Part of these may have been the destroyed architectural sculptures from the Close. The location would have been appropriate given that the Palace Yard was in use at least from the fifteenth century as a space for storage of building materials.[125] Further evidence that the "old stones" were at least in part constituted by the Reformation *spolia* comes from a 1781 law suit regarding the lease of the Archbishop's Palace.[126] The cathedral architect Thomas Atkinson was an expert witness since in his youth he used to work with his father as a cathedral mason. Moreover he "worked many years as architect and conversant on old gothic architecture and did many plans of monasteries for a book called *Burton's Monasticon*". He stated that the former Ingram's gardens were divided in various parcels "by dry walls, made of large stones of curious shapes with

---

[121] Brown, *York Minster*, pp. 120-121.

[122] Brown, *York Minster*, pp. 121 discuss these liminal images.

[123] French, *St William Window*, p. 8.

[124] WYL, TN/YO A9, 13.

[125] See Chapter 6.3.

[126] BIHR, CC. Ab. 9. York.

fragments of columns and mouldings of windows and arches". He suggested that these walls were built "from Elizabeth time" which suggests that he may have recognised them as debris of Reformation iconoclasm. The Ingram gardens were landscaped in the 1620s therefore it is unlikely that the fragments were the result of later iconoclasm. Furthermore the old stones from the Palace were reused to build the tennis court and other walls of the Ingram Mansion. By contrast it appears that the decorated stones were incorporated in garden features.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the *spolia* of the Reformation were so charged with meanings that their reuse would have been necessarily symbolic.[127] The suggested definition of "iconic reuse" in respect of iconoclasm is problematic and more appropriate concepts have been recently elaborated.[128] One of the arguments developed in *Iconoclash* is that by destroying an image another one is created. This is so powerful that it compels the viewer to take sides in the conflict which produced it.[129] Rambelli and Renders further elaborate this point.[130] They suggest that when objects are not completely destroyed by iconoclasm, they become culturally redefined, either negatively or positively. Thus the concept of cultural redefinition seems more appropriate for the Reformation iconoclasm and it can be applied to the evidence from the Minster Close

---

[127] Tarlow, 'Reformation and Transformation', pp. 108-21.

[128] The application of Stocker and Everson definitions of stone re-use is problematic because "iconic" has a precise meaning in Pierce semiotics, another meaning in semiotics of architecture and other meanings in common language, none of which seems to convey the right idea in respect of iconoclasm. See D. Stocker and P. Everson, 'Rubbish Recicled:A Study of the Re-use of Stone in Lincolnshire', in D. Parson (ed.), *Stone: Quarrying and Building in England A. D. 43-1625* (Chichester, 1990), pp. 83-101. Symbolic reuse would be a more acceptable term. Moreover the value of the distinction between a "casual" "functional" and "iconic" reuse, has already been questioned for Roman *spolia*, see T. Eton, *Plundering the Past* (Stroud, 2000), pp. 135-138. Tarlow suggestion that some of the reuse of catholic fragments was apotropaic and magical, may be pertinent to the reuse of St William's shrine in the late 17th century.

[129] D. Gamboni, 'Image to Destroy, Indestructible Image', in B. Latour and P. Weibel (eds), *Iconoclash: Beyond the Image Wars in Science, Religion and Art* (London, and Cambridge MA, 2002), pp. 88-136.

[130] Rambelli and Reinders, 'What does Iconoclasm Create?', pp. 18-24.

In the Close the fragments of architectural sculpture used in garden walls may have perhaps represented on a small scale what the ruins of the church of St Mary's Abbey represented in the sixteenth-century gardens at the King's Manor. Is has been argued that they were visible from the chambers of the Council in the North and in that context their fragmented state was a symbol of the victory of the Reformation over the traditional religion.[131] Ruin-gardens and their relationship with a great house find parallels in the mansions of Charles Brandon in Kirkstead Abbey and Barlings Abbey in Lincolnshire.[132] However, by the end of the sixteenth century a more positive attitude towards these ruins started to emerge. Rosemary Sweet suggests that monastic ruins and their Gothic architecture by then represented the discontinuity between the past and the present. In 1598 William Camden was moved by their presence because they symbolised the destruction of hundreds of years of learning and piety. At the beginning of the seventeenth century William Laud criticised the Tudors' barbarism towards these "inestimable pieces of antiquity".[133] It is therefore possible that Ingram used the *spolia* of the Reformation iconoclasm as garden features with a more positive connotation. Similar to the one attached to the sculptures of Roman antiquity displayed in the same gardens.[134]

In some cases ruins, fragments and spaces devoid of what they used to contain exploit the evocative power of absence. Annabel Wharton explored this idea for the late Antique city. The platform of the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem, once cleared of the Roman temple that replaced it, was deliberately left empty as a symbol of the victory of Christianity on the other religions. A similar meaning is suggested by the mosaics in St Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna, where parts of defaced Aryan mosaics were preserved within a new decorative programme.[135]

---

[131] P. Everson, D. Stocker, 'The Archaeology of Vice-Royalty: Charles Brandon's Brief Rule in Lincolnshire', in D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003), pp. 145-58.

[132] Ibid., pp. 150-3.

[133] Sweet, *Antiquaries*, p. 241.

[134] See Chapter 6.4. p. 344.

[135] A. J. Wharton, *Refiguring the Post Classical City. Dura Europos, Jerash, Jerusalem and Ravenna* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 94-8.

Diarmaid MacCulloch suggests a similar meaning for the defaced images in reformed churches.[136]John Moreland has a similar idea for the iconoclasm of the Bradbourne cross in Derbyshire, where the erased images stand as a perpetual memory of the absence of all the other images of the traditional religion.[137] This is also apparent in the doorway to the chapel of St Mary and the Holy Angel, in bay seven of the north nave aisle in the interior of York Minster. [138] (Fig. 80) From the exterior the archway had been blocked and filled with ashlar. On the interior the doorway is a reminder of the former existence of the chapel. The wooden door now leads to a broom cupboard. Wooden pegs and a mortice on the right architrave suggest that previously the doorway may have been blocked by a fixed screen. (Fig. 80) Above the doorway the defaced figures of the Virgin and Child under a canopy allow the recognition of the former dedication and the understanding of the obsolescence of that doorway. The angels on both sides have been defaced, their wings broken. (Fig. 81)

The chapel of St Mary and the Holy Angels housed a chantry dissolved in 1549.[139] Its popular name of St Sepulchre and its location to the north of the nave suggest that it was probably connected with the Holy Week rituals.[140] This would have made the chapel particularly vulnerable to iconoclasm, since Holy Sepulchre rituals on Good Friday were outlawed.[141] However, the chapel survived and was still leased out in 1562. From 1568 it could be identified with a stable commonly called "the Hell".[142] The conversion of a chapel into a stable was degrading. The name used in the documents from the Elizabethan period was the opposite of the heavenly connotation of the chapel's former dedication.

---

[136] MacCulloch, *Reformation,* pp. 559-60.

[137] J. Moreland, 'The World(s) of the Cross', *World Archaeology*, 31:2, (1999), pp. 194-213.

[138] Brown, *York Minster*, p. 107.

[139] Hamilton Thompson, 'The Chapel' ; See Chapter 2. 6. 2 p. 127. And see below.

[140] K. G. Beuckers, 'Zu den Obergeschlosskapellen am Querhaus der Kathedrale von Nidaros und ihrer Liturgischen Nutzung', in Andas, M. S, *The Medieval Cathedral of Trondheim. Architectural and Ritual Constructions in their European Context* (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 209-47, 251.

[141] Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, p. 461.

[142] See Chapter 2.6.

A deliberate use of chapels as stables is reinforced by the conversion of the Archbishop's chapel into the stable of the Ingram mansion.[143] The former symbol of the Archbishop's apostolic role and spiritual authority was given a very negative redefinition. The casuistry of Douai and Rheims suggests that the utilitarian and degrading use of sacred spaces and sacred things was a common problem which the priests had to deal with.[144] The domestic chapels of the prebendal mansions known from medieval documents were never mentioned after the Reformation, nor are they traceable archaeologically.[145] Their disappearance in the redeveloped mansions will be further discussed in Chapter 5.2.

A more ambiguous reuse is the one of the blue-grey stone slabs on the floor in the centre of the nave of St Michael-le-Belfrey. (Fig. 82) A campaign of works to investigate this stone was carried out in 1924 by the Dean and Chapter. [146] The stone, measuring 15 feet and 4 inches (4.60m) in length, 4 feet and 5 in (1.35m) in width and 3 tonnes in weight, was lifted and inspected by the York architect E. Ridsdale Tate, the consulting architect Walter Tapper from London and the Clerk of the Works. They identified it as an altar stone and the Dean and Chapter claimed that it was the Minster high-altar and wanted to appropriate it. However, the Parish Council of St Michael-le-Belfrey argued that there was no definitive proof of this, since no crosses were seen, and opposed the removal. The controversy was reassessed in 1974 by K. M. Longley, then archivist of York Minster.[147] She believed that the case for the identification of the stone as the high-altar was convincing and she added oral evidence collected in January 1966. Mr Bell, verger of the Minster and churchwarden of St Micheal-le-Belfrey, told her that when adjacent stones were taken up, the slab was seen to have a chamfered edge and two consecration crosses on its under side.

---

[143] See Chapter 2. 7. 1 and 2. 7. 2.

[144] Holmes, *Elizabethan Casuistry,* pp. 18-9, 25.

[145] Cross, *York Clergy Wills*, p. 71.

[146] YMA, H12/3, f 174, 191.

[147] York Museums Trust, (Yorkshire Museum), K. M. Longley , St William Shrine York Minster, found in Precentors' Court, File in off-site storage.

When the Protestant liturgy was reinstated in the Minster in June 1559, the removal of all altars was immediately ordered by the Archbishop's Vicar John Rokeby. The Visitations carried out in September by a commission composed by the same Rokeby, Thomas Gargrave and George Palmes residentiary found that by then only the small altars replaced under Mary's reign were standing.[148] If the stone in St Michael-le-Belfrey is indeed the high-altar, the meaning of its reuse is ambiguous. Its use as a floor may have been degrading but since it was kept within a church it was still located within a sacred place. Furthermore the use of the altar stone as a floor above St William's tomb does not suggest degradation. A radar survey was carried out under the slab and found that there is a considerable hollow space underneath the blue-grey stone deserving further investigation.[149] The men involved in the stripping of the altars were in service during Mary's reign and Palmes was soon to prove himself a defiant recusant.[150] Therefore, their intention to degrade the most sacred of objects is not clear. A similar ambiguity of intent has been recognised in the former monastic cathedral in Chester, where parts of the shrine of the local saint were reused to build the base of the new bishop's throne in the choir. The remaining ones were found hidden by a wall in the cathedral.[151]

Edward VI's iconoclasm and the dissolution of the chantries

A further destructive attack on the religious landscape of the Close happened in 1549 when the cathedral chantries were dissolved. This had far reaching social and economic consequences resulting in the disappearance of resident liturgical communities. The day to day care of the Minster was in the hands of the vicars choral who lived a common life in the Bedern. They were appointed by the absentee canons to replace them in performing the cathedral liturgy. Originally they were 36 but at the eve of the Reformation their estate was only able to

---

[148] Aveling, *Catholic Recusancy,* p. 20; PRO SP. 12/10.

[149] Anthony Masinton, Department of Archaeology University of York, has conducted a ground penetrating radar survey. The hollow space is big enough to contain a small car (Personal communication, October, 2009).

[150] See p. 296.

[151] Ward, 'Dissolution or Reformation?', pp. 267-79.

support 21.[152] The vicars were perceived by the historians of the Reformation as poor substitutes for the better educated prebendaries.[153] However, even if they lacked higher education in theology, they may have been better suited to deal with the spiritual needs of the people of York. The vicars were often recruited from families of tenants of the Dean and Chapter in the city of York and educated by the Dean and Chapter. This strengthened the connection between the cathedral and the urban community.[154]

In addition to the vicars choral there were priests serving the about 50 chantries in the Minster. They lived in St William's college. [155] The number of priests must have been considerable since in 1548 the Chantry Commission noted the presence of 100 chantry priests between the Minster and the York parish churches. It is not clear how many lived in the Close but when St William's college was dissolved in 1549, over 20 priests obtained a living in one of the many parish churches of York. Some of them were former monks who had been already displaced by the dissolution of the monastic houses in 1536. Eleven priests were also vicars choral and continued to live in the Bedern until 1578, performing various duties in the Minster.[156] The remaining priests received a pension that was rapidly eroded by the high inflation of the mid century. It is not possible to establish if they continued to live in the Close, perhaps as tenants in the former St William's College.

The attack on sacred things became much more severe during the reign of Edward VI. He was likened by his reformer government to the biblical King Joshua, destroying false idols and restoring an orthodox interpretation of religion.

---

[152] S. Rees Jones, 'A Short History of the College of the Vicars Choral', in J.D. Richards, *The Vicars Choral of York Minster: The College at Bedern* (York, 2001), pp. 384-5; Harrison, *Life in a Medieval College.*

[153] Cross, 'Priests into Ministers', pp. 205-225.

[154] Rees Jones, 'God and Mammon', p. 199.

[155] Cross, 'Priests into Ministers', pp. 212-3.

[156] Harrison, *Life in a Medieval College*, pp. 214, 247; D. M. Palliser, *The Reformation in York 1534-1553,* Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 40 (1971), p. 24; Aveling, *Catholic Recusancy*, p. 306.

In 1547 the doctrine of Purgatory was condemned. In consequence of this the cathedral chantries, the purpose of which was to pray for the souls of the dead, were dissolved. Moreover the 1547 *Injuctions* ordered the removal of all images, paintings and even pictures on stained-glass windows. A more severe Injunction in 1550 ordered the destruction of all images made of any material that had been previously removed from churches and chapels.[157] The quantity and quality of the portable art works in the cathedral was considerable. It belonged to two groups, the first of which was the cathedral treasure and the second of which was the property belonging to each chantry altar. A third group was represented by tombs and will be discussed later.

The precious objects that constituted the cathedral treasure were confiscated by the crown in various stages during the 1540s. Two inventories of 1500 and 1509 give an idea of the richness of the treasure and indicate that objects were used and displayed in the choir and during rituals.[158] These included gold and silver liturgical crosses, vessels and reliquaries decorated with precious stones such as sapphire, emeralds, ruby, pearls and diamonds. There were also decorated liturgical vestment and images. Five of these were of Mary in gilded silver. The treasure was the result of the gifts of generations of cathedral canons and archbishops. The Fabric also invested in art works. A precious tabernacle, meaning a polyptych, was made in 1482 for the high altar. It was carved in wood by the carver John Connyng and covered in gold leaf, on which one Francis Forster painted the image of St Peter, in gold, red, white and mustard colours.[159]

The cathedral also owned precious silk and velvet textiles such as curtains, hangings and cloths. Vestments and copes in the liturgical colours white, red, green and black were embroidered in gold. These textiles were imported from abroad. Oriental and "Turkish" carpets were also part of the cathedral

---

[157] Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, pp. 447-77.

[158] Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, pp. 212-35.

[159] YMA, E3/49. Brown, *York Minster*, p. 239.

furnishing.[160] They were luxury items appreciated for their beauty in the fifteenth and sixteenth century and often represented in both secular and religious paintings. In portraits such as *The Ambassadors* painted by Holbein in 1533 they were a reference to the Ottoman Empire and to the professional achievement of the sitters.[161] Reformers such as Archbishop Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell chose to be portrayed in their study, beside a table displaying a carpet.[162] The use of oriental carpets as church furnishing in the fifteenth century seems to have been widespread. A 1500 painting of a *Mass in St Denis* by the Master of St Giles in National Gallery, London, shows a carpet covering the steps of the high-altar. Sacred representations, such as the one by Memlin of 1465, also in the National Gallery, show an Anatolian carpet at the feet of Mary and Child. The Venetian painter Carlo Crivelli makes a great use of them in the *Annunciation* of 1494.[163] In sacred representations and in church buildings, oriental carpets contributed to create a sacred landscape by evoking distant Jerusalem.[164] Textiles and carpets were re-used in the choir at a later date, at least in part. Their decorative patterns may have not been unique to the religious context and therefore they were retained by the Minster.[165]

The second group of portable objects were the property of the chantries. Raine has searched the Chapter Acts and compiled a list of the objects located by each chantry altar.[166] A count of the number of pictures in the cathedral is outside the

---

[160] P. Thornton, *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France and Holland* (New Haven and London, 1978), pp. 109-11. In the sixteenth century the term carpet usually meant an oriental import. The term "Turkey" could have referred also to European imitations.

[161] National Gallery, London. L. Jardine, *Wordly Goods. A New History of the Renaissance* (New York and London, 1996), p. 429.

[162] National Portrait Gallery, London.

[163] National Gallery, London.

[164] N. Coldstream, *Medieval Architecture* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 151-2; P. Brown Fortini, *Venice and Antiquity* (New Haven and London, 1996), pp. 189-90; D. Howard, *Venice and the East* (New Haven and London, 2000), pp. 111, 155-9; *Venice and Islam,* Catalogue of the Exhibition (Venice, 2007).

[165] M. Ciatti, 'I Tessuti d' Arte a Siena', in M. Seidel (ed.), *Da Jacopo della Quercia a Donatello. Le Arti a Siena nel Primo Rinascimento* (Siena, 2010), pp.588-615, discuss the secular pattern of religious textiles.

[166] Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, pp. 274-314.

scope of this study, however each of the 50 chantries owned several images painted on canvas or wooden boards. Therefore there would have been over one hundred paintings on display in the Minster. These would have been sacred representations, perhaps similar to the ones of Flemish, French and Italian masters displayed in the National Gallery. Saints were also represented as wooden statues. These objects, being combustible, may have been burned in the well-documented practice of Reformation bonfires. These recalled the practice of the beginning of Lent, signifying the end of an order and the beginning of a new one.[167] Destruction by fire would have been acceptable by the traditional religion as an appropriate way to dispose of sacred objects.[168] Each altar possessed a marvellous collectio of cloths to decorate the altar table and to dress the images of saints. Vestments and coats for the imagese were made in damask, satin and silk in colours that indicated their foreign origin. Many were embroidered and some in gold thread. Gary Gibbs has studied the vestement given to images in the parish church of St Stephen in Coleman Street, London, between 1466 and 1542. He argues that these not only represented female piety but were an expression of women's social and political discourse within the church.[169] In York Minster chantries altars represented the crafts and guilds of the City of York; therefore objects owned by chantries not only reflected personal devotion to particular saints but also displayed the wealth and importance of each guild. The vestements and cloths therefore may have represented the social discourse of women in the context of the guilds. With the dissolution of the chantries this collective space for display of art and crafts and for the role of women within the cathedral, disappeared.

Personal devotion to the images of saints was expressed within the parish church. St Michael-le-Belfrey was the wealthiest parish in York and bequests and

---

[167] Aston, 'Public Worship and Iconoclasm', p. 18; Aston, *Faith and Fire,* pp. 293-4.

[168] Holmes, *Elizabethan Casuistry*, p. 18.

[169] G. Gibbs, 'Four Coats for Our Lady: Gender, Space, and Marian Devotion in the Parish of St. Stephen, Coleman Street, London 1466‑1542', *Reformation,* 13 (2008): 1-49.

donations of candles were recorded by the testamentary evidence.[170] Anthony
Masinton has discussed the presence and location of the altars before and after
the redevelopment of the church.[171] There was a rood with images and a
roodscreen, five altars for the cult of the saints and ten other images of saints. Up
to 1540 the cult of Our Lady was the most popular, receiving most donations,
and more people wanted to be buried in its vicinity. However, during the
rebuilding starting in 1525, mention of images in testamentary evidence declined
sharply until 1540 when it completely disappeared. The parish church of St John-
del-Pyke was one of the fifteenth parish churches of York suppressed in 1547
and 1548. Its parish was annexed to the one of Holy Trinity in Goodramgate.
There were 33 parish churches within the city at the beginning of the sixteenth
century and the official reason for the suppression was that there were not
enough parishioners and resources to mantain their fabric and priests.[172] This
may have reflected the demographic and economic crisis of sixtenth-century
York, but it may have also reprented an attempt to rebalance and to rationalise
administrative boundaries within the city.

Communities advertised their success and prosperity by commissioning art work
for churches.[173] York Minster was not only a place of worship but one where the
resources of the community at large and of the various fraternities were used to
fund art works and to invest in luxury items. This created a rich visual experience
to be enjoyed collectively. Generations of people had participated in the funding
and care of these collections. During the Reformation these object were either
destroyed or reused, their meaning often redefined with a negative connotation.
A collective visual experience on this scale, of publicly owned, freely accessible
material, was only to be recreated centuries later, with the creation of national
and civic art galleries and museums. The visual culture of the traditional religion

---

[170] Raine, *Medieval York*, pp. 35-46 ; O. M. Saunders, 'Minster and Parish: The Sixteenth Century
Reconstruction of the Church of St. Michael-le-Belfrey in York', Unpublished MA Dissertation,
(University of York, 1996).

[171] Masinton, 'Sacred Space', pp. 84-6.

[172] Tillott, *VCH York,* p. 365.

[173] Jardine, *Wordly Goods,* pp. 118-9.

was in part re-appropriated, its meanings redefined. Catholic objects and holy images taken away from their original context and transposed in a museum setting, rather than a link with a lost cultural tradition, create distance and otherness.

Relocating the Holy from Image to Text

The St William's *feretory* was dismembered by order of the Privy Council in October 1541. The precious metals and stones were sold for £ 64 and part of the revenue was used to buy Bibles for York's parish churches.[174] This episode is emblematic of two things. First, iconoclasm was used to convert the visual culture of the traditional religion into a new-text based one. Second, economic resources previously absorbed by the cult of images were deflected towards the growing consumption of goods. In the sixteenth century not only were extensive donations in money given to the images of saints, but many valuable items were also given. Imported goods such as cloth, jewellery, plates, materials for shoemaking and even animal fats used in making candles were given to the images.[175] Matthew Hunter suggests that these expenditures by pilgrims and parishioners, even in highly impoverished areas, were of concern to the Henrician regime. [176] The legal concept of a household was being redefined at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Moreover, the idea of good husbandry of the domestic domain was being developed. [177] From the late fifteenth century there was also an increase in domestic consumption, more things were part of the material culture of the household.[178] Hunter argues that the destruction of the devotional images could therefore be also interpreted as a way of deflecting resources away from the church and redirecting them towards a better life

---

[174] Cross, 'From the Reformation', p. 198.

[175] R. Whiting, *The Blind Devotion of the People: Popular Religion and The English* Reformation (New York and Cambridge, 1989), pp. 150, 193; Oakes*,* 'Pennies to Heaven'.

[176] M. Hunter, 'Iconoclasm and Consumption; or Household Management According to Thomas Cromwell', in S. Boldrick and R. Clay (eds), *Iconoclasm: Contexted Objects,Contexted Terms* (Aldershot, 2007), pp. 64-70.

[177] Cook, *Letters to Cromwell*, pp. 53-4, 238, Richard Layton's comments on the "bad husbandry" of minor monastic houses.

[178] C. Shammas, *The Pre-Industrial Consumer in England and America* (Oxford, 1990).

standard in the home. The consumption of mass-produced goods such as books was actively promoted by Cromwell in the 1536 *Injunctions*. He made the clergy directly responsible for showing the community where the books containing the Christian text were sold, since reading the Bible and devotional text supported personal worship.[179]This had an impact on the landscape of the Close and explains the Dean and Chapter's direct involvement in the construction of bookshops. These were placed in strategic locations, both inside and outside the cathedral, to literally open the books of Holy Scriptures to everyone.[180]

Holy Scriptures in the form of texts and books replaced the "false teaching" of the imagery; literacy and liturgy became closely associated.[181] Margaret Aston suggests that we ought to think about the various forms of iconoclasm not as an "erosion of the sacred" but rather as a "relocation of holiness". [182] The written words of the Holy Scriptures increasingly replaced images inside churches. In 1552 Archbishop Holgate ordered the painting of texts from the Scriptures above the high altar. The 1482 polyptych of St Peter in this location may have been first defaced and then painted over. [183]

Changing meanings of the Minster Close: the end of pilgrimages

In the fifteenth and early sixteenth century, pilgrimages were booming. One of their main aims was the pursuit of supernatural healing of the body. In addition to the already established cults there was a continuous demand for new healing saints. These sometimes had a reputation for specialising in particular diseases or

[179] M. Hunter, 'Iconoclasm and Consumption'; Thomas Cromwell, 'First Royal Injunction of Henry VIII (1536)', in W. H. Frere, (ed.), *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*, Alcuin Club Collection, XIV, vol. 2 (New York, 1910), p. 6.

[180] See below Chapter 4.2.

[181] Aston, 'Public Worship and Iconoclasm', p. 23; Moreland, *Archaeology and Text*, pp. 54-76; P. Collinson, 'From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia: the Cultural Impact of the Second English Reformation' in P. Marshall (ed*.), Impact of the English Reformation 1500-1640* (London, 1997), pp. 278-308.

[182] Aston, 'Public Worship and Iconoclasm', p. 23

[183] Cross, 'From the Reformation', p. 200.

body parts.[184] In the Minster, the fifteenth-century cult of Archbishop le Scrope was an unofficial but popular one.[185] Perhaps also stimulated by this competition the cult of the official resident St William was revived in the fifteenth century, attracting people from Yorkshire and from the north of England. St William's tomb-shrine iconography advertised his miracles and the figures of other helper-saints reinforced his credibility.[186] A crowd of pilgrims would have been attracted to the Minster Close creating a demand for goods and services. It is possible that the shops attested in the fifteenth century in the West Minster Yard catered for their needs.[187] Candles to light on the shrines and souvenirs to take home or give as gifts, such as the ceramic ampoules with the healing St William's oil, would most probably have been sold in these establishments.[188] The Fabric Fund was the beneficiary of this commerce, since a small proportion of its income derived from the sale of wax candles.[189]

Wax *ex voto* to offer to the shrines as a thanksgiving may have also been sold there. They were a more affordable alternative to the ones in precious metals. The inventory of silver and gold *ex voto* object displayed on a velvet cloth by the shrine of le Scrope in the sixteenth century included nine images of men and women, two cows, 16 eyes, 13 legs, ten hearts, ten teeth, four breasts, a fleet of model ships, anchors, boat hooks and a horse harness.[190] The offering of *ex voto* was a form of religiosity that increased in Europe during the fifteenth century. Chiara Frugoni suggests that in these there was an element of public display and self commemoration within a church, especially when the offerings were

---

[184] Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, p. 195.

[185] Norton, 'Richard Scrope'; Norton, *St William*.

[186] Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, p. 178.

[187] See chapter 2. 2. 1.

[188] J. Cherry, 'Pilgrim Ampullae of York Minster and the Healing Oil of the Shrine of St William', in S. Blick (ed.), *Beyond Pilgrim Souvenirs and Secular Badges* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 48-63.

[189] Oakes, 'Pennies to Heaven', p. 34.

[190] Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, pp. 225-6

conspicuous.[191] However, for Duffy *ex voto* objects were a necessary acknowledgement to other pilgrims of the healing power of the saint. This offered hope in a world of sickness and pain.[192]

With the end of pilgrimages the Minster Close would have become less frequented. It was still a centre of religious and secular power but its role as a regional centre decreased. The void left by religious healers such as the saints was filled by the increase in importance of other practices.[193] The demand for healers in the urban context was great during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[194] On one side there was an increase in the number of physicians and apothecaries adhering to a holistic system of medicine such as the Galenic and Paracelsian ones. The Royal College of Physicians was created as early as 1518 to regulate these practitioners. On the other side another group of practitioners gained importance during the sixteenth century.[195] The "white witches" were consulted when supernatural causes were believed to be at the origins of diseases. Historians of medicine suggest that the rise in witchcraft was a consequence of the relocation of beliefs in superstitious healing practices after the Reformation.

---

[191] C. Frugoni, *A Distant City: Images of Urban Experience in the Medieval World* (Princeton, 1991), p.86.

[192] Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars,* pp. 198-199; R. Palmer, 'The Church, Leprosy and Plague in Medieval and Early Modern Europe', in W. J. Sheils (ed.), *The Church and Healing,* The Ecclesiastical History Society, Studies in Church History, 19 (1982), pp. 79-99.

[193] For hospitals after the Dissolution K. Giles, 'Reforming Corporate Charity: Guilds and Fraternities in Pre- and Post-Reformation York' in D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003), pp. 325-39; C. Rawcliffe, *Medicine for the Soul: the Life, Death and Resurrection of an English Medieval Hospital. St Giles, Norwich* (Stroud, 1999).

[194] M. Pelling, *Medical Conflicts in Early Modern London. Patronage, Physicians and Irregular Practicioners, 1550-1640* (Oxford, 2003); L. Hill Curth, *English Almanacs, Astrology and Popular Medicine: 1550-1700* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 15-9.

[195] L. Kassel, *Medicine and Magic in Elizabethan London: Simon Foreman, Asrologer, Alchemist and Physician* (Oxford, 2005); J. Newton and J. Bath, *Witchcraft and the Act of 1604*(Leiden and Boston, 2008); Elmer, P. 'Medicine, Witchcraft and the Poetic of Healing in Late Seventeenth Century England', O. P. Gell and A. Cunningham (eds), *Medicine and Religion in Enlightenment Europe* (Aldershot, 2007).

Physicians were city-based and were one of the reasons for country gentry to come to town in York.[196] One of the main reasons for Lady Hoby's regular visits was to seek help from her physician. He performed also the function of counsellor, confidant and gave her purgative medicines.[197] Rituals of purification, confession and absolution were therefore relocated out of religion and into the medical profession.[198] There were attempts from Protestant ministers, especially the puritans, to offer spiritual support to troubled or sick minds, but by the early seventeenth century this was discouraged.[199] What was lost, however, was the communal value of these practices. The sharing of concerns about health and of penance, which were two of the reasons for pilgrimages, were replaced with a more private attitude towards the body and towards guilt. The Close, however, maintained its role as a healing centre. Medical doctors preferred to establish their practices in the Close rather than in the city because the Liberty of St Peter was not affected by corporate restrictions or expenses. Three doctors were attested in the Close from the 1550s onwards: Dr Stephen Tuble, Dr Roger Lee and Mr Lister, who was Lady Hoby's physician. One of the most attractive aspects of the Close is that maternity clinics were located there in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The recusant Thomas Vavasour established his clinic in Ogleforth.[200] This tradition may have continued, because Martha Stobbard "alias the moore midwife", had a practice in the Minster Yard after 1660.[201] The affluent women resident in the Close produced a considerable number of children.[202] The unpredictable timing of birth

---

[196] Pelling, *Medical Conflicts*, p. 338.

[197] J. Moody (ed), *The Private Life of an Elizabethan Lady. The Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby 1599-1605* (Stroud 1988). Lady Hoby wrote a journal of her everyday life from 1599 and 1605. She was the wife of Sir Thomas Hoby.

[198] G. K. Paster, 'Purgation as the Allure of Mastery: Early Modern Medicine and the Technology of the Self', in L. C. Orlin (ed.), *Material London* (Philadelphia, 2000), pp. 193-205.

[199] M. MacDonald, 'Religion, Social Change and Psychological Healing in England 1600-1800' in W. J. Sheils (ed.), *The Church and Healing,* The Ecclesiastical History Society, Studies in Church History, 19 (1982), p. 103.

[200] D. Palliser, *Towns and Local Communities in Medieval and Early Modern England* (Aldershot, 2006), pp 91-2 and Aveling, *Catholic Recusancy*.

[201] YMA, We, fols. 341-341v.

[202] Cross, 'Exemplary Wives'.

may have made the establishment of these facilities in the Close convenient. This show how the idea of sacred space connected with taboos about pollution by blood, body fluids and female presence, had drammaticly changed after the Reformation.

Liturgy of the word and interior space of the cathedral

The change of liturgy affected the use of space within the cathedral. The high mass and the multiplicity of masses celebrated on the numerous chantry altars were performances to which the faithful were asked to participate. A liturgy of the word, consisting of long sermons and readings from scriptures, made people listeners. The inner choir was not reserved to the clergy anymore, becoming the space where the divine services took place. During the sixteenth century the place may have been bare, but from the second decade of the seventeenth century an increasing amount of furniture and soft furnishing are recorded by the inventories. Cloth hangings and banners were made with the pre-Reformation fabric material in former liturgical colours. Copes and vestments in silk satin and precious fabrics were converted into dozens of cushions. These were dotted around the choir and by the altar. Many were placed directly in front of the seats of the dignitaries for kneeling on.[203] Perhaps this is an indication that a different attitude towards the decoration of church buildings was emerging. When Archbishop Neile was appointed in 1633, he encouraged the chapter to embrace new "Laudian" ideas about the beauty of holiness.[204] During the 1630s £ 1,000 was spent in adding a new sensory dimension to the Minster. The screen behind the altar was gilded and painted, new plates and cloths were bought. A new organ was built, showing that this musical instrument, previously banished by Archbishop Holgate's injunctions, was back in use.[205]

---

[203] Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, pp. 315-6 inventories of 1616 and 1633.

[204] Cross, 'From the Reformation', p. 211 ; P. Lake, 'The Laudian Style: Order, Uniformity and the Pursuit of the Beauty of Holiness in the 1630's', in K. Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603–1642* (Palo Alto, 1993), pp. 161-185.

[205] Cross, 'From the Reformation', pp. 212-3, p. 201 for Holgate injunctions. Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, pp. 319-25.

Seats were erected in the choir for clergy and dignitaries, their wives and other notable women. Seats and galleries were built in other cathedrals and became common even in parish churches during the 1620s and 1630.[206] By 1633 galleries or upper stalls had been erected in the south side of the choir for the use of the Dean and prebendaries' wives. On the opposite side there were the seats for the President of the Council of the North, his wife and other notable women. These were on a large gallery running above three or four stalls for the Archdeacons. The rest of the congregation may have been standing or sitting on chairs.[207] A space previously reserved to the male clergy became open to women. However, they were admitted as part of a family or household, signifying the increasing importance of the perception of the family as a unit.[208] After the Elizabethan establishment clerical marriage was strongly encouraged. The wives of the clergy with their number of children, often large, promoted Protestantism by creating an example of godly family units.[209] The families of members of the Church of York were located on the south side and the lay ones to the north. The latter were not only gentry coming to service in the cathedral, but were the family of lawyers residing in the Close.[210] The new seating arrangement was therefore reflecting and structuring the social order and the choir became a space where social conflicts were acted out.[211] After his visit in 1633, Charles I ordered for the gallery and other conspicuous seats in the choir to be removed.[212] He wished them replaced with chairs to be stored away after services, as to not spoil the beauty of the building. However, a month later he wrote again to the Dean and

---

[206] Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close,* p. 204; S. E. Lehmberg, *Cathedrals Under Siege* (Exeter, 1996), pp. 15-6; J. Schofield, 'Some Aspects of the Reformation of Religious Space in London, 1540-1660', in D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580,.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003), pp. 310-24.

[207] YMA, Wd, fols. 114, 115; Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, p. 318, 325-8.

[208] Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, p. 203; MacCulloch, *Reformation*, p. 661.

[209] Cross, 'Exemplary Wives'.

[210] See below pp. 236-43.

[211] Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close*, p. 204. P. M. Hunneyball, *Architecture and Image-Building in Seventeenth Century Hertfordshire* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 30-3.

[212] YMA, Wd, fol. 115; Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, pp. 325-7. For Charles I and aesthetic see Chapter 6.1.

Chapter. [213] He explained that the main reason for this order was his wish to prevent disputes between lawyers, knights and baronets over precedence in occupying the seats. The same disputes were carried out in the chambers of the Council of the North and orders of precedence were important for defining the relationship of that court with the central government.[214] Other conflicts previously carried out in the urban space were transferred to the choir. There was growing tension in the late 1620s between the city and the Dean and Chapter regarding the extent of the rights of the Liberty of St Peter.[215] In the 1630s doctrinal differences between a City Corporation and the chapter further added to this conflict. The Archbishop's courts imposed a 'Laudian' interpretation of the Book of Common prayers and prosecuted clergy of the parish churches for not conforming.[216] When in 1633 Archdeacon Whickham sat in a stall in the choir higher than the Mayor's one, an indignant corporation boycotted the Minster.[217] Charles I also intervened to settle this dispute about order of precedence during his visit.[218]

The nave, devoid of altars, carpets and soft furnishings was a space where a large congregation could listen to sermons. In York an external preaching place such as those in Norwich and in London is not recorded. The concentration of sixteenth and seventeenth-century graffiti on the north pillar between the crossing and the first bay, in contrast with the relative scarcity of graffiti on other pillars, suggests that a pulpit could have been located in the east side of the nave.[219] (Fig. 83) Some people may have entertain themselves or practise their literacy during long sermons by writing graffiti. There is no indication in York Minster that the nave was ever used as a thoroughfare between parts of the town,

---

[213] Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, p. 328.

[214] R. R. Reid, *The King's Council in the North,* 2nd edition (Wakefield, 1975), pp. 374-6.

[215] Cross, 'From the Reformation', pp. 211-2.

[216] R. A. Marchant, *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Dioceses of York, 1560-1642* (1960), pp. 74-96, 125-7; B. P. Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England, 1603-1641. A political Study* (Oxford, 1973), pp. 191-2, for similar cases in London.

[217] Cross, 'From the Reformation', p. 212.

[218] Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, pp. 329-30.

[219] Thanks to Anthony Masinton for drawing my attention to the graffiti.

such as in Norwich, Salisbury, Winchester, Exeter and Worcester. In London St

Paul's even animals and merchandise were carried through the church.[220] In the

church of St Giles in Edinbourgh areas not used for worship were partitioned by

walls and used for secular purposes.[221] In York the presence of the office of the

Council of the North in front of the cathedral may have maintained the decorum

of the place. Two boys caught playing football in the nave were flogged by order

of the Ecclesiastical Commission in 1566.[222]

The use of the cathedrals for business transactions continued after the

Reformation. Rents of the cathedral lands were paid at the baptismal font or in

front of the altar.[223] In York a clause in all the Dean and Chapter leases specified

that rents should be paid on Treasurer Haxby's tomb. This was located by the

north-west crossing pier and was believed to be the one of Thomas Haxby or

Haxey who died in 1425.[224] (Fig. 84) The tomb was surmounted by a stone

similar to a counter and the Clerk of the Works and the Chamberlain would be

there to receive payments from the tenants on four feast days: Candlemas,

Pentecost, Lammas and St Michael Archangel. An alternative explanation for the

graffiti on the north-west pillar is that these were related to payments of rents.

This is suggested by the fact that the pillar by the Haxby Tomb in its new

location is covered in eighteenth-century graffiti. Since the rent could be paid in

20 days after the feasts, it is possible that the money was left there and the name

and date written as a document. Vending activities may also have taken place

within the cathedral. As already mentioned, before the Reformation the sale of

candles was part of the income of the Fabric. A "house" in the cross aisle was

recorded in 1633.[225] This was probably a bookshop located to the north west of

the south transept. (Fig. 103) Given its proximity to St William's tomb-shrine it

---

[220] Lehmberg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals*, pp. 289-90.

[221] Spicer, *Calvinist Churches*, pp. 80-2.

[222] Tillott, *VCH York*, p. 158.

[223] Lehmberg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals*, pp. 288-9.

[224] The tomb has been moved in the northern chapel by 1717, YMA, Wf, fols. 170v-171; Brown, *York Minster*, p. 17.

[225] YMA, Wd, fol. 115.

may have been located on the site of a previous candle stall. The north transept continued to be used as Concistory Court.[226]

The cathedral as burial place for the community

After the Edwardian Act of 1547 dismissing the doctrine of Purgatory, brass and tombs became targets of destruction. This was not only carried out to reuse the brass as a valuable material but to obliterate the concept of a relationship between the living and the dead. Images of supine dead bodies and inscriptions inviting the living to pray for their souls were defaced. By 1550 it was a crime to have such tombs not removed. In that year, however, there was disquiet among aristocratic families that the collective memory of their social elite was at risk of being erased. A further act allowed the tombs of clergy and gentry to not be destroyed as long as they were not object of worship.[227] Perhaps because of this amendment to the act, the tomb of Archbishop de Grey, a masterpiece of early gothic sculpture, has been preserved from destruction. The antiquarians Torre and Drake attributed the destruction of brasses in the cathedral to the Civil War.[228] However, in other cathedrals such as Norwich, brasses were damaged before the seventeenth century.[229]

After the Reformation the cathedral and the cemetery of St Michael-le-Belfrey maintained their funerary significance.[230] The cathedral remained the place for burial and commemoration of the cathedral clergy. Lay members of the Close resident community also chose it as a burial place.[231] During the last quarter of

---

[226] See Chapter 5.1, pp. 232-6.

[227] P. Lindley, *Tomb Destruction and Scholarship. Medieval Monuments in Early Modern England* (Donington, 2007), pp. 21-22.

[228] G. E. Aylmer, 'Funeral Monuments and Other Post-Medieval Sculpture', in G.E. Aylmer and R. Cant (eds), *A History of York Minster* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 430-86.

[229] J. Finch, 'The Monuments', in I. Atherton, , E. Fernie, C. Harper-Bill, A. Hassell-Smith (eds), *Norwich Cathedral: Church, City And Dioceses 1096-1996* (London, 1996), pp. 474-5. In York Minster the works of pre-Civil War antiquarians as Roger Dodsworth (1619) Bodl., MS. 27, 693 = Dodsworth MS 161) and Glover (1585) could be compared with Torre (1691).

[230] Aylmer, 'Funeral Monuments', p. 431.

[231] Lehmberg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals*, pp. 281-7.

the sixteenth and in the seventeenth century, masons and tilers were paid yearly by the Fabric to cover graves in the Minster.[232] The death of a Secretary of the Council of the North, George Blithes, in 1581 was marked by the payment for his grave in the cathedral and by a new lease for his former residence, the prebendal mansion of South Cave.[233] The choir maintained its significance as one of the most prominent funerary places in the cathedral. Archbishops, Deans and prebendaries continued to be buried there and in the Lady Chapel. They were joined by their wives and children. Lawyers and gentry members of the Council of the North and their families were also buried in the choir.[234] The continuity of some areas of churches as prestigious burial places has been highlighted by Vanessa Harding.[235] Testamentary evidence in York suggests that before the Reformation the location of burials was selected according to devotion.[236] This choice of location, however, acquired different connotations when Protestantism was established. The continuing funerary use of the choir in the London parish churches may have reflected the importance of regular attendance to services.[237] But in Chester the burial arrangement within the church reflected the social structure of the community.[238] As discussed above, in York Minster after the Elizabethan establishment the choir was the focus of divine service and the seats for the clergy and for other notable people reflected the social order. The tombs and commemorative monuments of members of the Church of York and their families were concentrated on the south choir aisle and along the walls of the Lady's Chapel. The layty seems to have preferred the northern aisle and the northern side of the Lady's Chapel. (Fig. 112) This suggests that there may have been a correlation between seating arrangement in the choir and funerary

---

[232] YMA, E3/58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63.

[233] YMA, E3/58.

[234] I. R. Pattinson and H. Murray, *Monuments in York Minster. An Illustrated Inventory* (York, 2001).

[235] Harding, *The Dead and the Living*.

[236] Gee, 'The Topography of Altars'; Oakes, 'Pennies to Heaven', p. 49.

[237] D. Hickman, 'From Catholic to Protestant: the Changing Meaning of Testamentary Religious Provisions in Elizabethan London', in N. Tyacke (ed.), *England's Long Reformation, 1500-1800* (London, 1998), p. 121.

[238] Coster, 'A Microcosm of Community', pp. 124-43.

commemoration. The funerary monuments in the choir aisle therefore, reinforced and legitimated the structure and hierarchy of the seating arrangement and created a memory for clerical and legal communities in the Close.

The funerary monuments in York Minster reflected the post-Reformation belief in the separation of the living and the dead. Before the Reformation the living were reminded to pray for the dead. After the Reformation the deceased themselves were remembered in life.[239] The monuments and inscriptions of the clergy and residents of the Close fit the pattern recognised for the development of contemporary funerary monuments.[240] When portrayed the deceased are represented alive and inscriptions commemorate their life and achievements.[241] Archbishop Hutton's statue was made when the representation of the supine dead body was changing into the representation of the person as alive.[242] He is portrayed with open eyes in an unnatural recumbent position, supporting his body on the elbow. (Fig. 85) A further development of the funerary monument is represented by figures kneeling or standing in prayers. Perhaps setting a standard and a model to be imitated were the monuments by Nicholas Stone, the most famous sculptor of the time promoting classical style in England.[243] Anna Bennett was commemorated in 1615, fourteen years after her death, with a portrait. (Fig. 87) This may have been both a sign of enduring affection and a display of status by the lay prebendary Dr John Bennett. Sir William Belasyse, member of the Council in the North, who could afford Stone because he was one of the richest landowners in Yorkshire, is represented with his family.[244] (Fig. 86) The lawyer Henry Swinburne is portrayed kneeling in his professional gown on a large black and red cushion; a reminder perhaps, of his gift of a cushion to

---

[239] Gilchrist 'Dust to Dust', p. 410; J. Finch, *Church Monuments in Norfolk before 1850: An Archaeology of Commemoration* (Oxford, 2000), p. 125; P. Marshall, *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 265-308.

[240] P. Sherlock, *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England* (Aldershot, 2008).

[241] E. Panofsky, *Tomb Sculpture: Its Changing Aspects from Ancient Egypt to Bernini* (London, 1964), pp. 67-70.

[242] Lindley, *Tomb Destruction*, pp. 32-3.

[243] H. Colin, *A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects, 1600-1840* , 3rd ed. (New Heaven and London, 1995), *s.v.* "Stone, Nicholas"

[244] Aylmer, 'Funeral Monuments', p. 439.

the cathedral.[245] He is piously looking at the sky with his palms joined and a book open in front of him. (Fig. 88) His friend judge William Ingram, also in his gown, and his wife are commemorated in a nearby monument, originally located in the Lady Chapel. (Fig. 90) They are smiling and their gaze meets the one of the viewers. Henry Gee, Secretary of the Council of the North and son-in-law of Archbishop Hutton, is represented between his two wives and six children. (Fig. 89) A woman is commemorated as an individual and not for her role as a mother. On a position of honour at the centre of the Lady's Chapel east wall, Frances Matthew, who bequeathed to the Minster Library the large library of the late Archbishop Matthew, is represented in prayer. [246]

These portraits are not stereotyped but rather represent individual somatic features.[247] Apart from the ones by Stone, these monuments seem more related to the contemporary civic portraiture than to aristocratic tombs. This emerged in the late sixteenth century as forms of social and political discourse. Robert Tittler has highlighted its importance in the formation of civic identity.[248] The portraits celebrate service to society and family values. The gowns of lawyers and clergy indicate their professional roles and the importance they attached to it. Family bonds are visually expressed by the images of partners and children and proclaimed by the patronage of the monuments.[249] The accompanying texts reinforce the images by emphasising traits of character, such as professional integrity, compassion and a caring attitude towards their family and the less fortunate members of society. Accomplishments such as learning of classical

[245] Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, p. 316.

[246] Aylmer, 'Funeral Monuments', p. 441; Cross, 'Exemplary Wives'. The monument at present is hidden by scaffolding.

[247] The location of the monuments is the same they had in the seventeenth century, the colours, however, have been refreshed or reinterpreted in 1829-32, during the restoration of the choir after a fire, see Brown, *York Minster*, p. 300.

[248] R. Tittler, 'Portraiture, Politics and Society' in R. Tittler and N. Jones (eds), *A Companion to Tudor Britain* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 448-469; R. Tittler, *Townspeople and Nation. English Urban Experiences 1540-1640* (Stanford California, 2001); Tittler, *The Reformation and the Towns*; Sherlock, *Monuments and Memory*; Finch, 'A Reformation of Meanings'.

[249] See Pattison and Murray, *Monuments in York Minster*, passim.

languages were also celebrated.[250]Commemoration in the Minster was not only for the prestige of the individual but also constructed the identity of the resident community, as the civic portraiture of mayors and aldermen and their families did for towns.

Influences from classical art were employed to create a new Protestant vocabulary for the architecture of these monuments. The funerary monument made in 1512 by the Florentine sculptor Pietro Torrigiani for Henry VIII provided the first model for their iconography and architecture.[251] Saints and other symbols linked to the traditional religion were replaced by classical imagery. Decorative elements such as the winged hourglass, the wheel of fortune and miniature skulls, all alluded to the precariousness of life. Classical virtues represented as caryatids celebrated a successful life. These were often criticised in the seventeenth century because they represented bare-breasted women. [252] However, this nudity resulted from the failure to achieve the effect of "wet linen" dress, as the caryatids on the Swinbourne monument demonstrate. (Fig. 88)

The cemetery to the west of St Michael-le-Belfrey continued to be used as burial ground for the parish until 1715.[253] Burials continued also on the interior of the redeveloped church. On the basis of testamentary evidence, during the twelve years in which the church was being rebuilt it appears that the number of request for funeral declined.[254] However, from 1537 requests for elaborate funeral with lavish use of lights and candles continued at least until 1554.[255]

---

[250] Aylmer, 'Funeral Monuments', pp. 433-9; see monuments of Gee, Swinbourne, Bennett, Hogson, Bunny, William Ingram, Matthew Hutton.

[251] Sherlock, *Monuments and Memory,* pp. 129-162.

[252] Lindley, *Tomb Destruction,* p. 34.

[253] See Cahpter 2. 2. 1, p. 67.

[254] Saunders, 'Minster and Parish', pp. 12-4; Masinton, 'Sacred Space', p. 75.

[255] Masinton, 'Sacred Space', pp. 83-4.

A revival of the idea of sacred

In his 1633 visit Charles I was displeased with the seats in the choir and outraged by the bookshops within the transept and against the cathedral exterior.[256] Some of the reasons he gave demonstrate a new preoccupation with sacred space. In the interior the seating was deemed to be "a blemish for such a godly choir" and were ordered to be removed "so that the choir could be kept in his ancient beauty". On the exterior the buildings were "a detriment to the godly fabric" and "to the house of god".[257] Early Protestantism rejected the idea that God was more present in a place rather than another; the cathedral church building was therefore not sacred. The bookshops containing Holy Scriptures were not considered inappropriate. However, by the early seventeenth century the idea of the church as a space more sacred than others was developing and gaining support. During the early seventeenth century rituals of consecration were reintroduced for new churches and graveyards.[258] It is worth highlighting that the case for consecration was argued with references to two important and continuously revived traditions. The first was the "classical tradition" represented by the dedication of Roman temples and by the Constantinian consecration of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem in 335 AD. The second was the Jewish biblical tradition with reference to the Jerusalem Temple. By the 1630s the idea of the church as the house of God was well developed. Archbishop William Laud believed that the appearance of the church building reflected the "beauty of holiness".[259] The connection between architectural aesthetics and sacred space was then firmly established. The consequence of this will be further discussed in Chapter 6.1.

In conclusion the relocation of the sacred from images to texts had a direct impact on the landscape of the Close with the construction of bookshops, the

---

[256] See Chapter 6.1. pp. 302-4.

[257] YMA, Wd, fols. 115-116.

[258] A. Spicer, '"God Will Have a House": Defining Sacred Space and Rites of Consecration in Early Seventeenth Century England', in A. Spicer and S. Hamilton (eds), *Defining the Holy. Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 207-230.

[259] Spicer, 'God Will Have a House', p. 210-1. For Charles I and Laud religious policies see Spicer, *Calvinist Churches*, pp. 78-88.

establishment of which the Dean and Chapter were directly responsible for. In the cathedral devoid of altars and images, the choir was the focus of the liturgy of the word. The social relations were not structured around the chantry altars anymore, but by the seating arrangement in the choir. Even if the connection between the living and the dead was changed by the Reformation, burial and commemoration continued within the cathedral and in the cemetery of St Michael-le-Belfrey.

Sound and time in the Minster Close

Space is defined also by sound. Bells were used in the Middle Ages to extend the area of influence of a church on the landscape, often in competition with other establishments.[260] One of the main roles of bells was to mark the time of the day. *Ave Maria* bells signalled sunrise and sunset to the city and to the immediate hinterland. Moreover, bells marking the times of religious offices would have structured the day within the Close.[261] The pattern of time within the Close was a liturgical one, which changed within the day and the year.[262] However, a more equal division of time was also used since the late fourteenth century. A *horologium* was attested in the Fabric Rolls since 1433.[263] A keeper for the clock was appointed every year by the Fabric and occasional repairs were carried out during the fifteenth century.[264] This has been identified as the clock located in a small clock house just inside the south transept doorway.[265] The bells connected to it were housed in a small belfry on the roof of the south transept.[266] In 1528

---

[260] Hamilton and Spicer, 'Defining the Holy', p. 7-8.

[261] C. Humphrey, 'Time and Urban Culture in Late Medieval England', in C. Humphrey and W. M. Ormrod (eds), *Time in the Medieval World* (York, 2001), p. 111-3.

[262] Humphrey, 'Time and Urban Culture', p. 113 and 116; for liturgical calendar K. Giles, 'Marking Time? A 15th Century Liturgical Calendar in the Wall Paintings of Pickering Parish Church', *Church Archaeology* 4 (2000), pp. 42-51.

[263] YMA, E3/13; D. E. Potter, *Bells and Bellringers of York Minster* (York, 1987), p.8.

[264] YMA, E3/7-32.

[265] Drake, *Eboracum,* p. 529; Torre manuscript YML, LI/7/1, fols. 30-30v. Humphrey, 'Time and Urban Culture', p. 111.

[266] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral at York', p. 5.

the clock was repaired and a new dial was made and painted.[267] The rhythm and sound of time in the Close extended towards the city providing a reference for its people. Humphrey argues that in medieval York there was not a rigid division between "Church time" and "Merchant time" as suggested by Le Goff.[268] A mixed system in which religious and clock time were used together provided different rhythms for daily activities. In consequence of the 1538 *Injunction*, Archbishop Lee prohibited the ringing of the *Ave Maria* and of liturgical services.[269] The marking of liturgical time was then abolished.

A clock on the inner face of the West Minster Gates is first documented in 1577. It was repaired by John Newsome, a clockmaker of York.[270] This faced the area where the legal offices and Courts of justice were located. Paul Brand has demonstrated that a precise division of time was a crucial element for legal cases and court hearings from the late Middle Ages.[271] Therefore it could be suggested that in the Close liturgical time was replaced by "lawyers' time". Additionally, with the establishment of commercial activities in the Close, commerce would have also needed a regulated time. From the fifteenth century onwards civic clocks across Europe were used to construct civic identity. These were often connected with places of transits such as civic gates, archways and bridges.[272] A clock on the gates may have represented the wish by the Liberty of St Peter, and perhaps by the new lay community in the Close, to have a time separate from the one of the city.

---

[267] YMA, E3/39-40.

[268] J. Le Goff, *Time, Work and Culture* (Chicago and London, 1980), pp. 29-42.

[269] Cross, 'From the Reformation', p. 198; Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altar*, p. 412.

[270] Chapter 2, p. Palliser, *Towns and Local Communities*, p. 86.

[271] P. Brand, 'Lawyers' Time in England in the Later Middle Ages', in C. Humphrey and W. M. Ormrod (eds), *Time in the Medieval World* (York, 2001), p. 104.

[272] Humphrey, 'Time and Urban Culture', pp. 113-7; G. Dohrn van Rossum, *History of the Hour: Clocks and Modern Temporal Orders* (Chicago, 1996).

Feasts and performances as communal production of meanings in the Minster Yard

Before the Reformation the Minster Yard was used as a stage for liturgical performances. In addition to high mass processions enacted every Sunday, there were annual processions of which the most important were those related to the relics of St William and the Corpus Christi procession. These were events in which the social cohesion of the city was constructed and affirmed.[273] Moreover the Mystery Plays and above all the Holy Week rituals transformed the city and the Close into a distant and symbolic city: a New Jerusalem.[274] The Palm Sunday procession left from the cathedral south doorway and re-entered from the west doorway. Choir boys singing in high locations in proximity of the west door were part of the protocol for this procession. They impersonated the children waiting for Jesus perched on the trees outside the gates of Jerusalem. In the twelfth century the boys were raised on a platform outside the cathedral's west end.[275] From the fifteenth century the chambers above the West Minster Gates, almost facing the cathedral west door, would have been a good location for the singers. The space outside the cathedral's west end was also the one where rituals of penance were collectively performed on Good Friday afternoon or on some occasions before the Sunday Mass procession.[276] The liturgical west had a connotation of ritual death, purification and rebirth. It was a common location for baptisteries in medieval cathedral complexes in the Mediterranean area.[277] The liturgical processions and the York Mystery plays had disappeared by the 1570s.[278] However, rituals that fulfilled useful functions, such as the

---

[273] For the debate on the role of these rituals see Giles, *An Archaeology of Social Identity*, p.77.

[274] N. Coldstream, *Medieval Architecture* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 151-4.

[275] C. Hohler, 'The Palm Sunday Procession and the West Front of Salisbury Cathedral', in M. S. Andas (ed.), *The Medieval Cathedral of Trondheim. Architectural and Ritual Constructions in their European Context* (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 281, 285-90.

[276] MacCulloch, *Reformation,* p. 597 suggests that public penance increased after the Reformation, but being publicly shamed in the marked square it is not the same as performing a collective act of penance.

[277] S. Perring, 'Memory of Antiquity in English Medieval Architecture: The Case of York Minster Chapter House' (Unpublished MA Dissertation, University of York, 2004).

[278] Palliser, *Tudor York*, p. 232.

Rogationtide processions used to define parish boundaries, were kept.[279] Insecure regimes are suspicious of feasts that subvert the social rules, even within the authorised boundaries of a carnival.[280]Feasts that were perceived too disorderly and almost pagan, as the Yuletide procession in York, were suppressed by the Ecclesiastical Commission.[281] However, a yearly feast was allowed to continue in the Close. This was the rule of the Archbishop over the Close and over the city on Lammas day; he claimed jurisdiction over the whole city according to a custom established by 1140.[282] In the religious calendar this day coincided with the feast of St Peter in Vincula, celebrating Peter as prisoner in the Mamertino gaol in Rome. It was also the traditional beginning of the harvest feasts in England and in York was celebrated with the main fair of the year.[283] A 1755 source describes the protocol for the Lammas Fair. At the eve of Lammas day the Archbishop's steward entered the Palace Yard and in front of the Archbishop's prison declared the beginning of the Archbishop's rule on the city and Close for two days. He was given the keys to the city and was allowed to extract tolls at the city gates. The income from the fair and tolls, since the medieval period, covered the expenses for running the event and policing the fair ground or was given as charity. The Archbishop had the power to hold a court in the Close, and to commit prisoners to his gaol and to the City's one. [284] The Court of Pie Powder, originally meaning the court of peddlers, comprising of numerous jury, was held in front of the prison. This tribunal was necessary to deal with infractions on trade rules and petty crimes on the spot. However, it does appear that on Lammas day both the Ouse Bridge gaol and the Archbishop's prison were used for libations of wine and ale rather than for punishment. This tradition was so important that in the lease of the Palace to Ingram in 1616, the Archbishop

---

[279] See Chapter 3, p. 141.

[280] U. Eco, 'The Frame of Comic "Freedom"', in T. Seebock (ed.), *Carnival!* , Approaches to Semiotics, 64 (1984), pp. 1-9.

[281] Palliser, *Tudor York*, p. 247; Palliser, *Towns and Local Communities*, pp. 82-3.

[282] H. Richardson, *The Medieval Fairs and Markets of York,* Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, St Anthony's Hall Publications 20 (1961), pp. 11-15.

[283] R. Hutton, *The Rise and Fall of Merry England* (Oxford, 1994), p. 44. See also Chapter 5.1, p. 243-4.

[284] BIHR, CC, Ab, 9.

reserved the use of the prison and a portion of the Palace Yard for Lammas. It will be argued below that the Archbishop's rule on Lammas day was a lordship of misrule.

Semiotic theory defines carnivals and misrules as a communal production of meanings. The periodic subversion or reversal of established social rules within accepted boundaries of time and space maintains and reinforces social order. By contrast if the reversal of the rules transgresses the accepted boundaries of time and space, the carnival become unrest or revolution.[285] Lords of Misrule were popular all over England during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, especially around the Christmas season. [286] For a short period of time, people in the lower social orders were elected to impersonate the rulers. Their effective power, however, was limited to presiding over the pageants. A very popular lord of misrule in the Tudor period was Robin Hood. Henry VIII himself liked to impersonate him. However, this created some anxiety among some courtiers and after the real misrule of the Civil War this kind of impersonation was abandoned.[287] The Archbishop's Lammas day, however, continued well into the eighteenth century.[288] What was the origin of this feast and in what way did continue to be meaningful? The process of carnivalisation exorcises anxieties by acting them out, by performing the feared event within agreed boundaries of time and space.[289] The medieval origins of Lammas day may refer to the Norman rule of the Archbishop on the Close and on part of the city.[290] By returning once a year for two days only, the Archbishop ritually reassured the Dean and Chapter and the city that they were not subject to his temporal power. The emphasis on

---

[285] Eco, 'The Frame of Comic "Freedom"', pp. 1-9. The bibliography on carnival is huge starting with the classic study by M. Bakhtin, *Rabelais and his World* , English Translation (Bloomington, 1984). C. Humphrey, *The Politics of Carnival. Festive Misrule in Medieval England* (Manchester, 2001), suggests a more contextual historical interpretation and a real subversive value for the carnival. However, his examples also reinforce the idea of carnival as an authorised transgression.

[286] Hutton, *Merry England*, pp. 114-5.

[287] Hutton, *Merry England*, pp. 179-80.

[288] BIHR, CC. Ab. 9; Richardson, *The Medieval Fairs*, pp. 11-5.

[289] This is argued by Eco, 'The Frame of Comic "Freedom"', pp. 1-9

[290] For the Archbishop's medieval estate see Rees Jones, 'Property, Tenure and Rents', Vol. 1.

the prison seems to suggest that what was exorcised during the feast was his jurisdiction. After the Reformation the Archbishop's misrule may have been kept to exorcise the return to a previous order. However, this feast in the Close may have had the more practical function of regulating a traditional ale festival connected with the cathedral. These were fundraising events conducted in churches, often disorderly and with pagan undertones.[291] The distribution of ales from barrels kept on old stocks in the Archbishop's prison, possibly in his presence, may have structured the feast and discouraged disorderly behaviour. Moreover this was a yearly ritual when the Close and the City were united by surrendering their powers to the Archbishop.

Conclusion

The Reformation rejected the idea of the Close as sacred land with the church at its centre. The material culture and the practices which defined the sacred space came under attack in three main campaigns of reforms and iconoclasm. Beliefs about sacredness may have still been held by a not-yet fully converted cathedral clergy in the 1540s and in the 1550s. With the accession of Elizabeth and the presence of the Council of the North and its Ecclesiastical Commission, the Protestant religion was firmly established in York Minster. Words, spoken or written, became the new sacred. The cathedral inner space, purified from distracting art works, was arranged in function of the liturgy of the word. On the exterior, bookshops by the cathedral doorways were a consequence of this relocation of holiness. However, from the second decade of the seventeenth century, the connection between bookshops and liturgy was lost and new attitudes towards the aesthetic of the church started to emerge or perhaps were revived. Furthermore, meanings that were once connected with the liturgy of the traditional religion were lost or relocated to other spheres of the secular world. The relationship with the dead, however, was the hardest to change and there was continuity in the use of the parish cemetery in the Close and of the commemorative use of the cathedral choir.

---

[291] Hutton, *Merry England*, p. 59.

The cathedral, devoid of portable art and visual culture of the traditional religion, continued to be a place of worship. The emphasis of the divine services was moved into the choir. This became the space where the relationship between members of the community of lawyers and clergy living in the Close were structured. Existing conflicts between the city aldermen, the Council and the Church of York were also articulated in this space. The cathedral continued to be used for a multiplicity of secular activities such as a court house and for payment of rents.

CHAPTER 5. Creating Modernity: the Minster Close as a legal, commercial and cultural centre

This chapter will explain how, from the second half of the sixteenth century onwards, secular practices already established in the Close were further reinforced. This concerns the dialectic between tradition and innovation once more. Moreover it concerns some of the traits which have been identified by Max Weber as the most representative for the creation of modernity.[1] The role of urban law courts in creating the conditions for credit and the growing importance of the latter for the development of sixteenth-century trade and consumerism has been explained by Craig Muldrew in a case study on King's Lynn.[2] The development of a pre-industrial consumer society, first suggested by Joan Thirsk, with the desire for a richly textured material culture has been seen by Lisa Jardine as a driving force for economic and cultural changes.[3] In the archaeological field, Matthew Johnson has suggested a research agenda for the study of the rise of capitalism, stressing the relevance of issues concerning the formation of the class system[4]. In the second section of this chapter I will discuss how new ideas about urban culture and education were not only reflected in, but were structured by the space of the Close.

5.1 Legal and commercial

The permanent establishment in York of the Council of the North was seen as a major factor in the recovery of the city after a protracted economic crisis, both by contemporary politicians and by historians.[5] In the Close three decades of loss and redefinition of religious meanings were accompanied by stagnation in the

---

[1] M. Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the "Spirit" of Capitalism and other Writings* (New York and London, 2000).

[2] C. Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation. The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke and London, 1998).

[3] J. Thirsk, *Economic Policy and Projects: The development of a Consumer Society in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1978); Jardine, *Wordly Goods*.

[4] Johnson, *An Archaeology of Capitalism*.

[5] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 53-54.

built environment.[6] As seat of the Liberty and of the dioceses, the Close was still a centre for the Dean and Chapter's tenants for the region. However, with the drastic reduction in religious services and of pilgrims to the cathedral, its importance as a local and provincial centre diminished. In the 1560s the establishment of the Office of the Secretary of the Council in front of the cathedral represented a turning point. The Council of the North, as a court of justice, was part of an attempt by the Crown to modernise the legal system from the medieval Common Law to the application of equitable and civil law. During the sixteenth century the development of a consumer society and the consequent need to maintain creditworthiness made the swift procedures of civil law increasingly popular. In the Close there were other courts administering civil law, such as the ecclesiastical courts of the Dean and Chapter and of the Archbishop. The success and prestige of these courts and the possibility of higher earnings by combining several offices attracted high calibre, experienced lawyers who had previously served in the London's courts or as civil servants. Their relocation to York, together with the presence of suitors, provided the impetus for the domestic and commercial redevelopment of the Close.[7] In this section first it will be explained how the Close functioned as a legal centre and how this was expressed in spatial terms. Then the role of the courts in the development of trade will be discussed and finally the commercial space of the Close will be explored.

The Council of the North and the Office of the Secretary

Since the late fifteenth century the Council of the North, an institution for the governance of the Northern provinces, was itinerant. Its seat alternated between York, Newcastle, Hull and the castles of Sheriff Hutton and Middleham.[8] When in York it was based in the Deanery, however the gardens and open spaces of this residence were judged too small and unsuitable for the needs of the Council.[9]

---

[6] See Chapter 2.1, p. 56.

[7] Chapter 6. 2.

[8] Reid, *The King's Council in the North*.

[9] Tillott, *VCH York*, p. 341.

The Archbishop's Palace, despite its size, was not considered for relocation. This was possibly because it was the official seat of another jurisdiction, the Archdioceses. Therefore in 1538 when Robert Holgate, then bishop of Llandaff became Lord President, the York seat of the Council was relocated to the King's Manor; the just-dissolved St Mary's Abbey.[10] In 1560 the Council ceased to be itinerant and was permanently established in York.[11]

The Council of the North developed and replaced some of the functions of the Commissions of the Justice of the Peace, in order to maintain the control of the Crown on the northern regions.[12] The organisation and extent of the jurisdiction of the Council of the North was determined in 1537 to keep a tighter control on the north after the Pilgrimage of Grace. It became the supreme executive authority for the five counties north of the Trent. In Henry VIII's reign the Council was responsible for maintaining order and for implementing the King's religious, social or economic policies by supervising the administration of local governments.[13] At the onset of Elisabeth's reign, enforcing religious observance had become especially important. The Council was instructed to assist the bishops in this matter and to correct and punish people disobeying the laws of the reformed church. For this purpose the Ecclesiastical Commission for the Northern Provinces, headed jointly by the Lord President and by the Archbishop of York, was set up and as part of the Council.[14] The Council was also a supreme court of justice, exercising the Crown's criminal and civil jurisdiction for the North of England. It had power similar to the central Court of Chancery, the Court of Requests and the Star Chamber in London.[15] These courts were instituted by the Tudor regimes in an attempt to modernise the country's

---

[10] A. G. Dickens, *Robert Holgate Archbishop of York and President of the King's Council in the North,* Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 8 (York, 1955), pp. 13-7.

[11] Tillott, *VCH York*, pp 136-7; *Palliser, Tudor York*, p. 261. See also Chapter 5.1.

[12] Reid, *The King's Council in the North*.

[13] F. W. Brooks, *York and the Council of the North*, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 5 (1954), pp. 4-10.

[14] Reid, *The King's Council in the North*, p. 344, pp. 191-208, 283-4, 291.

[15] Reid, *The King's Council in the North,* pp. 147-8; S. G.Ellis, 'The Limits of Power: the English Crown and the British Isles', in P. Collinson (ed.), *The Sixteenth Century 1485-1603* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 62-64.

antiquated legal system.[16] They were courts of equity, offering judgement based on the application of a general law to a particular circumstance.[17] This was achieved by following the procedures of civil law, inspired by Roman law and by its Renaissance developments.[18] The equity courts supplemented and corrected the common law courts such as the Court at Westminster and the local manorial and County courts. This process of modernisation of the law, however, took a different turn in the early seventeenth century. The dichotomy between common law, perceived as Parliamentarian, and civil law, perceived as Royalist, became exploited by political factions. Among this growing hostility the Council prestige declined until it was abolished in 1641.

During the second half of the sixteenth century the Council of the North's function as a Court became the most prominent. Its lawyers were carefully selected by the central government because the presence in the Council of both the best civil and common lawyers was considered important.[19] Civil lawyers were bachelors or doctors of law, graduated from the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge. The common lawyers were trained in the London Courts of Inns. The Council was a civil court, but its secretary from 1589-1612 was always a common lawyer, to guarantee expertise in both legal systems. Because it was a court of equity, offering judgement based on the swifter and fairer procedure of civil law, it became very popular.[20] By the beginning of the seventeenth century the Court at York attracted an increasing number of cases from the local courts. Its business consisted of 2,000 cases a year; about 450 cases were heard in each

---

[16] Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England*, pp. 124-5; Reid, *The King's Council in the North*, pp. 340-5.

[17] Reid, *The King's Council in the North*, pp. 341.

[18] Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England*, pp. 131-40.

[19] Reid, *The King's Council in the North*, p. 251.

[20] For the political relationship between common law and civil law from the Reformation to Civil War: Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England*, pp. 122-57; Reid, *The King's Council in the North,* pp. 340-67; D. M. Derret, *Henry Swinburne (1551?-1624) Civil Lawyer of York,* pp. 19-22; R. H. Helmholz, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England. The Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction from 597 to the 1640* (Oxford, 2004), pp. 237-309.

of the four court sessions. This compared with the 79 cases of the Court of Chancery in London.[21]

The Council's activity was focused along the axis between the King's Manor and the Close. (Map 1, 2) The King's Manor was the seat of the Council housing the residence of the President and other staff, as well as chambers for meetings and court halls.[22] However, the Office of the Secretary of the Council was established in the Close. Both locations had the advantages of being in an urban context independent from the City of York, being within the boundaries of the former Liberty of St Mary's Abbey and of the Liberty of St Peter. It was important for the Council to be on neutral ground with respect to local governments because one of its functions was to control and to resolve disputes between commonalties.[23]

The presence of the Council's offices and chambers within a dissolved monastery and a cathedral close was significant. It was a powerful statement of the role of the Council in establishing the Reformation. Previous meanings of the monastic buildings within the precinct of St Mary's Abbey may have been used to communicate effectively a new message. The westernmost range of the King's Manor consisted of a large, detached chamber above a vaulted undercroft or cellar. (Fig. 93) A date of construction at the beginning of the seventeenth century has been suggested on the basis of architectural details; however it is not clear if this was a redevelopment of a previous building. Part of the chamber was built on the site of the monastic chapter house which had been already pulled down by the 1550s.[24] *Spolia* from the monastic buildings were reused in its construction. (Fig. 94) The chamber overlooked the gardens and the river and as such may have also had the function of a gallery. Everson and Stocker suggest that this was a prospect building designed to see from and to be seen. It

---

[21] Reid, *The King's Council in the North*, p. 344.

[22] Brooks, *York and the Council*.

[23] Brooks, *York and the Council*, p. 7.

[24] C. Norton, 'The Building of St Mary's Abbey, York and their Destruction', *Antiquaries Journal* 74(1994), pp. 271-5.

controlled access from the river and St Mary's gatehouse and, being in a high location, advertised the authority of the Council further into the landscape.[25] Moreover Everson and Stocker suggest that this choice of location was symbolic of the "reformation" of the previous functions of the chapter house.[26] This building represented the assembly of the monastic community and as such was a prime target of destruction during the dissolution.[27] However, this interpretation could be developed further. Chapter houses in monastic and cathedral complexes were secular buildings with a multiplicity of meanings.[28] One of their main connotations was judicial; they were the place where justice was administered, penance carried out and absolution given. In the Minster Close, the Chapter House, even after the Reformation, advertised the Dean and Chapter's legal jurisdiction to the town and the countryside.[29] One of the most important roles of the Council of the North was judicial. Not only was it a secular court of law but the Ecclesiastical Commission was a spiritual tribunal. The chamber built on the site of the monastic chapter house therefore communicated the continuity of the judicial role.

The principal access to the King's Manor from the city streets was the postern by the former Abbot's Lodging. The public and the justices lodging in the Close would have transited through Low Petergate and the Bootham Bar. From the early seventeenth century they would have entered the inner courtyard by two stone portals, decorated with allegories.[30] At present these are displayed side by side on the façade of the King's Manor, but originally may have been paired on the exterior and interior of the same entrance porch. (Fig. 95) Two caryatids

---

[25] Everson and Stocker, 'The Archaeology of Vice-Regality', p.155.

[26] Everson and Stocker, 'The Archaeology of Vice-Regality', p. 155-6.

[27] M. Howard, 'Recycling the Monastic Fabric', in D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003), pp. 226-7 ; Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close*, p. 210.

[28] W.S. Gardner, 'The Role of Central Planning in English Romanesque Chapter House Design', Princeton University, unpublished PhD thesis (1976), pp. 173-194; P. Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets. Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400* (New Haven and London, 1996), p. 187.

[29] Chapter 1, p. 30.

[30] RCHME, *York. East of the Ouse*, pp.31-33.

supporting a Ionic capital were a reference to the visual vocabulary of antiquity. In the spandrels of the portals the four cardinal virtues are represented, sending a message to suitors arriving for or departing from court hearings. Justice, holding sword and scale, and Truth, holding a mirror and fighting a snake, may have been on the exterior.[31](Fig. 96) Fortitude and Temperance, the latter now very worn, would have given an appropriate message to the suitors, winning or losing, leaving the tribunals. (Fig. 97)

Within the Close, the Office of the Secretary of the Council of the North was established in a large house belonging to the Dean and Chapter facing the west front of the cathedral.[32] This office was the point of contact between the public and the Council, its staff dealing with the legal cases to be heard in its Court. The staff comprised of the Secretary, an attorney, two examiners of witnesses, a clerk of the Court or registrar and two clerks of the Seal, one Clerk of the Ticket and fourteen clerks who acted as attorneys.[33] It would have also contained the archives of the Council.[34] By the beginning of the seventeenth century thousands of people, between suitors and witnesses, may have visited the Minster Yard on legal business. Therefore the Close regained the importance it lost as a provincial centre with the end of the pilgrimages, attracting people from the whole North of England.

The presence of the Office of the Secretary in front of the cathedral needs to be explained. Why was the Office not located within the King's Manor, which was not lacking in available space for redevelopment? The choice may have been a strategic one for several reasons. The Close had the advantage of being in the town centre, attracting visitors inside the walls where their needs could be

---

[31] N. Llewellyn, 'The Iconography of the Monuments to the Dead for the Living', in L. Gent and N. Llewellyn (eds), *Renaissance Bodies. The Human Figure in English Culture c. 1540-1660* (London, 1990), p. 222. Hunneyball, *Architecture*, p. 173.

[32] See chapter 2. 2. 1, p. 61.

[33] Reid, *The King's Council in the North*, pp. 243-160.

[34] G. E. Aylmer, 'The Council in the North: a Note on the Location of the Secretary's Office', *York Historian* 2 (1978), pp. 21-3.

catered for by the local inns and shops. More importantly the Council had the duty to enforce religious observance including attendance to sermons. The location of the Office of the Secretary opposite the ceremonial entrance of the cathedral would have been a powerful symbol of this control. Moreover, the Close was already connected with judiciary activity with the presence of the courts and prisons of the Liberty of St Peter and the Archbishop's. Therefore there was an already well established *habitus* for its legal use.

The Secular and Ecclesiastical Courts within the Close

One secular jurisdiction, the Liberty of St Peter, and two spiritual ones, the Dean and Chapter Peculiar and the Archbishop's jurisdiction, held their courts in the Close in the late medieval period. All of these courts continued their activities after the Reformation. The courts of the secular Liberty were held in the Hall of the Liberty, above Peter Prison in the West Minster Yard.[35] In 1582 this was provided with desks and bars for the attorneys who administered justice for the tenants of the Dean and Chapter. [36] Weekly petty sessions were held on Saturdays, dealing with theft and criminal behaviour often arising during this marked day. Quarter session of the Court of Common Pleas dealing with cases of trespass, debt and assault were held every three weeks on a Wednesday. The court of "leet" met twice a year. Its purpose was to exercise control on structures in the landscape important both for the preservation of the land and for the marking of boundaries. Parishioners of the Liberty failing to maintain ditches and hedges were summoned by this court. However, the Close and subjects of the Liberty living in York were also under the jurisdiction of the Wardmote courts.[37] The magistrates of the Liberty were appointed by the Commission of the Peace, under the control of the Council of the North after the Reformation. The dean and canons residentiariy were always among the number of justices nominated. The staff of the courts included stewards, coroners, a registrar, a clerk, a

---

[35] Leak, *The Liberty,* contains also brief information on the early history of the Liberty Courts.

[36] Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, p. 118.

[37] See Chapter 6.4, p. 342-3.

constable and two bailiffs. The latter derived part of their income from the rent of two chambers above the West Minster gates.[38]

The courts of two ecclesiastical jurisdictions continued to be held in the Close after the Reformation. The Peculiar Jurisdiction of the Dean and Chapter administered canon law and was responsible for the same people subject to the Liberty. Its centralised court, the *curia audiencie*, was based in the Close. Causes could be heard by a tribunal composed by the canons in the Chapter House or by a deputy, the *auditor causarum*, in the north transept. Some of the cases could also be heard in the *scriptorium* of the Dean and Chapter but there is no indication for the location of this room.[39] The court of audience had no fixed hearings until 1554. By then, because of the increase in cases, two sessions were held weekly on Wednesdays and Fridays.[40] The Archbishop's jurisdiction held four courts. The Consistory Court and the Exchequer were diocesan courts; the first administered canon law on several spiritual issues while the second specialised in testamentary law. The Court of Audiences, or Chancery, and the Prerogative Court were provincial courts. The first dealt with appeal cases from other consistory courts in the archdioceses and the second was competent for testamentary law for people with estates dispersed in several dioceses. Court hearings had no sessions or set times, however, the Exchequer court was held only on Fridays between 9 to 11 in the morning and 1 to 5 in the afternoon.[41]

The ecclesiastical courts after the Reformation were staffed by civil lawyers, because the study of canon law was discouraged if not considered dangerous.[42] They dealt with three types of legal business. In cases *ex officio*, infringements of the law were corrected by the judge without need of a plaintiff. These were cases regarding clergy discipline and social concerns such as sexual morality, perjury

---

[38] See Chapter 3, p. 159.

[39] Brown, *The Medieval Courts*, p. 6.

[40] K. M. Longley, *Ecclesiastical Cause Papers at York: Dean and Chapter Court 1350-1843*, Borthwhich Texts and Calendars. Records of the Northern Province, 6 (1980), p. xi.

[41] C. I. A. Ritchie, *The Ecclesiastical Courts of York* (Arbroath, 1956), p. 18.

[42] R. H. Helmholz, *The Oxford History of the Laws of England,* pp. 311-642 for a detailed study of the working of civil courts; Brown, *The Medieval Courts,* pp. 4-6.

and defamation. Spiritual problems such as non-attendance at church, Sunday trading, blasphemy, drunkenness, witchcraft, heresy and recusancy were also dealt in this way. For example in 1547 Sacramentarian heretics were judged in the Chapter House and committed to the Archbishop's Prison.[43] This continued to be used as an archdiocesan prison for all the spiritual courts, symbolising the enforcement of religious orthodoxy. The second type of legal case in the ecclesiastical courts was "instance" cases, which were suits brought by a plaintiff against a defendant. Most of this business consisted of registration of bonds and of cases of defamation. Since the thirteenth century the ecclesiastical courts were chosen in preference to common law ones because their equitable procedure was swifter.[44] In the sixteen century there was a huge increase in the cases dealt with by these courts.[45] The third type of case was testamentary and matrimonial issues.

The Chapter House continued its judicial function for the cases deserving the attention of the Dean and Chapter. Most causes, however, were heard more publicly in the cathedral north transept. A structure, perhaps including a bench and a sitting arrangement for the *auditor causarum*, was located just outside the Chapter House vestibule. The Archbishop's courts were located in the northern bay of the north aisle of the north transept of the cathedral. This place was simply called Consistory. (Fig. 99, 100) A doorway in the west side wall of the north transept gave access to the Palace Yard and was probably originally intended as the archbishop's private entrance to his court.[46] (Fig. 101) The area was separated from the rest of the cathedral by screens between the northern pillar and the transept's walls.[47] These fittings may have been made of wainscot like the ones of the Consistory in the cathedral of Chester and were pulled down in 1776.[48]

---

[43] Tillott, *VCH York*, p. 143-4.

[44] Brown, *The Medieval Courts*, p. 19.

[45] J.A. Sharpe, *Defamation and Sexual Slander in Early Modern England: the Church Courts at York*, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 58 (1980), pp. 3-4.

[46] Brown, *York Minster*, p. 35.

[47] Ritchie, *The Ecclesiastical Courts*, pp. 15, 19.

[48] YML, MS. XVI. D. 17. Thomas Beckwith, *History of York 1140-1788.*

Holes in the pillar's stones mark their position at a height of 2.22m above the floor level. The stones have a terminus *ante quem* of 1706 from graffiti and therefore were not replaced in later restoration. (Fig. 102) A filled mortice hole on the transept's north wall corresponds to the holes on the pillar. A repair in the Burlington floor along this line suggests that a mortice for a door may have been there.[49] The arrangement of the interior fittings of the court can be reconstructed from two plans of the Minster, one dating to before the refurbishment of 1726 and the other by Drake dating to 1736. At the centre of the bay there was a square platform raised on two steps, perhaps supporting the seat of the judge. On three sides of the bay there was a gallery raised on three steps. This may have supported the desks and bars for lawyers, registrars and clerks. The judgement in ecclesiastical courts was summary, relying only on the decision of the judge and therefore there was no need for a jury. The Consistory would have been screened from view but otherwise open towards the transept. Court hearings were therefore aurally accessible to the public in the northern transept. Moreover the raised seat of the judge may have helped in projecting his voice above the screens. Audibility may have been important for the ecclesiastical courts because the judgement on cases of spiritual and social nature (see below) provided an example of correct behaviour. However, the hearings in the Consistory were noisy and in the seventeenth century there were complaints that they were disrupting divine services in the choir.[50]

The Archbishop's courts had a *scriptorium*, where proctors and advocated met their clients. There was also an *officium* or archive. The mention of two keys indicates that these were two separate places.[51] It is likely that they were located in the building called the Exchequer Office. This was opposite the cathedral South Door, abutting the east façade of St Michael-le-Belfrey. Between 1531 and 1544 it was rebuilt as a two storey building. The reason for the redevelopment may have been its proximity with the rebuilt church, however it is possible that

---

[49] YMA, E3/62/1, a new fir door was made in 1607.

[50] BIHR, D/C York, V. 1662-3; cited in Longley, *Ecclesiastical Cause Papers*, p. xii.

[51] Ritchie, *The Ecclesiastical Courts*, p. 15.

the increase in the activity of the courts required more space for the archives and for the legal staff.

The lawyers

The increase in business of ecclesiastical courts and the establishment of the Office of the Secretary made the Close a centre attracting people from the hinterland, the dioceses and the five Northern counties. These courts were staffed by lawyers and clerks and officers whose presence transformed the society of the Close. In both secular and ecclesiastical courts business the plaintiffs and defendants could have appeared personally; but most commonly they appointed a proctor to represent them. These lawyers were not required to have a degree in law but they assessed and prepared the case to be taken to court.[52] Since they were the first experts to be consulted, their offices were appropriately located in Petergate next to the Gates of the Close. A two storey narrow building, abutting Peter Prison and the West Minster Gates, up to the 1640s was divided in several offices or studies.[53] In the 1570s proctors representing cases for several courts, such as James Stoke and Edward Fawcett, were probably based there.[54] In the same period the house abutting the South Minster Gates was occupied by John Farloy, a proctor specialising in causes for the Archbishop's Exchequer. His office was conveniently located for access to the Exchequer which was abutting his property. When necessary the proctor would have appointed an advocate. These were lawyers with a degree in civil law or trained in common law and members of the Inns of Courts. The latter were part of the staff of the Council of the North. The civil lawyers, on the other hand, could have held several positions in various courts.[55] In addition they were allowed to have private practices as advocates.

---

[52] Brown, *The Medieval Courts*, pp. 20-8; Ritchie, *The Ecclesiastical Courts*, pp. 52-6.

[53] See Chapter 2. 2. 1, p. 54.

[54] Ritchie, *The Ecclesiastical Courts*, p. 69.

[55] Ritchie, *The Ecclesiastical Courts*, p. 60-5; Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England*, p. 205-82, biographies.

The advocates were consulted by the proctors or by the clients in their offices within the Close. Sir John Ferne of Inner Temple, Secretary of the Council between 1595-9 had several offices in one of the houses to the west of St Michael-le-Belfrey. Two gentlemen may have been also lawyers. Mr Penrose had the lease of two chambers as "his office or place to write in" behind the Masons' Lodge and Richard Bell had his in the Gate Lodge.[56] However, most of the lawyers would have had their office in their home in one of the mansions. The former mansion of South Cave was the residence of a succession of Secretaries of the Council from 1578 until 1633.[57] Therefore the Office of the Secretary and its private residence were both facing the cathedral on the corners of Precentors' Court. This street became the address of gentlemen lawyers connected with the Council. The Subdeanery was redeveloped in 1576 by Richard Frankland, a notary and general registrar of the courts of the Dean and Chapter, Archbishop and Council.[58] In 1595 this mansion was then leased to William Payler of Grays Inn, attorney general of the Council, and to William Watkinson, gentleman in the County of York.[59] The mansion of Fenton was acquired, for several lives, by Edward Stanhope of Grays Inn (not to be confused with his elder brother Edward, a civil lawyer and prebendary), when in 1587 he became a member of the Council and Recorder of Doncaster.[60] The Wright House, after its expansion in 1584, was in the joint tenure of the gentlemen Frankland and Watkinson. Later, until 1616, it was the residence of Sir George Ellis, common lawyer and judge of the Council.[61] During court sessions the judges were also regular guests in the Subdeanery. Common lawyers were usually landed gentry who were in town only for the court sessions but spent the rest of the year in their country estates.[62]

---

[56] See Chapter 2, pp. 52-3 and p. 80.

[57] YMA, E3/51-63.

[58] YMA, Wb, fols. 281v-282 (1st); Ritchie, *The Ecclesiastical Courts,* pp. 51-2.

[59] YMA, Wc, fols. 90-90v.

[60] YMA, Wb, fols. 370v-371; Reid, *The King's Council in the North,* p. 495.

[61] YMA, Wc, fols. 218-218v; Reid, *The King's Council in the North,* p.498.

[62] Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England*, pp. 34-5.

The best prebendal mansions on the eastern area of the Close, Stillington,
Ullerskelf and Langtoft, were occupied by a succession of civil lawyers serving
as judges in the Archbishop's courts. The lay judge Richard Pierce redeveloped
the dilapidated mansion of Stillington in 1577.[63] This was leased in 1592 to
William Palmer, chancellor, a preacher but servings as deputy judge.[64] The
mansion of Ullerskelf was occupied by the judge and lay prebendary John
Gibson before 1582 and between 1588 and 1608 by John Bennet, also judge and
lay prebendary.[65] William Ingram, lay judge and brother of Sir Arthur, lived
there from 1609 until his death in 1623.[66] The mansion of Langtoft was leased to
Robert Lawghter, lay civil lawyer, in 1597.[67] The famous author and judge
Henry Swinbourne, from 1605 until 1624 lived and had his office in the former
Mason's Lodge, opposite the Exchequer Office.[68]

Civil lawyers were courtiers and civil servants. They studied civil law, based on
Roman law, at Oxford or Cambridge. After their education, since Roman law
was the base for international law, they were employed in the diplomatic service
and in central government offices. Others worked in Episcopal courts or taught in
universities.[69] But the most profitable positions were the ones of judge in the
Archiepiscopal Courts of Canterbury and York. The judges were selected
personally by the Archbishop after an experience of many years in the central
courts.[70] In York the possibility of also holding offices for the Council of the
North attracted the most prominent civilians. Some of them were made
prebendaries and as such had a higher income and higher status. This was
reflected by the ceremonial order of precedence; they came immediately after the

---

[63] YMA, Wb, fols 295v-296; Ritchie, *The Ecclesiastical Courts,* p. 18.

[64] YMA, Wc, fol. 27; Ritchie, *The Ecclesiastical Courts,* p. 14.

[65] YMA, Wb, fol. 315v; Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England*, pp. 165-6 , 232-3; YMA , Wc,
fols. 23v-24; Ibid., pp. 209-10.

[66] BIHR, CC. Ab. 9. York; Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England*, p. 243.

[67] YMA, Wb, fol. 312; Wc, fols. 156v-157; Ritchie, *The Ecclesiastical Courts,* pp. 38, 60.

[68] YMA, Wc, fol. 248; J. D. M. Derrett, *Henry Swinburne (?1551-1624). Civil Lawyer of York,*
Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 44 (1973).

[69] Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England*, pp. 7-43.

[70] Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England*, p. 27. Ritchie, *The Ecclesiastical Courts*, p. 60.

Lord Mayor but before the senior Aldermen.[71] However, not all civil lawyers who were also prebendaries were clergy, because many of them refused to take the holy orders. At the Reformation the study of canon law was discouraged, whilst the study of civil law was thriving. Graduates in civil law were needed to staff the ecclesiastical courts, which followed a civil procedure. The number of civil lawyers was small compared to a larger number of common lawyers and they were much in demand for government jobs. To encourage civilians to work for the ecclesiastical courts, a royal statute of 1546 allowed them to hold prebends and residentiaries offices without taking the holy orders.[72] This situation created some tension within cathedral closes. In York the judge John Gibson was made prebendary and residentiary by Queen Elizabeth. However, she kept calling him back to London or sending him on diplomatic missions. Dean Hutton protested with the queen because this prevented Jackson from performing his duties as judge and as residentiary.

In contrast with the common lawyer, who belonged to the local gentry's society, the civil lawyers usually had no local roots. Moreover their social origin at the beginning of the seventeenth century was more varied than the one of the common lawyers. However, the most important factor for the civilians' isolation was the nature of their work. Ecclesiastical courts had no sessions but worked all year round. The judges were constantly on call and this prevented them, even if they had land, to lead the life of the landed gentry. For this reasons civilians were urban dwellers and lived close to their work place.[73] The Close therefore became an enclave where the civil lawyers lived permanently. They occupied the best mansions, located in the north-eastern part of the Close more secluded from the city streets and protected from the intrusion of undesirable people or activities. By contrast the mansions and lodgings in the area of Precentors' Court must have become more populated during the quarter sessions, for about five months a year.

---

[71] Ritchie, *The Ecclesiastical Courts*, p. 58.

[72] Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England*, pp. 160-4.

[73] Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England*, pp. 34-43.

Other residents in the Close not connected with the legal profession were also involved in the running of the courts. They served as apparitors, attending hearings and carrying out the orders of the judges. William Gibson, a tailor resident in Minster Gates in 1575, combined the role of apparitor for the Dean and Chapter with the one of Keeper of the Gates and of janitor for the Close.[74]

The function of the Courts: credit, good reputation and protection

The growth in activity of civil courts during the sixteenth century was not exclusive to York but was a phenomenon common to all English courts.[75] Two types of cases constituted this increase: registration of bonds and suits for slander and defamation. Equitable or civil courts, such as the Council of the North and the ecclesiastical courts were favoured for the registration of bonds. In all these, creditors could recover their money with simpler and quicker procedures than in the common law courts, where debtors could drag the case on longer.[76] In the late medieval period the volume of trade was growing fast but there were not enough coins in circulation. In York this problem was exacerbated at the Dissolution when ecclesiastical mints were abolished. A mint established in the dissolved St Leonard hospital may have relieved, but not solved, the problem.[77] Most transactions, therefore, had to rely on some form of credit. Craig Muldrew in his study of King's Lynn demonstrates how in the sixteenth century the expansion of credit created an economy of obligation, in which at all levels of society almost everyone was indebted to others. Creditors not only had to make sound decisions about the reliability of their immediate debtors but also they needed to trust these debtors' ability to make a correct judgement about their own debtors. The construction and maintenance of good reputation and character became very important during the course of the sixteenth century because it demonstrated credit worthiness. Thus not only moral qualities, such as honesty, were

---

[74] See Chapter 3, Ritchie, *The Ecclesiastical Courts,* p. 41.

[75] Wittinghton, *The Politics of Commonwealth*; Sharpe, *Defamation and Sexual Slander*.

[76] Reid, *The King's Council in the North*, pp. 297-315 ; Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England,* pp. 150-7.

[77] Palliser, *Tudor York,* p. 221.

considered necessary for trading and for maintaining a good life standard, but
also the behaviour of all family members needed to conform to an expected
norm.[78]

Between 1550 and 1640 the cases of slander and defamation in the ecclesiastical
courts of York were mostly brought by women.[79] They tried to defend their
sexual reputation from accusations of prostitution, adultery and immoral
behaviour. Poor people were not deterred from the costs of recurring to justice to
address slander. It has been suggested that this was to defend their reputation as
goodly poor, avoiding falling into the category of undeserving poor.[80] Even the
gentry, however, were preoccupied with their reputation. In 1601 Lady Hoby
went to a great length to obtain an apology from the sons of two powerful
neighbouring aristocratic families.[81] Lady Hoby sued in the Council of the North
but failed to obtain a satisfactory apology. Despite pressure by influential people
to settle the matter out of court, she took her case to the Court of Star Chamber in
London and won. The reputation of women reflected also upon the family and
the male head of household and therefore contributed to the perception of credit
worthiness.[82] Changing ideas about the household and the role and order of the
nuclear family may have further pressurised women into a normative and
acceptable behaviour.[83]

Furthermore, with the expansion of credit many people lived with debts that they
were only able to repay after death with their estate and possessions. The display
of an abundance of household goods and clothing was not only a display of status
but also served the purpose of demonstrating creditworthiness, necessary for
maintaining a good position in society. As already mentioned, one of the major

---

[78] Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation*.

[79] BIHR, CP, H.

[80] Sharpe, *Defamation and Sexual Slander*.

[81] Moody, *The Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby*, pp. xlvi-li.

[82] L. Gowing, '"The Freedom of the Streets": Women and Social Space, 1560-1640', in P.
Griffiths and M.S.R. Jenner*, Londinopolis: Essays in the Cultural and Social History of Early
Modern London.* (Manchester, 2000), p. 137.

[83] Sharpe, *Defamation and Sexual Slander*.

roles of the ecclesiastical courts was the administration of testamentary law.[84] The number of wills and inventories in York increased decade by decade during the sixteenth century.[85] A carefully drawn will in the presence of witnesses may have been another way to display credit worthiness. The probate inventories meticulously list an increasing volume of household goods, valued by expert shopkeepers, which served to appraise the value of the estate of the deceased and to assess their credits and debts. However, there were often problems with the execution of testaments and the economic circumstances of widows and orphans could have been undermined by the claims of other parties.[86] The Archbishop's Exchequer court was dedicated to this business and the role of the judges was also to protect vulnerable people from becoming destitute. Henry Swinbourne's epitaph in York Minster refers to the widows and orphans which he protected with his legal work.[87] The experience gained by this judge on these matters resulted in a book *A Briefe Treatise of Testamenst and Last Wills*, which was the first treatise in England on family and testamentary law and was a reference legal work for the following 200 years.

The Close became important as a legal centre. In the ecclesiastical courts good reputation and credit were constructed or damaged. In the second half of the sixteenth century a reliable system to guarantee credit was vital for the new developments in the growth and retail distribution of consumer goods in the city. Phil Wittinghton shows that there is a correlation between the development of courts of law and the incorporations of towns in the sixteenth and seventeenth

---

[84] E. Welch, *Shopping in the Renaissance. Consumer Cultures in Italy 1400-1600* (New Haven and London, 2005), p. 92.

[85] Cross, *York Clergy Wills*, p ix.

[86] R. Grassby, *The Business Community of Seventeenth Century England* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 330-1.

[87] Derrett, *Henry Swinburne,* p. 28.

centuries.[88] Courts were needed to guarantee credit, this in turn was necessary for the development of shops as retail outlets.[89]

Trade in the Minster Yard

Connected with ecclesiastical locations and coinciding with feasts of the liturgical calendars, fairs were an important trade institution established during the Middle Ages. They attracted a crowd to a place and performed several other functions. The lordship of a fair was a profitable asset since tolls were charged for the goods sold and bought. The Archbishop's fair was held yearly at the feast of St Peter in Vincula, or Lammas day, over the course of two days. The fair was held in the city streets and the Archbishop collected rent from the sale of goods and tolls at the city gates.[90] The Dean and Chapter had the lordship of three fairs held in the Minster Yard. These were held at Candlemas, Pentecost and St Michael. The tolls and stallage fees for these fairs in the sixteenth and seventeenth century provided part of the income of the Keeper of the Gates.[91] He was responsible for organising the stalls and kept the required implements in rooms above the West Minster Gates.

In the sixteenth century fairs were still seen as important in stimulating city economy; in 1501 the city of York obtained a charter for holding a second fair in the city at St Luckes. [92] While weekly markets sold victuals and everyday merchandise, other manufactured or imported commodities were mainly bought at fairs or in shops. In sixteenth-century York the first two days of city fairs were devoted to the sale of animals and agricultural products and the subsequent days were dedicated to the display of manufactured goods, such as clothing, household goods and furnishing, ironware, spices and some luxury goods such as

---

[88] Wittinghton, *The Politics of Commonwealth*.

[89] R. M. Berger, *The Most Necessary Luxuries. The Mercers' Company of Coventry 1550-1680* (Pennsylvania State University, 1993).

[90] H. Richardson, *The Medieval Fairs and Markets of York,* Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, St Anthony's Hall Publications 20 (1961), pp. 11-15.

[91] YMA, Wb, fols. 36v-37; Wb, fol. 282;Wc, fol. 270.

[92] Richardson, *The Medieval Fairs*, p.16.

jewellery.[93] Carole Shammas suggests that there was an increase in demand and availability of household goods from the sixteenth century onwards. Consumers with modest means relied on markets and fairs to provide them with a range of cheaper, affordable goods.[94] However, even great households shopped at fairs for both provisions such as groceries and more special items.[95] Fairs were connected to feasts of the liturgical calendars and were times of great excitement, breaking the patterns of everyday life. A wide range of extraordinary and exotic goods would be displayed in the streets and change the urban environment into a different place. Fairs attracted people from the hinterland not only for the buying and selling of goods, but also for their entertainment value. [96] Street performers were one of the attractions; potentially subversive literature was distributed in the form of ballads by the literate vagrant community.[97] These large gatherings therefore needed to be carefully policed for censorship along with looking out for various other possible offences. Offences against the rules of trade or crimes against property and persons were swiftly dealt with by ordinary courts, such as that of the Liberty of St Peter, or by special ones, such as the Archbishop's "pie powder" (meaning "peddlars") court. Since people came to town on business, fair days were convenient dates for paying estate rents. Tenants of the Dean and Chapter were required to pay their rents twice a year. The Common Fund ones were paid at Pentecost and St Michael and the ones of the Fabric fund at Candlemas and Lammas, on the Haxby tomb in the cathedral.[98]

Shops at the beginning of the sixteenth century were catering mainly for the wealthier consumer, providing them with a continuity of service all year round. However, they were still workshops rather than retail outlets selling goods

---

[93] M. L. McCutcheon, *Yorkshire Fairs and Markets to the end of the Eighteenth Century*, Thoresby Society 39 (1940), pp. 128-9; Richardson, *The Medieval Fairs*, p. 17.

[94] C. Shammas, *The Pre-Industrial Consumer in England and America* (Oxford, 1990).

[95] Berger, *The Most Necessary Luxuries*, pp. 19-20.

[96] Welch, *Shopping in the Renaissance*, p. 167.

[97] R. C. Simmons, 'ABC, Almanacs, Ballads, Chapbooks, Popular Piety and Text Books', in J. Barnard and D. F. McKenzie (eds), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557-1695*, vol. 4 (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 510-1.

[98] See Chapter 4, p. 212.

sourced somewhere else. From the second half of the sixteenth century shops increasingly offered a greater range of services in provincial towns. They gradually replaced the fairs in the provision of luxury goods to the local gentry and to the wealthiest section of the population. The advantages offered by shops were facility of credit, continuity of service and above all customer care.[99]

Necessary luxuries: the development of shops

The only information about shops in the Minster Close before the 1560s comes from the list of rents in the Fabric Rolls.[100] Seven "shops" are attested in the Close in the first half of the sixteenth century. Until 1551 they were defined with the Latin term *opella*, literally a "small work". When the language of the Fabric Rolls was changed to English, *opella* was usually translated as "shop". Two of these can be identified with the workshops of early printers.[101] However, there is not enough information on the use of the other shops. From the late 1560s new shops were built and starting from the 1570s the leases give an almost complete picture of the commercial properties in the Close. The shopping areas in the Close were concentrated in the West Minster Yard, clustering around the West Minster Gates and between the South Minster Gates and the cathedral south doorway. Shops are also attested in the eighteenth century by the East Minster Gates, although there is no previous information. Shops were therefore concentrated by the entrances of the Close, attracting customers on their way to the cathedral or to the Courts of Law.

The ground floor of the gate lodge of the West Minster Gate was divided into three shops, two of these facing into the Close.[102] A house with four shops on the ground floor had been built, possibly early in the sixteenth century, abutting the

---

[99] Berger, *The Most Necessary Luxuries*, pp. 20-51; Grassby, *The Business Community*, pp. 175-8.

[100] Other shops may have been paying their rents to the Dean and Chapter Common Fund, However, the Chamberlain Rolls for the first three quarters of the sixteenth century are not useful.

[101] See Chapter 5. 2. pp. 262-4.

[102] See Chapter 2. 2.1. pp. 59-60.

gate lodge and almost facing the cathedral west doorway.[103] A five yard long and
narrow shop with a chamber on the upper floor stood against the wall of Peter's
Prison, making the most of the trading space just inside the West Minster Gates.
Two bookshops established next to the Minster west doorway in 1597, completed
the dense cluster of commercial premises in this area. This space was so
important commercially that the shops were crammed against these public
buildings, much restricting the open area in front of the cathedral. The row of
houses between the Gate Lodge and the former school house was established
since the fourteenth century and belonged to the Fabric Fund. On the ground
floor of at least some of the tenements, there were shops, which were certainly
trading towards Petergate, because they were within the boundaries of the City of
York. However, it is possible that they also had a counter in the back, towards
the Close. It is not possible to establish the nature of their business before the
second half of the seventeenth century. However, in 1618 there was a tailor shop.
A baker was resident in one of the houses, but it is not clear if he was using these
premises for business.[104] The appearance and function of this row, fronting the
city street and backing into a churchyard, can be compared to the fourteenth
century Lady's Row in Goodramgate, York. Rows of shops forming the
boundary of cathedrals precincts were attested also in Canterbury where they
would have originally attracted the pilgrims' trade.[105]

The second shopping area was along the street leading from the South Minster
Gates and the cathedral transept, expanded to the ground floors of the Deanery
and the former mansion Warthill. The houses on the corners with Petergate and
Minster Gates had shops on the ground floor facing into the Close since the
fifteenth century.[106] However, the area further north, towards the cathedral, was
commercially developed from the 1560s. Two rows of shops on both side of the

---

[103] See Chapter 2. 2. 1.

[104] YMA, Wd, fols. 44v-45.

[105] See Chapter 5.2. A. Quiney, *Town Houses of Medieval Britain* (New Haven and London, 1995), p. 40-2; Schofield, 'Urban Housing in England, 1400-1600', in D. Gaimster and P. Stamper (eds), *The Age of Transition. The Archaeology of English Culture 1400-1600*, The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 15, Oxbow Monograph 98 (1997), p. 132.

[106] See Chapter 2. 3. 3. pp. 94-6.

cathedral transept were built in the late 1560s. They were the first development project to be carried out and it could be argued that they were purpose built to be bookshops. As such their significance in this precise location will be discussed in Chapter 5.2. In 1574 a tenement in the west side of Minster Gates was redeveloped as a house with two shops. This had been the house and workshop of the printer John Gachet until 1544. The property was then redeveloped as the residence and shops of the tailor William Gibson.[107] This means that at the time of the works either he was already the tenant or was waiting to move there. Next to this house a large plot of vacant land on the corner between Minster Gates and the Minster Yard was developed in 1576 with the construction of a new house with two shops. The new property was leased immediately after its construction to the goldsmith William Rawnson.[108] He was active as a goldsmith from 1562 and member of the corporation of the City of York goldsmiths between 1583 and 1600.[109] The sequence of development and tenancy of these three mixed commercial and domestic properties suggests that the Dean and Chapter invested in building works only when they had a prospective tenants. Thus it is possible that these tenants may have had a say in the arrangement of the shops, which would have become their business premises for several decades.

At the end of the sixteenth century there was a growing demand for trading space in the area of the Minster Gates. This was the main access from the city to the cathedral. Moreover, the south doorway gave access to the choir, where the divine services took place and to the north transept, where the ecclesiastical courts were held. By the early 1600s even the Dean converted some of his estate for trading purposes. One of the ground floor chambers of the Deanery's medieval east wing was used as a tailor shop. [110] The chambers of the former mansion of Warthill, by then part of the Deanery, had been also transformed into

---

[107] See Chapter 2. 3. 3. pp. 96-99.

[108] YMA, Wb, fols. 289-290.

[109] H. Murray, *Directory of York Goldsmiths Silversmiths and Associated Craftsmen* (York, 1998), pp. 7-9.

[110] YMA, S3/5b, fol. 153.

commercial premises and leased to booksellers.[111] On the eastern corner between
Minster Gates and the Minster Yard, a house and two shops were built abutting
and belonging to the Deanery.[112]

The description of the second of the Deanery shops demonstrates how shops,
whether pre-existing or new built, were making the most of the street frontage.
This was a narrow band, with a street frontage of four yards and a depth tapering
from two feet to one yard. Shops adapted to the topography of the area, abutting
pre-existing buildings. In this case a long frontage and a narrow depth made the
most of an awkward corner.[113] Other shops shared the street frontage with
neighbouring ones, having a frontage between one and two yard long and a
greater depth.[114] Their size and appearance seem to continue the one of late
medieval shops. The space inside the shops was only big enough for one person
to work there and to store some of the goods, perhaps on shelves or hooks. The
cellars (sellars) mentioned in the leases of the majority of commercial properties,
may have been spaces used to store some of the merchandise. In London and
Norwich, cellars were often added to properties in sixteenth century, because of
the growing volume of goods to be stored.[115] Apart perhaps from the two
bookseller booths by the cathedral West Doorway, all shops had domestic
accommodation on upper floors. Extra storage space may have been found there.

The commercial advantages of shops in prime locations may have been indicated
by their rental value as stated in the leases. This may not always be a reliable
indication, because the nominal yearly rent may have stayed the same for a
century or so, but entry fees or substantial refurbishment could have been paid by
the tenants. However, it is interesting to compare the rental values of the
properties built or redeveloped in the late sixteenth century. The value of each of

---

[111] See Chapter 5.2.

[112] See Chapter 2. 3. 3, pp. 100-1.

[113] See Chapter 2. 3. 3, pp. 100-1.

[114] See Chapter 2, pp. 62-4, the four shops, 96 the shops in Minster Gates street.

[115] Orlin, *Locating Privacy*, p. 314, Schofield, *Medieval London Houses*, p. 135 and 141. M.
Atkin , A. Carter, D. Evans*, Excavations in Norwich 1971-8 Part II*, East Anglian Archaeology
26 (1985).

the two properties by the cathedral south doorway was 53 s for the west side and
£ 3, 3 s and 2 p for east side, as much as the best prebendal mansions.[116] The
rental value for the shop on the west side of the south doorway was greater than
the combined ones of all properties on the west side of Minster Gates, which
were substantial houses including seven shops. Therefore the location by the
cathedral doorway offered a distinct commercial advantage. On the West Minter
Yard the house with the four shops facing the cathedral west front, although
cheaper at 40s, was also very valuable. The two bookshops by the Minster west
great doorway were only 2 s each, because they had no accommodation but also
because they were built at the expenses of the tenant and given to the Dean and
Chapter. Therefore it must be concluded that the area in proximity of the
cathedral south entrance was perceived as the most commercially valuable in the
Close.

The information on building works gives some indication of the new shops'
appearance. The new house of the goldsmith Rawnson had a main shop and a
"little" shop. One of those would have faced towards the cathedral and the other
in Minster Gates. Both shops had a door, each with locks and key. The shop
windows had a hinged folding counter extending on the outside and an
overhanging board, fixed to a crochet to form a penthouse to protect the
merchandise from the weather.[117] Both these features served as shutters when
folded. In the row of bookshops abutting the cathedral south transept the
penthouse was a fixed feature running through the length of the rows. The
interface with the clients was articulated by the counter, also called "shop stall"
or "shop board" extending into the street. The street space, therefore, was part of
the trading space and commercial transactions were carried out across this
counter in full public view. Credit was important for the development of
consumer society in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and the success of
shops depended on their ability to offer credit. Since not all bonds were
registered in court, but only the ones involving larger sums, credit transaction

---

[116] YMA, Wc, fols. 43v-44; Wc, fols. 241v-241.

[117] See Chapter 2. 3. 3, p. 98.

and verbal agreements taking place in public were guaranteed by the presence of witnesses. In this way the future trustworthiness of the debtors was at stake.[118]

By the late sixteenth century the growth in retail in the Close was reflected by the need for more shop areas by expanding business at the expenses of the smaller ones. Some of the businesses were spreading across adjacent properties. The goldsmith Rawnson expanded his business acquiring the neighbouring "Gibson's house" and its two shops.[119] He also had the lease of a "little house" by the Chapter House, previously of the bookbinder Anthony Foster, used perhaps for keeping hens.[120] In 1580 two of the "four shops" in the West Minster Yard were occupied by the same milliner business. Other business expanded on several properties in different locations, sometimes also in Petergate. The seventeenth century expansion of the stationery business will be discussed in depth in the next section. In 1617 the widow of a tailor, Margaret Warthon, continued the family business from the shop abutting Peter Prison. She was also the tenant of a shop in the row in front of St Micheal-le-Belfrey and of another house in Petergate.[121] In conclusion the increase in trading space was not achieved by redesigning the space of the shops or by changing the shopping experience. The interface between the goods kept in the interior and the customer on the exterior was still represented by the counter. Expansion of the business was achieved by leasing other shops, although not necessarily contiguous ones.

The merchandise that was sold in the shops within the Close during the period covered by this research can be divided into clothing, household goods and books. Tailors were established in the area of Minster Gates, where they competed for space with the growing book trade. In the West Minster Yard they were more prominent in all the periods. From 1576 until at least 1587 two merchant tailors, Thomas Tennant of London and William Dawson of York,

---

[118] Welch, *Shopping in the Renaissance*, pp. 96-7.

[119] YMA, Wc, fols. 97v-98

[120] See Chapter 2. 5. 1, pp. 113-4.

[121] YMA, Wc, fols. 240v-241; Wc, fols. 276-276v.

were the tenants of the "four shops".[122] Tailors were dealing in local wool cloth
and from the second half of the sixteenth century they were also retailing
imported goods. Two draper businesses at the end of the sixteenth century were
located on both sides of the Minster Gates on the corners with Petergate and in
the Deanery shops.[123] By the seventeenth century provincial shops became expert
in catering for the changing tastes of the local gentry, which were increasingly
influenced by fashion. Not only were they satisfying the needs of their clients but
they were continuously creating the desire for new consumer goods.[124]
Sumptuary laws of 1533 and 1571 prescribed the fabric and dresses appropriate
for each social status. For instance red and blue velvet and some types of
imported wool were reserved for peers and knights. Taffeta, silk damasks and
gold and silver accessories were forbidden for people with an income of less than
£ 200 a year.[125] However, the desire for luxury goods was increasing at all levels
of society and the laws were continuously broken. There was a certain tolerance
for the transgression of sartorial boundaries at the higher level and usually only
people of lower status were prosecuted. However, in 1604 the Parliament
abolished sumptuary laws, ceasing to control the consumption of fashion.

By 1600 the inventories of provincial shops show that they stocked textiles with
a wide range of prices and quality, catering for needs ranging from the most
exclusive to the poorest clientele.[126] The "new draperies" made of worsted wool
were developed by the Flemish at the end of the sixteenth century and then
produced in England. These were lighter and more affordable than the traditional
wool cloth. Moreover, up to the end of the sixteenth century good quality
coloured fabrics were only produced in the continent and imported. The
increasing availability of high quality tropical dye material and improved dye
techniques allowed the production of polychrome cloth in England. This created

---

[122] YMA, Wb, fols. 305v-306. E3/55-61.

[123] YMA, Wc, fols. 274v-275, Wc, fols. 81-81v ; S3/5b, fols. 82-83.

[124] Berger, *The Most Necessary Luxuries*, pp. 15-57.

[125] Shammas, *The Pre-Industrial Consumer*, pp. 216-7.

[126] Berger, *The Most Necessary Luxuries*, pp. 37-8.

a revolution in the desire for colour in fashion.[127] People from the northern regions coming to the Close for court cases may have bought their novelty cloths in these shops.

One of the reasons why sumptuary laws were abolished is that Queen Elizabeth and her Court had developed a distinctive black and white style. This created a high status English sartorial identity, in contrast with the colourful imported Italian and French high fashion.[128] English Court fashion relied on the texture and volume of folded and pleated home produced linen, ruffles, embroidery and the best quality of English wool cloth. The lawyers in the Close continued to display this severe court style. Even if the Victorian restoration may have altered the original colour of their funerary monuments, Henry Swinburne, William Ingram and William Gee wear judge-gowns in black and heavy woven damask, decorated with abundant haberdashery and ruffle collars. (Fig. 89, 90) The lawyers' wives and children are in severe, plain clothes, with heavy veils on their heads. These may also have been mourning clothes, though the severity and heaviness of these dresses may be due to the sculptors' lack of skill. By contrasts the contemporary monuments by Nicholas Stone of Henry Belasis and of Anna Bennett show women's dresses in greater details. The finesse of the fabrics, the quality of the embroidery and the lightness of the new draperies gathered on their shoulders are rendered in the sculpted marble. (Fig, 92)

The more elaborate decorative details for dresses were sold by haberdashers.[129] They were specialist in trimmings, buttons and lace, imported silk and also special items such as fans or masks. A haberdasher sublet one of the "four shops" tenanted by a tailor.[130]This shows how clients could co-ordinate the details of entire outfits within a short distance. By 1605 in the same shops, another haberdasher was next to the business of a milliner, who would have retailed

---

[127] Shneider, 'Fantastic Colors' p.119

[128] Shneider, 'Fantastic Colors'.

[129] Berger, *The Most Necessary Luxuries*, pp 35-7.

[130] YMA, Wb, fols. 305v-306.

upmarket hats in this prominent location facing the cathedral doorway.[131]
Another milliner replaced the draper shop at the corner with Petergate and
Minster Gate in the 1620s. The shop of a leather dresser, next to the milliner in
the "four shops", completed the selection of dress accessories.[132] Leather crafts
were growing in importance in sixteenth-century York and this shop would have
sold leather items or prepared skins.[133] The latter may have been taken to the
neighbouring milliners to make leather hats, or taken to an upholsterer to be
fashioned into custom-made soft furnishing. An upholstery business was a long
term establishment in one of the Gate Lodge shops. Soft furnishing was very
important for comfort in the home. [134] Plain or coloured leather hangings were
the main décor of walls of rooms which were not wainscoted. The "blue
chamber" in the redeveloped Subdeanery may have had painted walls or
hangings and soft furnishing of that colour. In the mid 1570s blue was a very
expensive dye, made with indigo plant imported or local and only became more
common in the seventeenth century.[135] Cushions in leather or fabric added
padding and colour to wooden furniture. Probate inventories show an increase in
the quantity of cushions, bolster and mattresses to such an extent that Carol
Shammas named this period "the age of the bed".[136] Cushions were also
important to take to church for kneeling upon, as funerary monuments show.
Furthermore, leather was used by the neighbouring bookbinders to prepare
custom made book covers for different tastes and purses.

The most precious goods for the household and for personal ornament were the
ones sold by goldsmiths. One of the "four shops" prior to 1580 was occupied by
a goldsmith and, as already explained, in 1576 Rawnson's shops were
established in Minster Gates. A goldsmith sold and crafted not only jewellery,
but mostly silver wear for the home. Rawnson bought old silver from the Minster

---

[131] YMA, Wc, fols. 281v-282. By 1605 another milliner occupied both shops.

[132] YMA, Wc, fols. 281v-282.

[133] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 154-8, 162-4.

[134] Thornton, *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration*, pp. 97-129.

[135] Shneider, 'Fantastical Colors', p. 112.

[136] Shammas, *The Pre-Industrial Consumer*.

to reuse in his craft and made a new bowl for the cathedral from an old silver one in 1579.[137] Possibly this was some silver that the cathedral managed to retain after the Reformation. The position on the corner with Minster Gates and the expansion of the business over four shops after 1581 made Rawnson's shop one of the most prominent in the Close.[138] Goldsmith's shops are known from the abundant visual sources from London. In the sixteenth century they were based along very central Cheapside, in Goldsmiths' Row. But at the beginning of the seventeenth century they moved their business in the newly developed suburbs towards Westminster, the Strand and Holborn.[139] Trading outside the City of London and its corporate rules may have had its advantages, but it seems that the London goldsmiths moved their premises according to the changing habits of their clientele. In Westminster they would have benefited not only from the trade of the local resident gentlemen and courtiers, but also from clients coming to the central courts of law from many parts of England.[140] No amount of pressure from the city authorities and even by the king could bring them back to Cheapside. In the City of York the Goldsmiths were a small but wealthy corporation, they set strict rules to protect their trade from goldsmiths who were not freemen, trading in the Liberty of St Peter.[141] William Rawnson joined the corporation of Goldsmiths between 1583 and 1600. Perhaps he yielded to a growing pressure from the City to gain control on the various crafts people and traders in the Close. In 1606 there was a renewed campaign against non-freemen goldsmiths, trading from the Close. Clients from the city were fined 40s for commissioning work by them.[142] This action by the City suggests that the Close was a trading space were goldsmith wanted to establish their business. Not only could they

---

[137] Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, pp. 116, 137.

[138] YMA, Wc, fols. 97v-98.

[139] P. Griffith, 'Politics Made Visible: Order, Residence and Uniformity in Cheapside, 1600-45', in P. Griffiths and M.S.R. Jenner (eds), *Londinopolis: Essays in the Cultural and Social History of Early Modern London* (Manchester, 2000), pp. 177-8.

[140] I.W. Archer, 'Material Londoners?', in L.C. Orlin (ed.), *Material London* (Philadelphia, 2000), p. 176

[141] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp 146-178 for explanation of occupational structure in York.

[142] YCA B 28 fol 164. Murray, *York Goldsmiths*, p 8.

have avoided paying for the status of freemen, but above all they may have considered it a prime commercial space.

In late sixteenth-century London, growth in litigation in the courts and the development of shops were related. For wealthy people from the counties, going to court sessions in London was the occasion for shopping expeditions to buy or browse for new things.[143] The expansion of luxury shops in the Minster Close, suggests that by the end of the sixteenth century this had became a shopping centre for these commodities. York was a provincial capital with its own base of regular clients. The quarter sessions of the Council of the North attracted the society of local and northern gentry, as Lady Hoby's periodic trips to York show. She arrived with a shopping list from her household, to buy things that were not possible to buy locally.[144] Moreover the courts of law attracted people on legal business from the northern regions and the Close was well placed for attracting their custom.

Educating the shopkeepers: the apprentice system

The change from local workshops to retail outlets of imported goods required the shopkeepers to develop a range of skills.[145] First it was very important to know the quality of the merchandise and the conditions of the markets. Moreover, an understanding of the taste and needs of the clients became a necessary part of the trade. Starting a retail business was very expensive and building a stock of merchandise, or inventory that would sell without waste, was indispensable to survive as a trader. The development of interpersonal skills for dealing with the customers was no less important. Furthermore it was necessary to maintain a good reputation and to make sound judgements of the customers' character and credit worthiness. All these were in addition to the acquisition of appropriate numerical and literacy skills. The education of shop keepers therefore became a

---

[143] Archer, 'Material Londoners?', p. 176.

[144] Moody, *The Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby*, pp. 73-78.

[145] Berger, *The Most Necessary Luxuries*, pp. 213-42; Grassby, *The Business Community,* pp. 171-203.

long process, which started in childhood and was regulated by the apprentice system. The time required to complete an apprenticeship to become a freeman of a city was of seven years. National legislation such as the Statutes of Artificers of 1563 and local rules for access to a city corporation controlled access to craft and retail trade.[146] This was an attractive career for moving upward socially, therefore the Statute of Artificers tried to limit the number of apprentices for fear of depopulating the countryside. There were times when an increase in numbers was encouraged and the quote of places available was regulated by the local guilds.[147] A healthy number of apprentices, however, was an important sign of the vitality of a business.

Apprentices were boys and less frequently girls, that during their training moved to live with the family of the master.[148] He was responsible for the welfare of the apprentices who worked for him. Their number was variable, but usually there were up to six. This meant that business premises needed to have an adequate accommodation for the family and for the apprentices. The Dean and Chapter were well aware of this when they built the new shops. Moreover in a clause used for the leases of only three of the properties in the Close, they demanded that the tenants "No at any time […] shall or will permit and suffer any person or persons whatsoever to inhabite and dwell in the same houses tenements or messuages or shoppes or any of them, other than his apprentices and his owne familie ". The properties mentioned were the row of shops by the cathedral south doorway and the house with the "four shops".[149] The anxiety of the Dean and Chapter in this case was not simply about subletting or selling the lease to others, which was also prohibited for other properties. It was a prohibition to have lodgers or guests of any kind in this location. Perhaps it was just a concern with density of inhabitants in buildings by the cathedral doors, causing an excessive lack of decorum and sanitation. It is significant, however, that the

---

[146] Berger, *The Most Necessary Luxuries*, pp. 214-5.

[147] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 149-51 and 274-5.

[148] Grassby, *The Business Community*, pp. 343-5.

[149] YMA, Wb, fols. 305v-306.

house just opposite the south transept, leased to the goldsmith, did not have these sorts of restrictions. Therefore it may not have been simply a preoccupation with slum conditions, or a mistrust of the tenants, one of whose was a gentleman. This clause may have reflected an anxiety about the residence of masterless vagrants in the late sixteenth century. These were skilled craftspeople, but they were considered vagrants because they were either lapsed apprentices or they may have completed the apprenticeship but never applied for the freedom of any city. They were generally regarded with suspicion as rebellious and troublesome youths.[150] However, why were other premises not subjected to this prohibition, especially since goldsmiths employed foreigner immigrant experts in their craft?[151] The anxiety of the Dean and Chapter may have concerned the vagrants' role in the book trade and this will be discussed in the following section.

Conclusion

The Minster Close in the second half of the sixteenth century became a prominent legal centre, not only on a provincial level but for the whole northern regions of England. The increasing success of civil courts during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was due to the development of an economy based on credit. The courts' role in this respect was to register and guarantee credit transactions. Creditworthiness was based on trust and this was underpinned by the construction and maintenance of good reputation and character, which were defended in court suits if necessary by all social orders. The increasing use of credit from the late fifteenth century was aimed at acquisition of more goods for a better life standard and a more textured domestic experience. However, the construction of a personal image with fashionable clothing and conspicuous consumption in the home was an important element for demonstrating credit worthiness. Credit and shopping became more than a way to obtain necessary or desired goods, because a vicious circle of consumerism was created. Joan Thirsk explained how a mass market developed during the sixteenth century and that

---

[150] Fumerton, 'London's Vagrant Economy'.

[151] Palliser, *Tudor York*, p.164.

many imported goods were considered necessary by the inventories.[152] However, Carol Shammas concluded that new commodities were also consumed by malnourished and poorly housed people, inventories of their possessions were made for the benefit of their creditors.[153] Therefore it could be argued that people in the lower social orders demonstrated their creditworthiness by the acquisition of goods that could be released at death or in a court suit. They may have needed to do so just to stay above the poverty line. Buying things was a display of financial confidence not necessarily backed by adequate capital or by sound financial management. Creditors could only hope that debts were backed by capital in the form of chattels that could be eventually freed at death. The judges of the Exchequer court dealt with the execution of wills and part of their role was to protect the most vulnerable from paying the price of this circle of credit. In the Close, however, the courts themselves attracted crowds and in turn luxury shops. This contributed to feed the whole circle of display, consumption and creditworthiness. In this context, where there was a thriving market for second hand goods, it is easy to understand the economic importance of Thomas Cromwell's iconoclasm.[154] Goods given to the church not only were not consumed in the household but were also relegated outside the circle of credit. Keynesian theory considers the relationship between the state and the consumer. In this case the government intervened to direct consumer spending and thus helping the development of a modern consumer society.

---

[152] Thirsk, *Economic Policy and Projects*, pp. 49, 106, 119.

[153] Shammas, *The Pre-Industrial Consumer*, pp. 291-99.

[154] B. Lemire, *The Business of Everyday Life. Gender, Practice and Social Politics in England, c. 1600-1900* (Manchester, 2005), pp. 82-109.

5.2 Urban culture and education

The Close was a centre for learning and literacy since the early medieval period, when Monastic scriptoria and schools were associated with the cathedral.[155] In the late medieval period the rich libraries of the cathedral clergy further demonstrate how literacy and religion were already closely associated.[156] The collections of the Minster Library, built in 1420, relied on their bequests.[157] During the sixteenth century giving to libraries was seen as charitable and these were open to the public, as the case of the library of the London Guildhall shows.[158] In York Minster Library books were chained and locked to benches, suggesting that they were available for the clergy and perhaps some of the literate public. In 1629 the collection was substantially increased with the gift by Frances Matthew, widow of the Archbishop, of her late husband's rich library.[159]

Caroline Barron suggests that in London by the late fifteenth century and as many as fifty percent of males were able to read.[160] The increasing number of parish reading schools in that period also suggests that literacy was widespread in York.[161] However, even if the access to the written text was already well developed by the beginning of the sixteenth century, the scale of the book trade in the Minster Close from the 1570s demonstrates the extent to which the consumption of books had grown after the Reformation. In this section it will be explained how the role of the Close as a centre for urban culture and education

---

[155] Norton, 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral'.

[156] Cross, *York Clergy Wills*. Passim.

[157] YMA, E3/10, 21; C. B. L. Barr, 'The Minster Library', in G.E. Aylmer and R. Cant (eds), *A History of York Minster* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 487-539.

[158] N. Bateman, 'John Carpenter's Library: Corporate Charity and London's Guildhall' in D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003), pp. 356-370; C. Barron, *The Medieval Guildhall of London* (London, 1974), p. 34.

[159] Barr, 'The Minster Library', pp. 487-539.

[160] C. Barron, 'The Expansion of Education in Fifteenth Century London' in J. Blair and B. Golding (eds), *The Cloister and the World: Essays in Medieval History in Honour of Barbara Harvey* (Oxford, 1996), p. 240.

[161] J. Moran, *Education and Learning in the City of York, 1300-1560*, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 55 (1979), pp. 18-9.

was maintained and further strengthened during the sixteenth and seventeenth century.

Book trade in the Minster Close

The Close during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries became one of the main centres for the provincial booktrade. Three reasons contributed to this development. First there were advantages for printers and bookseller to operate within the Liberty of St Peter. In this way they could avoid the pecuniary and training requirement necessary to obtain the freedom to trade within the city. Only fifteen stationers and three bookbinders became freemen of York during the sixteenth century. However, a similar number would have traded and operated from within one of the liberties.[162] By 1603, no stationer operated within the city and no one was a freeman, despite the encouragement of the City Corporation.[163] The second factor that contributed to the development of the booktrade was the association between religion and education and later between liturgy and literacy. As already explained the religious authorities strongly promoted consumption of books. Third, books were retail goods that could be marketed as luxury commodities, a speciality of the urban shopping experience. As already discussed above in Chapter 5.1, the Close was excellently positioned for this kind of trade.

Apart from London, Oxford and Cambridge, where the book trade was organised differently from the rest of the country, in the second half of the sixteenth century the major centres for book trading were York, Norwich and Exeter.[164] The study of the development of the provincial book trade for this period has relied so far on lists freemen and on the inventories and wills of stationers. York is perhaps the best documented case: Barnard and Bell have examined the activity of the Foster family between 1590 and 1616[165]. They have correctly

---

[162] Pallisser, *Tudor York*, pp. 169-70.

[163] Barnard and Bell, *John Foster's Inventory,* p. 2.

[164] J. Barnard an M. Bell, 'The English Provinces', in J. Barnard and D. F. Mckenzie (eds), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557-1695,* vol. 4 (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 665-86.

[165] Barnard and Bell, *John Foster's Inventory*.

identified Anthony Foster as the first occupier of the bookshops to the west of the cathedral South Doorway. However, information from the Dean and Chapter leases give a more accurate picture of the space occupied by book shops and their development.

In the early sixteenth century foreign early-printers established their workshops and businesses in the Close. Gerard Wanesford, who died in 1510, had a shop in the Minster Yard and a press and warehouse near the church of St John-del-Pyke.[166] Ursyn Mylner, probably of Dutch origins, operated from the Close in 1509-16, before taking the freedom of the city.[167] The French printer John Gachet, alias John Frenchman in the Dean and Chapter documents, was living in the Close from 1516 until 1544. He was probably leasing the "William Gibson's" house and two chambers above one of the Minster gates.[168] The stationer Peter Hill may have occupied the same house in 1562.[169] An inventory of 1510 about the stock of Gerard Wanesford listed 252 missals, 399 breviaries and about 300 other volumes. The majority of which were *Doctrinalia* for grammar schools, primers and alphabet books for reading schools and hymn books for the song schools.[170] The Close therefore was a convenient place for publishers, because it served the literate clergy and the students in the schools, which were connected with the Minster and with the parish churches.

In 1557 the London Stationery Company became a corporation and took complete control of the book trade in England and Wales.[171] This changed the nature of publishing and printing because these activities became centralised in

---

[166] T. P. Cooper, *The Sign of the Crown. Stationers, Early Printers and Bookshops within the Minster Gates, York* (York, 1925), p. 5.

[167] Pallisser, *Tudor York*, pp. 169-70.

[168] R. Davies, *York Printers and Stationers* (London, 1868), pp. 21-7; Cooper, *The Sign of the Crown,* p. 6; YMA, E3/ 41-45.

[169] Wb, fols. 129v-130.

[170] J. Moran, *Education and Learning in the City of York, 1300-1560*, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 55 (1979), p. 17; G. Duff, *The English Provincial Printers, Stationers and Bookbinders to 1557* (Cambridge, 1912), pp. 45-6, 51-8; Cooper, *The Sign of the Crow,* p. 5.

[171] J. Barnard and D. F. McKenzie, *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557-1695,* vol. 4 (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 10-11.

London, under the monopoly of the Stationery Company. The only exceptions were Oxford and Cambridge, which maintained the right to publish. The import of the cheaper product from the Continent was also under the control of the Company. These monopolies lasted until the second half of the seventeenth century. The London monopoly on publishing was in part a response to economic factors. Publishing required huge investments with slow returns; bigger firms were better capitalised. Printing all books in London and distributing the finished product from there was cheaper. In fact paper suitable for printing was imported and distributed by London traders. The consumption of books in London was conspicuous and the provincial press would have to send the finished product to the Capital anyway. Therefore printing in London cut carriage costs. [172] However, an important reason for the creation of a national monopoly was censorship. A centralised and regulated press was better controlled by the regime. The Stationer Company was under orders from the Star Chamber to search for prohibited literature and they also exercised their censorship in York.[173] The consequence of these developments was that provincial stationers became retailers, completely depending on London for the choice of literature they sold. Therefore for about 100 years the state had absolute control on whatever was officially printed in England.

There is no evidence for book trade in the Close after 1544. However, in 1567 the book trade was again well established. Two bookbinders Steven Bockwit and John Goldwhait occupied two of the "four shops" in the West Minster Yard. Another bookbinder, Thomas Richardson, was the tenant of one of the shops in the West Minster Gate Lodge.[174] In 1567 their shops were object of a search by the Stationery Company. Goldwhait was found with unlawful books in Latin and had to appear before the Archbishop's Court.[175] At this time the shops by the cathedral south door were being built. Anthony Foster, bookbinder and stationer,

---

[172] Barnard and Mckenzie, *The Cambridge History,* p. 666.

[173] Barnard and Mckenzie, *The Cambridge History,* pp. 149-50, 507.

[174] YMA, Wb, fols, 305v-306.

[175] Davies, *York Printers*, pp. 30-1.

was the tenant of the shops on the west side.[176] On the east side the shops were occupied by the bookseller Richard Bangor, and by a tailor, who may also have dealt in books.[177]

During the sixteenth century, books were sold also by members of the clothing trade. This created a long dispute between the Drapers and the Stationer Company. But after a final dispute, in 1599, the Stationers obtained the absolute monopoly on the booktrade and drapers had the option to become stationers.[178] The connection between these trades is exemplified in the Close by shops and family businesses changing from the clothes to the book trade. The bookbinder, Richard Brett, was the tenant of the house to the west of the Library before 1588.[179] The silkweaver John Blanchard acquired the tenancy and held it until 1605, when the leather dresser John Jackman moved there.[180] As will be explained later, this was an activity connected with bookbinders. The same John Blanchard had also the tenancy of two shops and a house to the west of Minster Gates. In 1618 the tenant of this property was William Blanchard stationer that by 1625 was trading with a second John Blanchard, stationer.[181] It seems likely that this was a family business that changed from the clothing to the book business. Other properties previously occupied the draper Robert Sherbourn and then by the widow of the draper William Smithson, later became occupied by stationers, suggesting a connection and perhaps a transition between these trades.[182]

It is significant that the buildings by the cathedral South Doorway were called "shops" during their construction, rather than houses, as is the case in other

---

[176] See Chapter 2. 3. 2., p. 81.

[177] YMA, Wc, fols. 43v-44.

[178] Barnard and Mckenzie, *The Cambridge History,* p. 11.

[179] YMA, Wc, fols. 5v-6

[180] YMA, Wc, fols. 228v-229

[181] YMA, S3/5b, fol. 85.

[182] YMA, Wc, fols. 81-81v; S3/5, fols. 82-83.

mixed domestic and commercial developments.[183] The limited area of land they occupied and the character of the elevation suggest that they continued the tradition of the rows of shops, making the most of street frontage.[184] Moreover, in London shops flanking the entrance of parish churches were a common feature from the mid sixteenth century.[185] I have already suggested that the choice of this site in the Close was probably deliberate, because it was not due to the lack of available space in the area.[186] The bookshops by the south doorway of York Minster had their counters and five shelves for the display of books, right next to the entrance to the transept.[187] As already said this was the main entrance to the cathedral from the city and its importance was reinforced after the Reformation. I have also argued that this location was chosen not only for commercial purposes but because it was the duty of the clergy to promote the liturgy of the word and the consumption of books.[188] The comparison with the development of St Pauls' churchyard in London, reinforces this argument.

In the close of St Paul's by the mid sixteenth century bookshops were established along St Paul's Cross Churchyard, between St Paul's Gate, or Cheap Gate, and the Great North Door in the north transept.[189] (Fig.104) This was the principal access to the choir from the main city streets: Cheapside and Paternoster Row. A bookshop described as "little" and "shed" was right next to the cathedral doorway. The neighbouring bookshops were proper houses, up to four floors tall. Space in this prime position by the cathedral North Door was exploited to the maximum. By 1572 there were few free spaces between the buttresses of the north transept and of the choir. Among the bookshops there were a few tailors' shops and a "little hole" of a shop, selling pins and walking sticks. When chantry property became available around the close it was immediately converted into

---

[183] See Chapter 2. 3. 2, pp. 88-92.

[184] See Chapter 6.1.

[185] J. Schofield, 'The Topography and Buildings of London', p. 307, St. Ethelburga.

[186] See Chapter 4, p. 205; Chapter 6.2, p. 309.

[187] Barnard and Bell, *John Foster's Inventory,* p. 15. probate inventory of Mark Foster.

[188] See Chapter 4, pp. 205.

[189] Blaney, *St Paul's Cross Churchyard*.

shops. However, it is important to note that sixteenth-century bookshops concentrated by the north transept entrance. The shops in the area to the south of the cathedral were more varied, perhaps because this was a busy thoroughfare across the close, linking the Strand with the east of the City of London.

Book selling in the Minster Close must have been commercially attractive. In 1597 a well known London stationer, Thomas Gubbins, built two bookshops at his own expense by the cathedral west door.[190] These were low booths with no heating and not suitable as accommodation. A 1656 print by Daniel King show the Minster's west front with two timber structures by the cathedral side doors. (Fig. 105) They may represent the closed booths with the counter and penthouse boards folded away. However, the drawing of the cathedral is not realistic. King seems to have been of two minds: he wished to draw an imaginary cathedral, isolated from its untidy context of abutting buildings. At the same time he wished to be faithful to reality, recording the small shops by the cathedral doorways. The booths are not in proportion with the cathedral and are in the wrong position. The leases are adamant: the bookshops were on both sides of the central doorway. Their structure may have been similar to the bookshop, planned but never built, by the stationer John Day. It was to be located in the middle of St Paul's Cross churchyard.[191] It was "little, lowe and leaded flat". (Fig. 106) It was exclusively a commercial premise and while it was not a temporary structure it was designed to be an unobtrusive building. The London stationer Gubbins may have taken this idea to York. In the cathedral transepts there was perhaps a similar structure. King Charles I during his 1633 visits perceived these three buildings as similar: "we observed at the west end of that church where we entered certain houses built on either side, close upon the wall and one within the very cross isle, which wee conceive tend much to the detriment of the Church and altogether to the disgrace of that goodly fabric".[192] This suggests that the building inside the cathedral may have also been a bookshop, however, there is no other

---

[190] See Chapter 2. 2. 1, pp. 62-3.

[191] P. W. M. Blayney, 'John Day and the Bookshop That Never Was', in L.C. Orlin (ed.), *Material London* (Philadelphia, 2000), pp. 322-43.

[192] YMA, Wd, fols. 114v-115.

documentation for this structure. Its location would have been in proximity of the choir, the focal point of the Protestant service. A wall between two pillars of the north-west aisle of the south transept shows several mortice scars for timbers.[193] This suggests that this structure could have been located there. (Fig. 103) All these bookshops so closely connected to the cathedral may have encouraged the purchase of religious books. Despite being relatively cheap, books were not affordable by everyone and scholars disagree on the proportion of people able to purchase religious books in the sixteenth century.[194] Not much is known about over the counter lending practices, however, it could be tentatively suggested that the small building within the cathedral may have been used for short term lending of already bound Bibles and Books of common Prayers. This would have been a more convenient solution for encouraging people to read, than keeping a great number of books chained to benches.

In the second decade of the seventeenth century there were changes in the organisation of the book trade in the Close. By 1617 the two shops by the west doorway were leased to a gentleman, when Thomas Gubbin returned to London. It is not clear if they were still used as bookshops, but in 1628 they were used by the mercer John Pepper.[195] The shops to the east and west of the cathedral South Doorway were both still used as bookshops by the heirs of Anthony Foster after his death in 1610, and remained bookshops until at least 1644.[196] Once the connection between liturgy and literacy had been well established, the original meaning of the bookshops by the cathedral entrances was lost. This is demonstrated by Charles I's perception of the shops as an environmental and aesthetic nuisance, rather than as a promotion of literacy.[197]

---

[193] Thanks to Anthony Masinton for help in locating this structure.

[194] P. Collinson, A. Hunt, A. Walsham 'Religious Publishing in England 1557-1640' in J. Barnard and D. F. Mckenzie (eds), *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557-1695,* vol. 4 (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 29-93 and pp. 56-57.

[195] YMA, Wd, fols. 86-86v, Wc, fols. 275-276.

[196] Barnard and Bell, *John Foster's Inventory*, p. 13-5.

[197] YMA, Wd, fols. 114v-115.

Moreover, the leases indicate that from the 1610s the book trade in the Close was expanding and became concentrated in the hands of only two or perhaps three, stationery firms. The heirs of Anthony Foster's business, his daughter Jane and her husband Roger Jackman occupied the shops by the cathedral south doorway and one of the "four shops" in the 1610s and perhaps later.[198] The widow of a relative, the stationer John Foster who died in 1616, lived in the former Lime Kiln house. Her husband's business may have been taken by stationer Richard Foster, perhaps a relation, who continued expanding its trading space in Minster Gates for three decades. In the 1610s he became the occupier and then the tenant of the shops and two houses in Minster Gates formerly tenanted by the goldsmith Rawson.[199] The business expanded during the 1620s and 1630 along the east side of Minster Gates, acquiring a property to the east of the South Minster Gates and the house and the two Deanery shops further to the north. These were the properties tenanted by drapers in the late sixteenth century.[200] Extra storage or accommodation space for the apprentices may have been needed, because a large chamber on top of the Dean's slaughterhouse was leased as part of the house in Minster Gates.[201]

In the same period of time the business of William Blanchard occupied a house and two small shops on the west side of the street.[202] In addition John and William Blanchard were the tenants of the "two rooms" formerly of the mansion of Warthill, from the early 1620s and up to 1635. These were divided into five or six rooms.[203] They may have used this space as a warehouse and, because of their position, also as further shop floor.

The concentration of trade in the hand of few, large family firms, or more extended family cartels, suggest that the investment necessary to run the

---

[198] YMA, Wd, fols. 78v.

[199] YMA, Wd, fols. 50-50v.

[200] See Chapter 2. 3. 3.

[201] See Chapter 2. 4. 1.

[202] See p. 2. 3. 3, p. 96.

[203] See p. 109.

provincial book trade required large and well capitalised businesses.[204] Provincial book sellers needed to stock a variety of newly published books. This was a substantial investment, the return for which may have taken some time. Perhaps smaller businesses did not find it easy to survive on book selling alone, when mixing clothing and the book trade was prohibited.

The inventory of John Foster of 1616 gives an idea of the kind of books sold by a York stationer. The stock consisted of a great variety of literature and suggested a clientele not restricted to clergy, student and lawyers. One third of the stock consisted of religious books, including commentaries aimed at a lay public. The other third consisted of educational books, mostly for grammar school pupils. The remaining third consisted of a variety of literature. There were philosophers' works, an impressive collection of Classics authors, historical and political works, scientific and medical treatises, juridical works, poetry and drama and a few books on gardening. Among his debtors and regular clients there were clergy, lawyers and tradespeople, which were part of the society of the Close.[205]

The success of the book trade in York, beside the advantages of the Close as a trading centre, may have also been due to excellent customer care. There were a high proportion of recently published and new books in the Foster inventory, which would have satisfied the most demanding customers. A variety of crystal reading spectacles, writing paper and other accessories were also on sale.[206] Moreover the stationers in the Close, since the sixteenth century, offered to their client a comprehensive service with in-house bookbinding. Stationers sold books unbound, in sheets. This was for two reasons. It cut the transport costs and the customers could select a cover according to their taste and pockets. The most luxurious book covers in Elizabethan times were still influenced by French taste and foreigner bookbinders had been in demand since the first half of the

---

[204] Barnard and Mckenzie, *The Cambridge History*, p. 11; Grassby, *The Business Community*, pp. 330-1, on importance of kinship in trade.

[205] Barnard and Bell, *John Foster's Inventory*, pp. 98-106.

[206] Barnard and Bell, *John Foster's Inventory*, p. 96.

century.[207] The long activity of John Gachet in the Close may have created a school of apprentices still working on French taste. The best bindings were sewn and the cover made of wooden boards, lined in leather. The covers were decorated and painted as well as the books' edges. However, with a greater consumption of books, new cheaper binding technique emerged. The presence of neighbouring leather dressers was necessary to the book trade, because cheaper, soft, leather covering, with no board, became very popular. Moreover wooden board were substituted by paster and pulp boards, made by milling trimmings of paper, and gluing the spine. Raw materials and tools for the craft of these bindings were recorded in the 1616 inventory.[208] This craft may have had an environmental implication for the Close and the need for frequent sewage cleansing, may have been related to the use of these materials.[209]

Despite the growth of the larger businesses, a small shop just inside the South Minster Gates during the seventeenth century continued to be occupied by chapmen.[210] They were selling printed materials such as ABC books, almanacs, ballads and other literature. This kind of literature was often suspicious and very difficult to censor by the Stationery Company and by the Crown. It was often sold by chapmen and hawkers taking this popular literature around the country at fairs and markets. Especially during Elizabeth's reign, they were suspected of being masterless vagrants, disseminating uncensored texts, with religiously subversive contents.[211] The clauses of prohibition of hospitality, found exclusively in the leases of late sixteenth-century bookshops, may have been aimed at preventing these people from spreading subversive ideas just by being visitors in these houses. However, the chapman Leonard Swan must have been a

---

[207] Barnard and Mckenzie, *The Cambridge History,* pp. 620-4.

[208] Barnard and Bell, *John Foster's Inventory*, p. 96.

[209] See Chapter 6. 4, pp. 346-7.

[210] See p. 96.

[211] Simmons, 'ABC', pp. 510-1.

well established and trusted resident of the Close, because in 1619 he was made Keeper of the Gates.[212]

In conclusion, the book trade in the Close prospered from the Elizabethan reign onwards. From the second decade of the seventeenth century it appears that the trade expanded, taking space from clothing and luxury items business, and became concentrated in the hands of a few family firms. Even buildings previously used for the cathedral needs, as the rooms of Warthill, became used for the book trade, as well as some of the Deanery outbuildings.

Schools

The Close was a centre for education at primary and grammar level. Elementary and reading schools were based in York parish churches, where children were taught by parish priests. At the beginning of the sixteenth century there were schools in St Micheal-le -Belfrey and in St John-del-Pyke for children living in these parishes.[213] A community of children, however, was resident within the Close, the twelve choristers of the Minster Song School.[214] They lived with the Master of the Choir in a house or mansion, which also served as their school. The rooms of Warthill served for this purpose during the fifteenth century. Later the mansion of Wistow is the most likely to have served as the Song School.[215] A 1547 statute ordered that the boys were to attend the Free Grammar school after their voice broke if they had served for five years in the choir.[216]Having been accepted in the Song School, therefore, was a path to the advantages of further education.

York was a centre for grammar education for the north of England and the Dean and Chapter during the middle ages tried to establish a monopoly on grammar

---

[212] YMA, Wc, fol. 270.

[213] Moran, *Education and Learning*, pp. 18-9

[214] Moran, *Education and Learning*, p. 19.

[215] See Chapter 2, p. 101 and 6.1, p. 287.

[216] Moran, *Education and Learning*, p. 19; Raine, *The Statutes*, p. 62.

schools for a ten mile radius.[217] Education at grammar level in York was severely disrupted by the Dissolution, because of its connection with monastic institutions. One of two York grammar schools was based in St Leonard's Hospital, dissolved in 1539. The Abbey of St Mary provided accommodation for the 50 pupils of the Minster's Grammar School, St Peter's school.[218] The school building was located in Petergate, possibly in the house abutting the west front of St Michael-le-Belfrey. The passage separating the school building from the row of houses may have served as an independent entrance in the Close for the children. The accommodation of the school master may also have been in this building.[219] At the Dissolution, without the provision of board for its pupils, this school too may have disappeared and never relocated to the Close.[220] Half of the school building was leased as accommodation and the ground floor may have been used for business premises.[221] This use is attested in the late seventeenth century, when part of the ground floor was leased to the practice of a midwife and part as a tavern.[222] It is possible than even when the school was there, the ground floor may have been leased as commercial premises.[223]

To remedy the crisis in grammar education of the 1540s, Archbishop Holgate's Free School was established in the Close. This foundation was collaboration by three agencies, the Archbishop, the Dean and Chapter and the City Corporation, to provide a necessary social service for the city. It was in part private and corporate charity and in part public funding. In a document of September 1546, a month before the foundation of the school, the City of York conveyed land to the Archbishop. [224] A neighbouring tenement "nowe beyng a scoole howse"

---

[217] Moran, *Education and Learning*, p. 15, 21. F. Leach, *Early Yorkshire Schools*, vol. 1, The Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series vol. 27 (1898), pp. 27-30.

[218] Leach, *Early Yorkshire Schools*, p. 31.

[219] YMA, E3/60.

[220] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 222-3. See Chapter 5.1

[221] YMA, E3/64.

[222] See chapter 2. 2. 1.

[223] Howard, *The Building of Elizabethan*, p. 86.

[224] Gray, *The Mansion House of the Treasurers*, p. 49-50. See Chapter 2.2.

already belonged to the Archbishop. This suggests that a school was already functioning in Ogleforth. The same lands a month later were conveyed by Holgate to the newly founded free school. This endowment is attested until 1824, providing the school with funds for the maintenance of its buildings.[225] Moreover, the city granted to the school, in the person of the Archbishop as its principal governor, with a 99 year lease of the city bastions from Monkgate up to the third tower from Bootham Bar. This would have originally produced income as pasturage, but later the bastions and the ditch were sublet to Arthur Ingram for his garden.[226] When Young became Archbishop and governor of the school, the endowment of the long lease of the bastion was reissued to him. The grateful words that accompanied the lease may have acknowledged the work that the Archbishop was doing for the good of the city also as governor of the school.[227] In 1553 the City Corporation acquired the decommissioned church of St John-del-Pyke, next to the school, and sold it to Holgate. This may have been for the purpose of expanding the school premises.[228] Parish churches were already associated with primary education and this space would have been suitable for this purpose.[229] Moreover the problem of conversion and maintenance of redundant church buildings was sometimes solved by assigning them to an institutional use. For example the grammar school in Leicester, also a collective enterprise, was housed in a redundant church until new premises were built in 1573.[230] In Norwich the grammar school was housed in the former Carnary chapel in the close.[231]

A letter patent of Henry VIII granted the school in October 1546 and in January 1547 the school became an independent corporation.[232] Four copies of the deed

---

[225] Woodward, *Archbishop's Holgate School*, pp. 2-3.

[226] BIHR, CC. Ab. 9.

[227] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 215-20.

[228] See Chapter 2. YCR, V, 91. Raine, *Medieval York*, p. 49.

[229] Moran, *Education and Learning*.

[230] Howard, *The Building of Elizabethan* , p. 85.

[231] Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close*, p. 208. D. J. Lamburn, 'The Minster and the Reformation', in *Beverley Minster* , pp. 56, 59.

[232] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 222-3. See Chapter 5.1.

of foundation were made, one for each of the four parties that were responsible for the administration of the school. The governors were Archbishop Holgate and his successors, the Dean and Chapter, The Mayor and Aldermen and the school master.[233] Among other things they were in charge of the administration of the income from property endowed to the school. This was to be spent only on building maintenance, which included the important duty for the school master to keep clean the King's Ditch.[234] The Dean and Chapter actively participated in the running of the school. They were responsible for the appointment of the school master if the Archbishop was not available. They paid the usher yearly, repaired the lane leading to the school building and made a further yearly financial contribution.[235] The Free School was a non fee paying, day school for boys resident in the City of York. In addition it provided further education for the cathedral Deacons, as a part of Holgate's attempt to raise the educational standard of the cathedral clergy. The Deacons were boarding and lodging with the headmaster in his house annexed to the school.[236] Perhaps for this reason the headmaster was forbidden by the school statutes to bring his wife to live in the Close. In 1547, even if clerical marriage was encouraged and Holgate tried to set the example, the presence of a woman in a male community was still problematic.

Pilgrimage to Parnassus

The structure of modern England's educational system began to be defined in the second half of the sixteenth century. St Peter's School was re-founded in 1557 as an initiative of Mary's Counter Reformation. Its premises moved to the Horsefair, outside the city walls, where there was more space for boarders.[237] It

---

[233] F.H. Woodward, *Archbishop's Holgate School York. Some Notes on the Foundation* (York, 1961), p. 1.

[234] Woodward, *Deed of Foundation*.

[235] YMA, E1/88 onwards.

[236] Woodward, *Deed of Foundation*, art. 25 and 26.

[237] A. Raine, *History of St Peter's School: York AD 627 to the Present* (London, 1926). C. Cross, 'York Clerical Piety and St Peter's School on the Eve of the Reformation', *York Historian* 2 (1978), pp. 17-20.

continued after the establishment of Queen Elizabeth as a fee paying boarding school, chosen for the education of children of prosperous families resident in the county and for some of the Song School choir boys. Grammar schools were funded all over England, in purpose built school houses or in decommissioned buildings as in the cathedral closes of Norwich and Beverly. Another impact of the Dissolution was that resources previously used to found chantries were now deflected towards education. Lands endowed to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, created special connections between particular colleges and local communities.[238] The Minster's wealthiest prebend of Masham , was eventually endowed to Trinity College in Cambridge, after appropriation by the Crown.[239] Therefore special links were established between Cambridge and grammar schools in York. The best students from the free grammar schools of the Northern and Western provinces were harvested by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and trained as civil servants, teachers or persuasive preachers. From there they were employed in government offices, in southern aristocratic household or in schools and colleges all over the country.[240] This process could have drained the regions of the best brains, concentrating expertise in the south-east. However, Warren Boutcher argues that this politics of education created strong links between international politics, the Court in London and regional interests.[241] Holgate's grammar school contributed to this process of selecting the best children, educating them and sending them to university. As a prominent legal and religious centre the Close directly benefited from the expertise of these university educated people and its links with the centre of political and cultural power were reinforced. After their "Pilgrimage to Parnassus", the name of a play performed in 1598 by student of St John's college in Cambridge, these professionals returned to the regions.[242] Although civil lawyers rarely were

---

[238] W. Boutcher, 'Pilgrimage to Parnassus: Local Intellectual Traditions, Humanist Education and the Cultural Geography of Sixteenth-Century England', in Y. L. Too and N. Livingstone, *Pedagogy and Power. Rethorics of Classical Learning* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 110-147.

[239] Cross, 'From the Reformation', pp. 196-7.

[240] Ibid. p. 141.

[241] Ibid. p. 141.

[242] Ibid. p. 140.

employed in their place of origin, an old boy of Holgate's School, Henry Swinburne, after an early career in London, returned to live and to work in the Close.[243]

Conclusion

The Close at the beginning of the sixteenth century was a centre of urban culture at the forefront of the production and diffusion of printed matter. However, in contrast with London, where St Paul's cathedral close became colonised by bookshops by the mid sixteenth century, in York the growth of the book trade happened only from the late 1560s. From the late sixteenth century, however, the Close became the fourth centre for the book trade in England. This was reflected by its built environment. The consumption of books in the Close was also linked to its continuing role in education. After the Reformation the foundation of grammar schools within or connected to the Close was one of the most important factors in transforming society

---

[243] Derrett, *Henry Swinburne*.

CHAPTER 6. Inhabiting the Close.

Rebuilding or "urban renaissance"?

The previous chapter discussed how the institutional cultural and commercial role of the Close was redefined after the Reformation. This chapter will focus in more details on two themes. The first is the transformation of the urban landscape, including concerns with urban planning, environment and infrastructures. The second concerns the structure and use of domestic space. The transition from the medieval to the early modern town has been the subject of considerable debate during the past forty years. Widespread economic crisis and social problems in Tudor and Stuart provincial towns have been used as an evidence for urban decline. Patrick Collinson, with a strong visual metaphor, has defined urbanism from the late fifteenth to the late seventeenth century as "the narrow neck of an hourglass" between the vitality of medieval civic life and eighteenth-century urbanism.[1] During the past decade these views have begun to be challenged by historians and archaeologists.[2] One of the aims of this chapter is to contribute to this debate presenting the case study of the Close and arguing for the vigour of urban life in sixteenth and seventeenth-century York.

The perception of a decline of urban life and civic values in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century has been further reinforced by the concept of "urban renaissance" in the long eighteenth century.[3] For Peter Borsay this definition

---

[1] Collinson, *The Birthpangs*, pp. 58-9.

[2] Tittler, *The Reformation and the Towns*; P. Withington, *The Politics of Commonwealth* (Cambridge, 2005); Griffith and Jenner, *Londinopolis; K. Giles, An Archaeology of Social Identity*; Masinton 'Sacred Space'; P. B. Hartshorne, 'The Street and the Perception of Public Space in York*'*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of York (2004); I. Fay, 'Health and Disease in Medieval and Tudor Norwich', Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of East Anglia (2007).

[3] P. Borsay, *The English Urban Renaissance: Culture and Society in the Provincial Town,1660-1770* (Oxford, 1989); P. Borsay, 'Politeness and Elegance: The Cultural Re-Fashioning of Eighteenth-Century York', in M. Hallett and J. Rendall (eds), *Eighteenth-Century York: Culture, Space and Society*, Borthwick Text and Calendar 30 (2003), pp. 1-12; this concept is accepted and reinforced by J. Stobart, A. Hann, V. Morgan, *Spaces of Consumption. Leisure and Shopping in the English Town, c. 1680-1830* (London and New York, 2007), especially pp. 109-110.

signifies both the rebirth of the idea of urbanism after a period of decline and the application to the built environment of the values of the Renaissance. The development of classical elegance in architecture and urban design, of towns as places of conspicuous consumption and the efficient institutionalisation of the urban poor are identified by Borsay as signs of urban success. By contrast he describes the landscape of the provincial towns before the Restoration as vernacular and unremarkable. Crumbling medieval buildings, such as cathedrals and churches, stood as the only reminder of a more illustrious past. Classical designs and architectural details used in Tudor and Stuart buildings were not more than "a tantalizing hint of things to come".[4]

The idea of decay in the urban experience and the lack of interest in innovation in sixteenth and seventeenth-century York have already been questioned. Kate Giles has suggested that distinct change is to be found in the adaptation of existing buildings rather than in new forms of the built environment.[5] Moreover ideas of urban order attributed to the Renaissance were already present in late medieval York.[6] The dangers of locating a medieval/ "Renaissance" divide in the eighteenth century have been further discussed by Matthew Johnson.[7] He points out how this can obscure the fact that some of the practices attributed to "Georgianisation" were already occurring in the sixteenth century. Furthermore he argues that the acceptance or rejection of continental influences in the sixteenth century should be interpreted as an active choice by builders and patrons, not as a sign of backwardness or marginality. The category of the Renaissance is itself the subject of much controversy. The word was used only occasionally by the Humanists, even before the fifteenth century, to indicate

---

[4] Borsay, *The Urban Renaissance*, pp. 41-2, 54.

[5] Giles, *An Archaeology of Social Identity*, pp. 195-6.

[6] S. Rees Jones, 'Town Planning in Late Medieval York' in T.G. Manby, S. Moorhouse and P. Ottaway (eds), *The Archaeology of Yorkshire: An Assessment at the Beginning of the 21st Century*, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Occasional Paper 3 (2003); Hartshorne, 'The Street and the Perception'.

[7] M. Johnson, *Behind the Castle Gate. From Medieval to Renaissance* (London and New York, 2002); Johnson, *Ideas of Landscape*, pp. 8-11

episodes of classicism.[8] The concept of the Renaissance was constructed by Jacob Burckhardt in 1860, to explain changes in fifteenth-century Italian art. Only later it was extended to other cultural changes, when newly formed European states developed their nationalist identities with reference to the values of the Renaissance.[9] The Renaissance therefore is one of the nineteenth century's grand narratives. If the term "Renaissance" is maintained, it should be twisted and devoided of its nineteenth-century meanings, such as the superiority of the classical tradition, Eurocentrism, individualism, and progress.[10] Its suitability for the study of urban space and material culture of sixteenth to nineteenth-century England needs to be questioned. The extent and modes in which humanistic ideas were translates into urban design needs to be set against the archaeological evidence, rather than against idealistic constructs. In this chapter the landscape of the Close will be discussed looking for subtle changes in the built environment and considering the continuous tension between tradition and innovation.

In the first section of this chapter I will question allegations of decay in the Close. These did not necessarily describe a situation of dereliction but instead an emphasis on decay may have been used to support arguments for change. The second section will discuss the transformation of the built environment and domestic space. The third section will deal with changes in building practices and the fourth is about the attitude towards the environment, including waste and water management, gardens and animals.

---

[8] S. Settis, *Futuro de Classico* (Torino, 2004), pp. 59-60.

[9] J. Burckhardt, *The Civilisation of the Renaissance in Italy*, 3rd edn. (London, 1995); M. Seidel, *Da Jacopo della Quercia a Donatello. La Arti a Siena nel Primo Rinascimento* (Siena, 2010), p. 16 on Renaissance and nationalism.

[10] G. Vattimo, *The End of Modernity: Nihilism and Hermeneutics in Post-Modern Culture*, translated by Jon R. Snyder (Cambridge, 1988), discuss how categories used in the past cannot easily be discarded, because are now part of our culture. However, they can be retained in a 'weak' form devoided of their original meanings.

6. 1 The Rhetoric of "decay" and "reformation"

This section seeks to indentify and to investigate phases of investment and stagnation in the built environment of the Close. This cannot be done simply by considering quantitative information from the written sources or from the standing evidence. It is necessary to consider a wider context and to evaluate qualitative information from the documentary sources. The tension between "decay" and "reformation" constantly emerges in the written sources of the sixteenth-century Close and its urban setting.[11] However, allegations of decay in the cathedral landscape need to be critically assessed and balanced with evidence of more positive attitudes. Although many problems may have been real, in some instances neglect and decay may have been emphasised to provide the necessary "pathos" in a rhetorical argument. Aristotelian rhetoric was commonly used in the sixteenth-century political domain. This is composed of three parts one of which is the "pathos". Drawing attention to the degeneration or inadequacy of something made the proposal for new solutions stronger. A discourse of "decay" as a state of degradation to be restored to the previous order with a "reformation" was applied to a wide range of situations in the late fifteenth and sixteenth century.[12] The desire to return to a past, perceived as more orderly than the present, reflected the rhetoric of pan-European Humanism. Even the religious Reformation was a part of this discourse, the *Collectanea satis copiosa* of 1530 argued for the return to a previous order, not for a schism.[13] Complaints of decay and ruin of towns, only to be rescued by a reformation of the commonwealth and political order were aired since the 1480s, when local governments sought and obtained the power to intervene in cases of dilapidation of private property.[14] The 1535 rebuilding statutes of Henry VIII allowed city corporations to

---

[11] A. Dyer, *Decline and Growth in English Towns 1400-1640* (Cambridge, 1991); A. Dyer 'The Urban Economy' in Tittler and Jones, *A Companion,* pp. 343-4.

[12] The word "rhetoric" is used in this section in the proper Aristotelian meaning. P. Slack, *From Reformation to Improvement. Public Welfare in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 8-11 and 29-30.

[13] J.Guy, 'Monarchy and Counsel:Models of the State', P. Collinson (ed.), *The Sixteenth Century 1485-1603* (Oxford, 2002), pp.117-9.

[14] Slack, *From Reformation*, p. 8. Tittler, *The Reformation and the Towns*, pp. 96-102.

confiscate derelict properties.[15] Despite these provisions, several decades later
the decay and reformation of towns was still a powerful political argument. In
1561 Sir Thomas Gargrave, former MP for York and Vice-President of the
Council of the North, as the Speaker of the first Elizabeth Parliament, gave an
oration on urban decay and its possible remedies.[16] (Fig. 98) Thus allegations of
"decay", rather than reflecting dereliction in the urban environment, may instead
have represented an impetus towards redevelopment and innovation. Each
instance, therefore, needs to be investigated in light of this rhetoric. [17]

Economic crisis

Other factors need to be considered in interpreting the transformation of the
landscape of the Close during the sixteenth century. It occurred at a time of
economic depression, with severe social repercussions in the English towns. The
extent of urban decline in the sixteenth century has been object of debate and
controversy since Slack and Clark's thesis in the 1970s.[18] Their pessimistic
interpretation, shared by other historians, suggested that the economic crisis was
prevalent in England in the first half of the century. The Dissolution created
further problems and after 1560, despite the expansion of the economy, the towns
were under the pressure of a growing number of poor.[19]   It is now accepted that
different factors affected provincial towns in different ways. Geographical
location, changing conditions in trade and the material and social consequences

---

[15]R. Tittler, ' "For the Re-edification of Townes": The Rebuilding Statutes of Henry VIII',
Albion, 22/4 (1990), pp. 591-605.

[16] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 261 and 201-225.

[17] I.W Archer, 'Material Londoners?'; I. W. Archer 'Popular Politics in the Sixteenth and Early
Seventeenth Centuries', in P. Griffiths and M.S.R. Jenner (eds)*, Londinopolis: Essays in the
Cultural and Social History of Early Modern London* (Manchester, 2000), p.13.

[18] P.Clark and P. Slack, *English Towns in Transition 1500-1700* (Oxford, 1976).

[19] C.Phythian-Adams, *Desolation of City: Coventry and the Urban Crisis of the Late Middle Ages*
(Cambridge, 1979).

of the Dissolution created different urban experiences: some town prospered while others were in a more difficult situation.[20]

York was one of the worst afflicted and with Coventry, Lincoln and Winchester was cited as evidence for the theory of a general urban decline.[21] A contraction in economy and demography show that York was in recession. In the 1520s its population had almost halved since 1377. However, with an estimate of between 5,600 and 8,000 inhabitants, depending on sources used, it was still the third most populous town in England and ranked ninth in 50 for taxable wealth.[22] Despite these negative events, there were in York a number of quite prosperous citizens owning ships and trading in expensive commodities, such as lead.[23] The following three decades were marked by further difficulties. Bad harvests and several outbreaks of plague and influenza, made worse by malnutrition, may have reduced the population by a further third by the 1550s. The demographic decline started to reverse only from the 1560s.[24] The population recovered quickly after the outbreak of epidemic, such as the plague of 1603, which killed about 2,000 out of the 12,000 inhabitants. The economy recovered and found a new stability in the last quarter of the sixteenth century.

The economic crisis in York was exacerbated by a great number of vagrants and rural poor. They were attracted to the city in the hope to finding better chances of survival or social mobility.[25] This problem was felt throughout the sixteenth and continued into the seventeenth century, both in periods of depression and recovery of the city. From 1524 the City of York was pleading to the Crown for

---

[20] Dyer, *Decline and Growth,* pp. 43-9; Dyer,'The Urban Economy', pp. 343-4; S.M. Jack, *Towns in Tudor and Stuart Britain* (New York, 1997).

[21] Dyer*, Decline and Growth,* p 27. Palliser, *Tudor York,* pp. 201-225.

[22] P. Slack 'Great and Good Towns 1540-1700', in P. Clark (ed), *Cambridge Urban History of Britain, 1540-1840,* vol. 2 (Cambridge, 2000), pp.347-73; Dyer, *Decline and Growth,* pp. 58, 62, 66; C. Galley, *The Demography of Early Modern Towns: York in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Liverpool, 1998), p. 48.

[23] Tillott, *VCH York*, pp. 129-131.

[24] Galley, *The Demography*, pp. 44, 77. Palliser, *Tudor York*, p. 124.

[25] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 123-5 and 274-277. P.Slack, *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1991).

the remission of the fee-farm, on grounds of loss of income from taxes.[26] Moreover, public money was increasingly needed to provide necessary educational and social services. The crisis in the provision of support for the sick and the poor became even more acute after the Dissolution. Poverty not only was a social problem, but also was perceived as threatening to the urban order. Poor were thus being regulated, marginalised or ejected from the urban space.[27] In the first half of the century the way to deal with this problem was pre-modern, cruel and direct.[28] In 1501 all the wards had stock and fetters to imprison vagrants and in 1515 the able bodied were beaten and expelled from the city and the sick had to wear a badge on their shoulders.[29] However, during the second half of the sixteenth century the control and regulation of poverty became part of the social reformation of cities.[30] The Council of the North was actively promoting this idea. At first the councillors of York refused to survey and employ the poor but the Council in 1569 ordered them to exercise a stricter social control.[31] The work of "poor folk" is documented in the Close in 1577. After the 1576 Poverty Act, poor people were employed by the Minster Fabric as labourers to sweep and tidy the Minster Yard.[32] Despite these measures, begging remained a serious problem and the hope for alms given in the street continued to attract many beggars to the city. In 1599 during assize days, the street had to be patrolled to allow the judges to cross from the King's Manor to Bootham Bar.[33] The inhabitants of the Close were well aware of this problem. The judge Henry Swinburne (d. 1624) left considerable legacies in his will for the poor, so that "they will not do so much clamour in the streets".[34] Charity to the "clamorous poor", meaning the beggars,

---

[26] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 215-20.

[27] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 213-5, 275-7, 286; Hatshorne, *The Street and the Perception*, pp. 212-13.

[28] Muldrew, 'From a "Light Cloak' to an Iron Cage"', pp.156-79.

[29] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 213-5, 275-7, 286.

[30] Giles, *An Archaeology of Social Identity*, pp. 89-93.

[31] Slack, *From Reformation*, p. 37.

[32] YMA, E3/55.

[33] Palliser, *Tudor York*, p. 286.

[34] Derrett, *Henry Swinburne,* p. 28.

rather than being distributed as alms, may have been used to reform this still undisciplined aspect of urban poverty.

The debate between historians on urban decline has long emphasised economic and demographic aspects. However, more recently, understanding of the ways in which urban communities related to each other in the sixteenth and seventeenth century has became prominent in historical and archaeological research.[35] Urban success is not only determined by economic or demographic factors but by the quality of political culture. This includes attitudes towards urban space, public buildings and infrastructures, regulation of the environment and strategies of estate acquisition.[36] It will be argued below that in the period between 1500 and the late 1560s, projects of regeneration, strategies of acquisition of buildings and provision of services were applied by several urban agencies to manage the economic and social crisis.

Regeneration in the Close: the early sixteenth century

The historiography of secular cathedrals on the eve of the Reformation describes a situation of inertia, corruption, neglect and decay of the cathedral buildings. [37] For example the 1519 inquest of the condition of the cathedral in York has been generally accepted and quoted as exemplary evidence for neglect.[38] However, at the beginning of the sixteenth century York Minster was a wealthy and well administered ecclesiastical corporation, run by two or three canons in residence out of a total of 36, with numerous staff carrying out administrative and service

---

[35] Tittler, *The Reformation and the Towns*. K. Giles, 'Reforming Corporate Charity: Guilds and Fraternities in Pre- and Post reformation York', in D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003), pp. 325-40; A. Shepard and P.Withington ,*Communities in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2000); Withington, *The Politics of Commonwealth*, pp. 3-15; M.S.R. Jenner and P. Griffiths, *Londinopolis: Essays in the Cultural and Social History of Early Modern London* (Manchester, 2000).

[36] Tittler, *The Reformation and the Towns*, pp. 254-9.

[37] D. MacCulloch, 'The Change of Religion', in P. Collinson (ed) , *The Sixteenth Century 1485-1603* (Oxford, 2002), p. 84; Cross, 'From the Reformation', pp. 193-5.

[38] Raine, *Fabric Rolls,* pp. 267-9; Lehmberg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals,* pp. 36-7, 67; A. Masinton, 'Sacred Space', p. 27.

roles. [39] The major construction works of the cathedral were finally completed by 1500.[40] Archbishop Wolsey, appointed in 1514, and his predecessor never resided in their dioceses and their Episcopal duties were carried out by deputies. The deans at the beginning of the century were also absentees. However, Dean Brian Hidgen, appointed in 1516, was in residence for 22 years and was constantly present for chapter meetings. He demonstrated an active interest in the maintenance and redevelopment of the buildings in the Close from the beginning of his office. The 1519 inquest on the state of the cathedral, rather than an example of decay, may signify that action was being taken to improve management. The inquest was carried out by the Vicars Choral. It emerged that slips in the standard of housekeeping needed to be addressed. Building maintenance, cob webs, misplaced keys and vestments that needed to be laundered and mended and other minor complaints seem to have been the problem.[41] In the same year repair works to the church of St Michael-le-Belfrey began, after over a century of complaints by parishioners.[42] Another sign of Hidgen's interest in rebuilding was the redevelopment of the mansion of Ullerskelf, of which he was prebendary.[43] He may have inhabited that mansion when the Deanery was used as the seat of the Council of the North until 1547.[44] In addition, Hidgen's display of pomp and wealth in special occasions may have represented an attempt to affirm the authority of a resident Dean and his prestige within the city. He attended Christmas functions in the Minster preceded by a cortege of 50 gentlemen and followed by 30 yeomen. They were all dressed in a tawny livery, displaying textile material and trimmings indicating their respective social status. However, his major display of patronage was the rebuilding of the

---

[39] Cross, 'From the Reformation', p. 194.

[40] Brown, *York Minster*, p. 215.

[41] Cross, 'From the Reformation', p 194.

[42] Masinton, 'Sacred Space', pp. 77-8

[43] See Chapter 2, p. 117.

[44] See Chapter 5. 1, p. 216.

church of St Michael-le-Belfrey, the last architectural project in the Close before the Reformation.[45]

The church of St Michael-le-Belfrey was remodelled between 1525 and 1537.[46] The Dean and Chapter financed the work and the project also received support by individual canons.[47] Anthony Masinton suggests that new ideas on perspective and light were applied in the design of St Michael-le-Belfrey.[48] Classical decorative details were interpreted in the still traditional structure of the church.[49] Since major works in the cathedral were completed by 1500 this project represented both the regeneration and the continuity of the Close as a centre of architectural excellence and experimentation.[50] The Archbishop's Exchequer Office, abutting the church, was rebuilt immediately after.[51] The redevelopment of this area of the Close prominently located between the cathedral, the Deanery and the city streets may demonstrate the Dean and Chapter's commitment to create order in the urban environment. Despite the economic depression of the 1520s, construction projects for public buildings did not stop in the City of York either. The new Common Hall Gates, with the annexed chamber and maison-dieu, were completed in 1532 by the St Christopher Guild.[52] This was a guild with the charitable role of building and maintaining urban infrastructures. Robert Tittler has argued that in times of economic crisis English towns invested in public buildings, such as guildhalls, as a display of confidence in the future.[53] These projects of regeneration may have represented the application of humanist ideas that urban order and decorum were

---

[45] Palliser, *Tudor York*, p. 214; Masinton, 'Sacred Space', pp. 68-9.

[46] Masinton, 'Sacred Space', pp. 77-8.

[47] Masinton, 'Sacred Space', pp. 68-9.

[48] Masinton, 'Sacred Space', pp. 88-89.

[49] A. Masinton, ongoing work on the church, personal communication, University of York, 5 March 2010.

[50] Brown, *York Minster,* for architectural history until 1500.

[51] See Chapter 2. 3. 3, p. 99.

[52] E. White, *The St Christopher and St George Guild of York*, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 72 (York, 1987), pp. 2-10.

[53] Tittler, *Architecture and Power*.

connected with good governance. Decay and disorder, by contrast, were connected with disease and poverty.[54]

Stategies of acquisition and provision of services after the 1536 and 1548 Dissolutions

Anxiety about urban decay and disorder became more acute after the Dissolution. In 1536, at the Dissolution of the monastic houses, about a quarter of domestic properties in the City of York were appropriated by the Crown and resold in 1545 to a London alderman.[55] In 1548 at the Dissolution of the chantries a further 500 houses were appropriated by the Crown.[56] There was the fear that property falling into the hands of speculators from the south of England would be left to decay. Moreover rents paid to distant landlords would have drained money away from the city, exacerbating the depression. The Corporation of York tried to buy the bulk of the properties of the dissolved chantries, with the help of their friend at court Sir Michael Stanhope. He acquired these from Protector Somerset, but the price was too high and the deal could not be closed.[57]

The Dean and Chapter may have faced the same anxieties in regard to those buildings in the Close that were to be appropriated by the Crown. These properties once sold would have been outside the control of the Dean and Chapter and Archbishop, with the consequent danger of undesirable tenants. Pre-emptive selling of assets anticipating this event was forbidden, but more imaginative solutions could have been implemented.[58] Voluntary surrender of properties, where there was suspicion that they might be expropriated, may have given some control on re-acquisition.[59] This may have been the case of the two mansions in the Close surrendered to the Crown: the Treasurer's House in 1547

---

[54] Fay, 'Health and Disease', pp. 163-71.

[55] Palliser, *Tudor York*, p. 236.

[56] Palliser, *Tudor York*, p. 239.

[57] Tillott, *VCH York*, pp 147-8; Palliser, *The Reformation,* p. 24.

[58] Tittler, *The Reformation and the Towns*, pp. 59-73, 67-70

[59] Tittler, *The Reformation and the Towns*, pp. 67-70

and the prebendal mansion of South Cave in 1549. The prebend of South Cave was attractive to the Crown, because it was the wealthiest of the offices still left in York Minster.[60] Its mansion in the Close was prominently located, facing the west front of the cathedral, the Dean and Chapter may have wished to retain control on that property. The surrendered mansion was immediately bought by aforementioned Sir Michael Stanhope in 1549. By 1568 it is recorded as a property of the Fabric Fund.[61] This suggests that a strategy to preserve this estate had been successful.

The Treasurer's house in the late 1540s was at risk of being expropriated. The office of Treasurer had been weakened by the confiscation of the cathedral treasure during the 1540s, however, two wealthy prebends were still attached to it.[62] This mansion stands in the most secluded residential area of the Minster Yard, next to the cathedral's East doorway and the Chapter House. Moreover it was connected to the memory of St William, a former Treasurer and Archbishop and until 1541 the most venerated saint in the Minster.[63] The Dean and Chapter may have been anxious about losing control on such a property. A case of dilapidation of the Treasurer's house was brought to a 1545 Chapter meeting.[64] Dilapidation of this mansion is surprising because Treasurer Lancelot Collynson had been in residence at least for a decade before 1538, dividing a rich common fund only with the Dean. His successor William Cliff was also resident.[65] Either Cliff had been so negligent that, according to the Minster Statutes, a survey was necessary to enforce repairs. Or an assessment of dereliction by the Dean and Chapter was made in advance of the surrender of the Treasurership in 1547, perhaps to influence its value. In fact the mansion after its surrender was immediately bought by Archbishop Holgate and inherited by two successive Archbishops.

---

[60] Cross, 'From the Reformation', pp. 196-7.

[61] YMA, E3/51-63.

[62] Cross, 'From the Reformation', p. 195.

[63] Norton, *St William of York*.

[64] YMA, H3/65, f 35b.

[65] Cross, 'From the Reformation', p. 195.

Another successful acquisition was the dissolved chapel of St Mary and the Holy Angels. This was sold in 1549, but by 1568 what was left of the chapel belonged to the Fabric Fund.[66] One building, however, was lost. St William's College in 1549 was bought by two speculators, Matthew White a chantry commissioner and his business partner Edward Bury. They also bought 150 messuages and thirty houses of chantry property in York, creating such an outrage that they were murdered two months later in the rebellion at Seamer.[67] Therefore, apart from St William's College, the Church of York successfully retained control of property in the Close and on the residents within.

During the crisis created at the Dissolution by the disappearance of necessary social services in the city, the Church of York and the City Corporation joined forces to remedy the situation. Institution for the care of the sick and the poor were kept out of the boundaries of the Close. Instead its traditional role as an educational centre was further reinforced. The foundation of Archbishop Holgate's free school was the result of the joint action of Archbishop Holgate, then President of the Council of the North, the Mayor and the Communality and the Dean and Chapter.[68] If the Archbishop was the major party in this initiative, the contribution of the other two was considerable in both the endowment and management of the school. The way in which the land, the lease of the bastions and the suppressed parish churchof St John-del-Pyke were endowed to the school suggests a well planned collaboration of several agencies, acting for the common good of the city.[69] However, the most remarkable collaboration, which transformed the landscape of the Close, was the permanent establishment in York of the Council of the North. Although some of the Council's activities may have been unpopular with the York citizen, the city's economy benefited from its

---

[66] Tillott, *VCH York*, p. 338; BIHR, CC. Ab. 9. York and chapter 2 p.

[67] Dickens, *Robert Holgate Archbishop of York*, p.13; Palliser, *The Reformation*, p.24; and *Tudor York*, p. 239.

[68] See Chapter 2. 5. 3, pp. 121-2 and Chapter 5.2, pp. 270-2.

[69] It has been suggested that this may have been the grammar school supported by the Commonality of York and for which the remission of the fee-farm was claimed. Raine, *Medieval York*, p. 49.

residence.[70] This was recognised in 1560 by the city councillors and by Sir Thomas Gargrave, Vice-President of the Council between 1555 and 1579.[71] He was trusted and respected by the city and served as its MP in 1547-52.[72] At least since 1568 he lived in the Close in the former prebendal mansion of South Cave and was steward of the lands of the Dean and Chapter.[73] Gargrave was a good politician, connecting the Council with the interests of the City of York and of the Dean and Chapter. He put pressure on his friend William Cecil, obtaining by the Queen the permanent establishment of the Council in York.

Stagnation

Despite the fact that in the first half of the sixteenth-century public buildings were redeveloped, there was marked stagnation in construction activity in the domestic and commercial sectors. The written sources suggest a prolonged lack of building activity in housing and shops of the Dean and Chapter estate in the Close until the end of the 1560s. This perception, however, needs to be set against the poor survival rate of the Fabric Rolls between 1500 and 1567, whilst the series of rolls between 1567 and 1587 is almost complete, between 1568 and 1587 only four years out of sixteen are missing. By contrast between 1535 and 1567 only eight rolls on a total of 37 survive. However, in these surviving rolls a lack of purchase of building material and of workers' wages in the account suggests a lack of building projects, both in the Close and in the city. This is in contrast with the high level of building activity documented in the accounts between 1567 and 1587. The discrepancies in the survival of sources could be misleading, creating the impression of an increase in building activity. However, leases from 1500 to 1720 allow us to reconstruct an almost complete picture of the buildings in the Close, and it is evident that major rebuilding and the construction of new houses on previously vacant land happened from the late

---

[70] Tillott, *VCH York*, pp 136-7. The requests by Holgate for provision of soldiers and goods for military purposes to an already depleted town was particularly resented in 1549, see Dickens, *Robert Holgate*, pp. 14-5 ; Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 53-54.

[71] Palliser, *Tudor York*, p. 261.

[72] Palliser, *Tudor York*, p. 261.

[73] YMA, E1/91; E3/ 51-55.

1560s. Furthermore the list of rents in the Fabric accounts from 1499 until 1639 record the core properties of the estate: three tenements, one house to the west of the cathedral, six ground floor rooms or shops, a room with a chamber over and two chambers above the gates.[74] The only additions were the small house abutting the Library, documented from 1544 but perhaps built in the 1500s, the small building by the Chapter House documented from 1537, a stable and "the Hell" from 1559.[75] The Chamberlain Rolls start to record rents only from 1572, listing the buildings of new construction.[76] This suggests that there was indeed a period of stagnation in the built environment followed by a sudden increase in activity in the 1560s. Nevertheless, in the surviving rolls it appears that maintenance to the cathedral and to the infrastructures was carried out. Disruption to the paving of the Minster Yard was promptly repaired with new cobbles, when a bell foundry for the new bell for St Michael-le-Belfrey was made in 1556.[77] The gutters running in the cemetery of St John-del-Pyke were repaired in 1536 and the Masons' well was constantly kept in good order.[78] The built environment was well looked after but static.

The situation in the Close seems to reflect the one in the City of York in the same period, where domestic building activity stagnated until the last quarter of the century. Economic decline and loss of population had an impact on property rents and vacant and dilapidated houses became a problem.[79] Therefore the Dean and Chapter had no incentive to redevelop or build new properties on vacant plots or to increase commercial space in the Close. However, in other cathedral closes the situation appears to be quite different. In St Paul's cathedral in London, properties of dissolved chantries within the close were immediately converted into bookshops of the fast growing book trade.[80] In monastic

---

[74] From YMA, E3/32 and E3/63.

[75] YMA, E3/44-45-51.

[76] YMA, E1/91.

[77] YMA, E3/48.

[78] YMA, E3/43.

[79] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 214-5; Hartshorne, 'The Street and the Perception', pp. 134-5.

[80] Blayney, 'John Day', pp. 326-7.

cathedrals as in Norwich, buildings were adapted for the use of the secular clergy and new houses were built from the 1540s.[81] There also was a high level of building activity in the small City of Chichester during the 1530s and 1540s. The Dean and Chapter were redeveloping shops and residential properties, increasing living space and adding new features such as chimneys.[82] These discrepancies must be explained. London was prospering because its role as the capital was growing. Norwich was one of the most prosperous and populated cities and domestic building activity had been further stimulated by the rebuilding following the 1507 fire.[83] Also the urban experience of Chichester was quite different from the one of York. Chichester was a small city of less than 2,000 people, but with a growing population and growing taxable income.[84] There is no apparent explanation for its success, but it may have been an advantaged by its position in the south of England with more favourable conditions for trading.[85] The difference between the relative economic growth of these cities and York may have been a factor for the different rate of redevelopment in the respective cathedral closes in the same decades.

In conclusion, in the first half of the sixteenth century there was investment in public buildings and in services, but not in housing stock. In Chapter 6.2 it will be discussed how from the late 1560s to the 1580s the building stock in the Close increased and reached its maximum potential, which is the land use shown by eighteenth-century estate maps.[86] Domestic and commercial space was periodically adapted and restructured for the needs of the tenants. However, after the 1580s it is not possible to establish clear patterns of redevelopment and stagnation, because the responsibility for further building works was the tenants', and thus not documented by the Fabric Accounts.

---

[81] Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close,* pp. 210-220; T. Tatton-Brown, *Great Cathedrals of England* (London*,* 1989), p.193; Lehmberg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals*, p. 84.

[82] J. Fines, 'Cathedral and Reformation', M. Hobbs (ed) *Chichester Cathedral. A Historical Survey* (Chichester, 1994), pp.54-5.

[83] Dyer, *Decline and Growth*, 36-7; Tittler, *The Reformation and the Towns*, p. 99.

[84] Dyer, *Decline and Growth*, pp. 53-66.

[85] Ibid., p. 27.

[86] BIHA, Map 24.

Decay: the Palace and the mansions

Allegations of decay are found in the written sources in respect of high status domestic buildings in the Close. However, apart from iconoclasm, the secular establishment of York Minster was never subjected to destruction and reshaping of the built environment on the scale seen in monastic cathedrals. There, buildings symbolic of the communal life of the religious community were demolished or adapted for the needs of a secular life.[87]Nor was the Close ever subjected to vandalism and destruction of canons' houses and of boundary walls, as had happened in the closes of secular cathedrals in France.[88] In York Minster the Reformation had been a remarkably controlled process. When the Pilgrimage of Grace reached York in 1536, Aske met the clergy at the Minster doors accompanied by only 4,000-5,000 horsemen. Many thousands of rebels were left outside the city walls for fear of vandalism.[89] Continuity and adaptation to changing circumstances, rather than responses to traumatic events, characterised the occupation of high status domestic buildings in the post-Reformation Close.

The Archbishop's Palace since the thirteenth century had ceased to be the Archbishop's residence in York, but it had come to symbolise Episcopal spiritual authority within the Close.[90] Archbishop de Grey's construction of a new chapel, significantly dedicated to the apostle St Andrew, followed by his relocation to Bishopthorpe, coincided with the strengthening of the Dean and Chapter's authority. This had been a common practice in cathedrals after the Gregorian reform, to stress that the authority of bishops was spiritual, rather than secular. The Palace was used instead for lordly hospitality. Edward I made his headquarters there during the Scottish campaigns. Plantagenet and Tudor royals continued this tradition when visiting the North. Despite occasional complaints

---

[87] R.K. Morris, 'Monastic Architecture: Destruction and Reconstruction', in D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003), pp. 235-51; Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close,* p. 209; Howard, *The Buildings of Elizabethan,* pp 13-45.

[88] Picard, *Les Chanoines dans la Ville,* passim; Spicer, 'Orleans'.

[89] Tillott, *VCH York*, p. 145; Palliser, *The Reformation in York*, p. 24.

[90] Miller, *The Bishop's Palace*.

of decay, until 1507 the Palace was fit for hosting Queen Margaret on her way to Scotland and in 1531 it was still in good order.[91] However, in 1541 Henry VIII broke with the tradition observed by his own family. During his visit he stayed at the King's Manor.[92] He may have chosen this to make a statement of ownership of a dissolved monastery and to reinforce the power of his Council in the North.

The most prominent narrative of "decay" and "reformation" in the Close is the one documented in the 1618 lease of the Archbishop's Palace to Sir Arthur Ingram. Of the old Palace "nothing but an arch and a prison and an old chapel" was left. The grounds were "full of old stones and marshes areas".[93] However, the Archbishop's Palace was not in complete ruin; it was still inhabitable in the 1610s, when Sir Arthur Ingram occupied the west wing and the neighbouring mansion of South Cave as its keeper. Having lost its role as a grand residence, the Palace was looked after by a custodian throughout the sixteenth and early seventeenth century. His main responsibility was to be the gaoler of the Archbishop's prison, which continued to be used for the people of the Diocese, kept in good repair and well furnished of chains, stocks and fetters.[94] The Palace ground was used as pasture, providing part of the income of the custodian.[95] The Palace Yard was certainly used as a quarry for re-used building materials.[96] The "old stones", as already discussed, may have been in part the result of iconoclasm and in part may have resulted from the demolition of the Palace great hall or other annexes. The hall was dismantled by Thomas Young, Archbishop between 1561 and 1568, allegedly to recover the lead and to sell it for his own

---

[91] Butler, 'Notes on the Minster Close ', p. 13. See chapter 2 pp. 127-32.

[92] Tillott, *VCH York,* p.146; Brooks, *York and the Council,* p. 10.

[93] See Chapter 2. 7. 2; Butler, 'York Palace', p. 29.

[94] See Chapter 2. 7. 1, pp. 132-4.

[95] YMA, Wb, fols. 36v-37; Wb, fol. 282; YMA, E3/59; E3/62/1; YMA, Wc, fol. 270; YMA, E3/62/3; E3/63/1.

[95] YMA, E3/59; E3/62/3, "late William Rawnson".YMA, Wc, fol. 270.

[96] See Chapter 6.3, pp. 341-2.

profit.[97] Archbishop Markam tells another story in a legal cause of 1781. According to him Young pulled down the Great Hall to "recover the ashis", meaning the timbers, and not for robbing the lead.[98] Young was in fact an unpopular figure among zealous Protestants because, when President of the Council of the North and of the Ecclesiastical Commission, he had been tolerant of recusants and survivalists.[99] In Norwich too, the great hall of the Bishop's Palace was pulled down. The chapel was leased out and the rest of the palace was reduced but kept in good order.[100] Both in York and in Norwich the great hall may have been pulled down because it had become obsolete. In York its timbers may have been needed for redevelopment; perhaps even for the King's Manor, which was being remodelled at that time, or for the sixteenth-century rebuilding of the Treasurer's House. The Reformation denied the bishops their apostolic role, as defined in the Gregorian reform, thus their palaces did lose some of their symbolic meanings.

The prebendal mansions from 1500 until the end of the 1560s continued their original residential role. They were high status urban dwelling of the canons when attending Chapter meetings or when in residence. By the beginning of the sixteenth century only one or two canons were in residence at any time in York Minster. In accordance with the 1325 Minster Statutes the most comfortable mansions in the Close were to be offered by the absentees to the residentiaries. This because the canons residentiariy were expected to be available at all times for the cathedral management and to entertain in grand style, spending 1000 marks in the first year of their office.[101] The Henrician Statutes of 1541 tried to encourage residence with the abolition of the clause requesting a huge spending in entertainment. However, the number of residentiaries only increased to three after the Reformation.[102]Therefore only few of the mansions would have been

---

[97] Drake, *Eboracum*, p. 454. Stow, John *The Annales of England* (London ,1631 2nd edn), p. 662.

[98] BIHR, CC. Ab. 9, York.

[99] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 244-5.

[100] Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close*, p. 211.

[101] Cross, 'From the Reformation', p.198. Raine, *The Statutes*, pp. 38-9.

[102] Cross, 'From the Reformation', p.198.

occupied by canons in residence both before and after the Reformation. In the first half of the sixteenth century the mansions of South Cave, Langtoft, Ullerskelf, the Deanery and Treasurer's house were certainly inhabited.[103] A clause in the Minster Statutes prohibited letting of the mansion within the Close to persons who were not members of the Church of York. Until the 1560s there is no evidence that this rule was ever broken.[104] The leases indicate that the mansions acquired a high rental value only in the fourth quarter of the century after widespread redevelopment. This reflects not only the quality and market demand of the property, but also changes in the professional status of the tenants. When the mansions were leased to clergy members of the Church of York only symbolic rents were paid. For example a red rose at St John was requested by the absentee George Boleyn in 1582 for the mansion of Ullerskelfe to the canon Edwin Gaudes. But in a new lease in 1588 he charged a proper market rent of £ 53 to the lawyer and lay prebendary John Bennet.[105] Some of the absentees came periodically to York and attended chapter meetings. They asked for the right to be hosted in their own mansions as part of the lease agreement. In 1558 Dr George Palmes a residentiary and former prebendary of Langtoft was promoted to the prebend of Wetwang, one of the wealthiest but without a mansion. The new prebendary of Langtoft, Benjamin Norton, leased the mansion to Palmer, which was already living there, requesting the right to be hosted in the mansion when in town.[106] The arrangement did not last long because Dr Palmer in 1559 refused to swear allegiance to Elizabeth and Norton complied but became a recusant soon after.[107] Prebendaries preferred to remain in the same house even when they were appointed to another prebend. This continued throughout the sixteenth century.[108]

---

[103] YMA, Wa, fol. 1v; Wb, fol. 116v.

[104] Raine, *The Statutes*, pp. 38-9.

[105] YMA, Wb, fol. 315v; Wc, fols. 23v-24.

[106] YMA, Wb, fol. 116v.

[107] Cross, 'From the Reformation', pp. 204-5.

[108] YMA, Wc, 156v-157.

Alternative use of the mansions

The mansions not used as dwellings of resident canons were put to alternative uses. Members of the cathedral community and necessary activities were housed in these mansions. The carpenters' workshop was located in the hall of the mansion of Fenton and beforehand in the former mansion of Warthill.[109] This was leased by the Fabric Fund from the prebendary of Warthill and it was specifically intended for the housing needs of the cathedral community. The choir boys were living there in 1478. Some of the cathedral appointments included accommodation. Throughout the sixteenth century the Master of the Choir and twelve choir boys were to be housed in an adequate "house or mansion" in the Close.[110] It is not possible to locate with precision the house "where the magister of the children dwelleth" in 1571, but this was most probably the mansion of Wistow. [111] In Salisbury too the master, the choristers and the school were housed in one of the prebendal mansions.[112] Other mansions in York may have housed some of the cathedral's administrative staff, but there is no evidence for this.

Even when the rent of prebendal mansions was symbolic, the lessees had to maintain the property in good repair at their own expenses.[113] In the Minster Statutes there were a series of measures to prevent dilapidation of prebendal property. Inspections of the mansions were carried out every time a new prebendary was appointed. The repairs were compulsory, but the newly appointed prebendaries could claim compensation from the Dean and Chapter common fund for improving previously neglected houses.[114] Moreover, the Clerk of the Work had the duty to prevent decay and carry out repairs of the cathedral

---

[109] See Chapter 2 p. 101.

[110] YMA, Wa, fols. 50v-51;Wa, fols. 157v-158.

[111] YMA, E3/52. See Chapter 2. 4. 2, p. 111.

[112] RCHME, *Salisbury,* p. 23.

[113] YMA, Wa, fol. 1v.

[114] Raine, *The Statutes* , pp. 37-9.

and associate buildings.[115] Despite these measures for careful maintenance, in the Visitation of 1559 some of the mansions were said to be in decay.[116] The perception of decay is reinforced by the narrative in the leases of the redeveloped mansions of Stillington and the Subdeanery in 1576-7. These were redeveloped by the new tenants at their own expenses with "very great charges" for "great reparations" and "needful repairs and alterations".[117]

Decay of prebendal houses was also remarked in Chichester, where a newly appointed bishop in 1509 complained of the general squalor of the close and of the unwillingness of the canons to take residence. This, however, was part of the rhetoric for his endowment of four new prebends for Wincester and Oxford graduates and the claims of decay may have been exaggerated.[118] In Salisbury two of the seven canons' houses were refurbished in the 1540s and the medieval Deanery was updated and its hall closed in the mid sixteenth century.[119] Other canons' houses were used to house the song school or leased to the laity since the beginning of the century. This suggests that the mansions in Salisbury Close were inhabited and looked after. However, the bishop's Visitations of 1562 complained about the decay of prebendal houses. In the 1580s several of the mansions were redeveloped and by 1593 they were declared to be in better state that they had ever been.[120] This chronology for redevelopment is very similar to the one in York. It is significant that in both cathedrals complaints were made in visitations at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. This may indicate that the mansion, rather than dilapidated, may have been perceived as antiquated. Moreover, emphasis on "decay" may have supported the rhetoric of renewal at the beginning of the new regime.

---

[115] Ibid. p. 78.

[116] Cross, 'From the Reformation', p. 203 citing PRO S. P.12/10/244-5; Aveling, *Catholic Recusancy,* pp. 17-8.

[117] YMA, Wb, fols. 281v-282; Wb, fols. 295v-296.

[118] Lehmberg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals*, p. 36.

[119] RCHME, *Salisbury*, pp. 24-5.

[120] Ibid., p. 24.

Structure and use of the medieval mansions 1500-1560s

Only three of the prebendal houses in the Close have in part survived modern redevelopment. Standing evidence and pictorial sources of the mansions of Fenton, Ullerskelf , Strensall and the Treasurer's house, suggest that the medieval mansions were stone built. Timber frames over a stone undercroft or lower floor were also used in the service wing of the mansion of Langtoft and in the early sixteenth-century redevelopment of the mansion of Ullerskelf.[121] Written sources and maps suggest that houses developed throughout the course of time, with the expansion of wings and outbuildings, as the progressive expansion of the Deanery and of the mansion of Strensall indicate.[122] In the early sixteenth century, the best documented mansions were comprised of an open hall with dais and wings at the higher and lower ends. They were similar to high status dwellings of country lords.[123] The wing at the high end contained a parlour and a service or storage room, sometimes called the "candle room", and in most cases a cellar in a undercroft or basement. On the upper floor there was the great chamber, a number of other chambers and a chapel.[124] Garderobes and closets are also attested on the upper floor.[125] At the lower ends there were the kitchen and service rooms such as the pantry, buttery, larders and salt-fish rooms.[126] Outbuildings included bakeries, also called pastry, breweries, fuel storage for wood and coal and stables. The mansions' gardens were ample and the ones of the mansions of Fenton, Stillinghton, Ullerskelf and the Treasurer's house were bounded by the city bastions. (Map 5) The courtyards of the mansions were enclosed by a further range, sometimes with a gateway and porter lodge.

---

[121] Chapter 2. 6. 1, p. 125 ; 2. 5. 2, pp. 114-7.

[122] See Chapters 2. 4. 1 and 2. 4. 2.

[123] Wood, *The English Medieval House*; Grenville, *Medieval Housing*.

[124] Cross, *York Clergy Wills*, pp. 10-4 and 58-64.

[125] See Subdeanery, Deanery.

[126] Cross, *York Clergy Wills*, pp. 10-4, 58-64 and 70-4.

Separate lodgings with closets and fireplaces are attested in the Deanery gatehouse.[127]

The use of the mansions before the last quarter of the sixteenth century is documented by three probate inventories. One is the 1545 inventory made at the death of Dean Layton. [128]From the analysis of this document it emerges that the Deanery functioned not only as a centre of consumption, but also as a well managed centre for domestic production. Dean Layton, a fierce critic of mismanagement, may have set in his own household an example of good husbandry of the domestic domain.[129] The inventory is fragmentary and not all the rooms and their contents are described. Nevertheless it gives an idea of the conspicuous accumulation of household goods by Dean Leyton. This included not only utilitarian objects but also textiles, silverware and visual art, such as religious paintings on canvass and boards. The lower end of the house and the Deanery yard housed productive activities. The presence of a granary suggests that a considerable amount of agricultural produce, possibly coming from the Dean's prebendal estate, were stored. The bakery and the outbuildings storing coal and peat served for processing this food. Moreover another raw material was bought or perhaps produced in the Deanery yard. A spinning room, with spinning wheels, was located at the lower end of the house. Scales for weighting wool were found in the higher end of the house, suggesting that the Dean was in direct control of its purchase or production. The Deanery yard and the Warthill gardens may have been used for pasture, producing wool and meat.[130] The presence in the stable, in addition to two horses, of a cow and a pig sty, suggests that the slaughterhouse, converted later to other uses, was still being used.

By contrast two inventories of the mansion of Langtoft give an impression that this house was completely different from the vitality of the Deanery. The first is the 1529 inventory of William Melton and second the one of Thomas Marser of

---

[127] See pp. 106-8.

[128] Cross, *York Clergy Wills*, pp. 10-4 and 70-4.

[129] See p. 168 for Layton personality.

[130] Cross, *York Clergy Wills*, pp. 58-64.

1547. The comparison between these suggests that changes in the use of the house had occurred in the years between 1529 and 1547. The interior arrangement of the house did not change, but the name of the rooms and their content did. In 1529 in the high end wing there were a great chamber, a chapel chamber and a chapel. The chapel chamber contained a bed and linens. Further five chambers also contained beds and linens, and were named after the owner and four important or habitual guests, according to the custom of that time.[131] In 1547 the chapel chamber changed name and use; it was re-named "the stodie". It seems to have been the best furnished room, containing a table covered by a carpet, a chair with a cushion, all the books of the deceased, four chests and two other pieces of furniture for storage. Thomas Marser's cap and gown were also kept there, adding a further personal touch to the space of this room. It is significant that the names and function of the bed chambers were changed too. Apart from the owner's chamber, there were a wardrobe chamber and a servant chamber, the other two rooms were not mentioned, and therefore may have been empty. Thomas Marser had his main household based in the smaller parsonage house of Escrick. In contrast with the one in York, its study there contained books, rather than "all his books", and storage furniture. A trestle table and a chair could have been used for household management, rather than for comfortable study.[132] The changes in the use of rooms in the mansion of Langtoft suggest that this was used by Thomas Marser for his work in the Minster and perhaps staffed by a minimal household. The study with all his books was prominent because as Chancellor he was in charge of the Minster's doctrinaire matters. However, the changes in use of the guest chambers and paucity of household goods suggest that the role of the mansion for hospitality had also declined. This impression is reinforced by the content of the cellar, with its several great barrels empty and only a small one full of Barbera wine.[133]

---

[131] Cooper, *Houses of the Gentry*, p. 94.

[132] Cross, *York Clergy Wills*, p. 75.

[133] Barbera is a red wine made from a cepage now grown almost exclusively in the Monferrato and Langhe areas of Italy.

In fact the other purpose of the medieval prebendal mansions was to offer hospitality to travelling magnates and their retinue. The Dean of York was one of the great lords of medieval England and a high standard of hospitality was expected by him.[134] The lodgings in the Back Gate House would have been used to house the retinue of visiting magnates. Moreover two large cellars, in the undercroft of the high end wings, suggest the capacity for lavish hospitality. Probably for these reasons the Deanery until 1538 was chosen as the seat of the itinerant Council of the North. However, changes in use of the other mansions suggest that allegations of decay, rather than neglect and dereliction, may have referred to obsolescence. A comparison could be found with the medieval Episcopal mansions in London or Inns, which were the urban residence of the bishops when attending the court in Westminster. These courtyard mansions with halls and chapels and vast gardens were built outside the jurisdiction of the City of London, in the suburb of Southwark and in the Strand. By the end of the fifteenth century they were losing their original meanings and the Reformation accelerated this trend. During the first half of the sixteenth century the mansions on the Strand remained high status residences. However, rooms facing the streets or the courtyards were let as workshops or as low status lodgings. Other mansions were developed as Inns of Law or inns for visitors. [135] (Fig. 107)

The reasons for this decline were changes to the way in which great households functioned and political careers were made. Mark Girouard argues that during the sixteenth century the size of the household was progressively but significantly reduced. More recently it has been suggested more crucially that what was changing was not so much the number but the composition of the household. Female servants replaced armed men.[136] The centralised control of the Crown made it unnecessary to keep a large retinue as a private militia for power or protection. The way to gain power and influence was also changing; it required serving the Crown from a base in the Counties and spending periods of time in

---

[134] Dobson, 'The Political Role of the Archbishops of York', pp. 63-64.

[135] Schofield, *Medieval London Houses*, pp. 34-6, 41; Quiney, *Town Houses of Medieval Britain*, pp. 193-200.

[136] C. M. Woolgar, *The Great Household in Late Meieval England* (New Haven, 1999).

London at Court or on legal business. In these circumstances travelling with the household would have been a hindrance.[137] In York Minster Close the medieval mansion and the Palace were made for a different lifestyle therefore by the mid sixteenth century they had become obsolete.

Lack of acceptance of new ideas of urbanism

Whenever change was needed or desired, the rhetoric of decay was used. Fifty years after the major phase of redevelopment of the Close, new attitudes towards urban planning were emerging. The comments on the landscape of the Close made by Charles I in his visit of 1633 demonstrate the rejection of a previous understanding of urban space:

"...we observed at the west end of that church where we entered certain houses built on either side, close upon the wall and one within the very cross isle, which we conceive tend much to the detriment of the Church and altogether to the disgrace of that godly fabric. After this looking aside we saw the like mean tenements in many places erected upon the south side of the church, which gave us cause to inform oneself of that great abuse in building houses and stables with their unclean passages a great deal too near to the house of God.... we will and command that neither you the Dean and Chapter for the time being nor any other Dean and Chapter that shall hereafter be, do either cause or suffer any dwelling house, stable or other edifice to be built within or against any part of that cathedral church aforesaid or the quire or chapter house of the same. And further that neither you nor they renew any lease ... but that you suffer the leases now running to expire and then pull down the houses, or sooner if any shall be so well minded to the Church as relinquish their dwellings."[138]

In the late sixteenth-century redevelopment, the cathedral and other public buildings in the Close were abutted and partially hidden by smaller buildings. This continued the medieval tradition of smaller timber buildings nestling against

---

[137] Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, pp. 84-6.

[138] YMA, Wd, fol. 114 v.

public or high status masonry buildings.[139] The latter were not perceived as isolated architectural forms, nor were they in any way diminished by the presence of these smaller, useful structures. Special rules were set out in the leases for the maintenance of buildings in close proximity of the cathedral, or abutting the church of St Michael-le-Belfrey, the gates and gate lodge, the Library, the Deanery wall and the Deanery back gate house.[140] An inspection by the Clerk of the Works or by a surveyor was carried out twice a year. If repairs were ordered, they were to be made within 20 days, followed by a further inspection. Repairs of the structural timbers of the frame, the "great timbers", of buildings abutting public ones were the direct responsibility of the Fabric rather than the tenants'.[141] It is significant that this rule did not apply for all the other properties of the Dean and Chapter, therefore special care was taken to prevent structural damage to public buildings. Special measures were also taken to maintain timber framed buildings in prominent locations. The tenants of the two houses in Petergate abutting and bonded with the South Minster Gate, were allowed to collect wood for the repair free of charges from the Dean and Chapter's wood of Langwith.[142] Therefore not only the structural maintenance of the gateway was important, but also the decorum of the street next to this important entrance in the Close. The Dean and Chapter took great care of the small domestic, commercial and educational buildings nestling against public ones and restricting the open space of the Minster Yard. These not only provided income to their estate, but also were important in articulating the meaning of the Close as a trading and cultural centre.

Concerns with overcrowding and unplanned development began to be in expressed in Elizabethan time. The 1580 proclamations for London prohibit building on green fields within the city. In the Stuart period, with Inigo Jones at

---

[139] K. A. Morrison, *English Shops and Shopping: An Architectural History* (New Haven and London, 2003), p 19. Schofield, *Medieval London Houses*, pp. 71-2, St Ethelburga, Bishopsgate.

[140] YMA Wb, fols, 138-138v; Wc, fols, 81-81v; We, fol. 326; Wb, fols 305v-306; Wd, fol. 78v; Wc, fols. 276-276v; We, fols. 11v-12; Wc, fols. 281v-282v; Wb fols. 129v-130; Wb fol. 302.

[141] YMA Wb, fols, 138-138v; Wc, fols, 81-81v; Wb fol. 302.

[142] YMA Wb, fols, 138-138v; Wc, fols, 81-81v.

the King's Works, more radical attempts were made to order the urban landscape according to principles of lower density and regular planning.[143] The cathedral landscape, because of its religious and political meanings, became a special target for change. I have already discussed how 'Laudanism' was a political issue in the Minster Close in the 1630s. I have also mentioned how new ideas of sacred space and the "beauty of holiness" were emerging with reference to Antiquity and to the iconography of the Solomon Temple in Jerusalem.[144] These, however, were not only ideas about religion but were part of a political agenda constructed with an aesthetic programme. The Stuart Kings relied on architect Inigo Jones for designing classicist architecture which underpinned and promoted the authority of kingship.[145] When Laud was made Bishop of London in 1628, Jones immediately started to work on the new façade of old St Paul's. Charles I was the patron of this project and his statue, together with the ones of his father and of the Saxon Kings, were to surmount the great portico. This structure was inspired by Palladio's drawings of the "Temple of Peace", or more precisely the Basilica of Maxentius in Rome. This building had a particular political meaning in the fifteenth and sixteenth century. It was a most admired ruin and it was believed that the treasure of the Solomon Temple in Jerusalem, plundered by Titus in 70 AD, was hidden there.[146] The papacy used this legend to reinforce their power by claiming that Rome was the heir of Jerusalem. The Stuart Kings were eager to construct Solomonic associations for themselves to legitimise their power. By graphically reconstructing the "Temple of Peace" as a classically isolated building, Palladio may have influenced the pan-European trend of clearance around cathedral buildings.[147] Clearance therefore was not the result of enlightened "Renaissance" planning but a reference to kingly and biblical authority. Charles I order to clear the buildings abutting York Minster were part

---

[143] Howard, *The Buildings of Elizabethan*, pp. 100-5.

[144] See Chapter 4, p. 217.

[145] R. Tavernor, *Palladio and Palladianism* (London, 1979), pp. 115-46 especially115-18 and 137-46; C. Anderson, *Inigo Jones and the Classical Tradition* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 4-5, 144-9, see also Jones' interpretation of the centrally planned Stonenge.

[146] Tavernor, *Palladio*, p. 137.

[147] For clearance around French cathedrals see Picard, *The Chanoines Dans la Ville*.

of a programme during his trip to Scotland of 1633. Orders for clearance were issued also at Durham cathedral and at St Giles' in Edinburgh.[148]

However, changes in architecture are resisted unless they are built on a familiar message. In this respect the response of the Dean and Chapter to the order to demolish buildings abutting the cathedral is revealing. Despite the fact that the Dean and Chapter were of Laudian persuasion, they took no immediate action and furthermore they renewed their leases a few years later. The Archbishop, made responsible by the King for enforcing this order, took no action either.[149] This suggests, rather than contempt for the King's orders, a lack of acceptance for these new ideas in urbanism. Not only might they have been reluctant to lose income from rents, but they also may not have been able to imagine the Close without these buildings. After all they were well maintained and the stable "The Hell" was discretely located to the cathedral's north side. Only after the Fire of London did the reasons for clearance become more convincing. In October 1667, exactly a year after this event, under the orders of Dean Hitch, tenants were relocated and the houses by the South Doorway demolished.[150] Danger of fire and pollution from domestic smoke were the official reason for this order. However, pollution by smoke and the need for a better environment was part of the rhetoric of "decay" of the Restoration.[151] It could be suggested that by that time the loss of small buildings in the Close was made more acceptable by the drawings of Daniel King in 1656 and of Hollar in 1667. These envisaged York Minster as an isolated cathedral, preparing the way towards clearance. (Map 5 a)

Conclusion

From this analysis it emerges that throughout this period there was preoccupation with disorder and dereliction of the built environment. Complaints of decay may

---

[148] A. Spicer, '"Laudianism" in Scotland? St Giles' Cathedral, Edinburgh, 1633-39: A Reappraisal', *Architectural History* 46 (2003) : 95-108.

[149] YMA, Wd, fols. 114 v-115.

[150] YMA, We, fol. 186.

[151] M. Jenner, 'The Politics of London Air: John Evelyn's Fumifugium and the Restoration', *Historical Journal* (1995): 535-551.

indicate awareness of problems and impetus towards finding solutions. The rebuilding of the church of St Michael-le-Belfrey and other projects continued the role of the cathedral landscape as a centre of architectural and artistic excellence and demonstrated the interest of the Dean and Chapter in urban regeneration. In the thirty years immediately following the Reformation, there was no need for expanding housing or commercial property within the Close; the environment appeared to have been kept tidy but was stagnant. Strategies implemented to retain the control on buildings and inhabitants of the Close further demonstrate the concern for urban order. Moreover, despite claims of decay, high status domestic buildings do not seem to have been dilapidated, but it appears that they had lost their original meanings. Discourses of urban order and improvement, perhaps inspired by humanist ideas, continued throughout the seventeenth century. However, it seems that drastic changes in urban planning needed to be first visualised and then put in practice.

6.2 Residential regeneration in the Close

The last quarter of the sixteenth century and the first one of the seventeenth century were a period of major transformation in the landscape of the Close. The question whether there was a period of substantial rebuilding or if there were progressive adaptations of the medieval housing stock, was first addressed by W. G. Hoskins in 1953.[152] His theory on the rebuilding of rural England has been widely criticised, debated and refined with regard to chronology, geographical and social context.[153] High status dwellings, such as country houses, have also received considerable attention.[154] However, rebuilding in an urban context has been addressed systematically only in the past decade, with the development of a multi-disciplinary archaeology of buildings. This reflects the methodological challenges of studying the built environment where there has been poor survival of the standing evidence, due to extensive modern redevelopment. Public buildings have received more attention, but only recently the study of domestic buildings has started to be addressed.[155] Many scholars have argued that explanations applied to rural contexts may not be appropriate for town houses.[156] Jayne Rimmer has discussed the variety of spatial solutions adopted in the construction and use of small urban houses in late medieval York and Norwich.[157] This variety makes the interpretation of rebuilding in town houses more complex. However, the potential of an interdisciplinary and contextual approach to the study of houses in the early modern period has been

---

[152] W. G. Hoskins, 'The Rebuilding of Rural England, 1570-1640', *Past and Present* 4 (1953): 44-59.

[153] R. Machin, 'The Great Rebuilding Reassessed', *Past and Present* 77 (1977): 33-56; M. Johnson, 'Rethinking the Great Rebuilding', *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 12 (1993): 117-125.

[154] Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*; Cooper, *Houses of the Gentry*; C. Platt, *The Great Rebuilding of Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1994); Airs, *The Tudor and Jacobean*; Hunneyball, *Architecture*.

[155] Tittler, *Architecture and Power*; Giles, *An Archaeology of Social Identity*.

[156] S. Pearson, 'Medieval Houses in English Towns: Form and Location', *Vernacular Architecture* 40 (2009): 1-22; .S. Pearson, 'Rural and Urban Houses, 1100-1500: "Urban Adaptation" Reconsidered', in C, Dyer and K. Giles (eds), *Town and Country in the Middle Ages 1100-1500*, The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monographs 22 (2005), 43-59; Quiney, *Town Houses of Medieval Britain*; Grenville, *Medieval Housing*; Schofield, *Medieval London Houses*.

[157] Rimmer, 'Small Houses'.

demonstrated by Chris King for urban merchant mansions.[158] The evidence from the Close offers the opportunity to explore the transformation of domestic space in higher and lower status housing in a provincial town between the 1560s and the 1630s.

The dynamic of rebuilding from the 1560s

In order to understand the degree of urban planning in the redevelopment of the Close, it is necessary to briefly consider the sequence of construction works. There are lacunae in the Fabric Rolls between 1560 and 1568-69, either because they are missing or badly preserved.[159] However, these incomplete records are supplemented by information from leases. Construction work can be divided into three groups: new buildings, redevelopment of existing domestic buildings and development of workshops. The first new project to be carried out was the construction of the bookshops by the cathedral south door, completed in 1568-9. This location was a previously empty area of the Minster Yard. As already discussed, this choice of location was deliberate and planned. The choice to build against the cathedral was not due to the lack of alternative suitable space; therefore it was not a response to commercial pressure on land use in the Close. In fact there were still two empty plots right opposite, on the corner with Minster Gates. In the same year other projects of redevelopment and maintenance were carried out the refurbishment of the former mansion of South Cave, by then already occupied by Sir Thomas Gargrave, was completed and the house in Petergate to the east of the South Minster Gate was refurbished, as well as the house abutting the Chapter House. Some conversion of the Masons' Lodge to residential use was also made this year.[160] In the following year two unidentified tenements were repaired and the house of the "Master of the Children", probably the mansion of Wistow, was refurbished.[161] In 1574 the house of William Gibson

---

[158] King, 'The Interpretation'.

[159] YMA, E3/49, 51.

[160] See p. 84.

[161] See p. 109.

in Minster Gates was substantially rebuilt and the Minster Yard was paved.[162] The two building projects carried out in 1576 consisted of the construction of a new carpenters' workshop and the new goldsmith's house opposite the cathedral south door. The mansion of Fenton was on lease as residential in 1578. [163] Only one roll, 1582-3 is missing in the series between 1577-8 and 1583-4.[164] In these six years, the works of the Fabric consisted only of small repairs, paving, maintenance and cleaning of the soakways and gutters around the Close.

In 1584 another major phase of residential redevelopment began. The Masons' Lodge was further redeveloped as a substantial dwelling house and immediately leased to a gentleman.[165] The neighbouring Lime Kiln was still in function for the building needs of the cathedral's Fabric and at that time there were no plans for its redevelopment. However, a year later, in 1585 the Lime Kiln house was converted into residential use. At the same time the Wright House was expanded with a two floor extension linking it to the neighbouring stable and chamber. The workshop was floored over and an external staircase added. The ground floor continued as the carpenters' workshop. Further minor works in 1587 expanded the accommodation with the addition of garrets, or alternatively made it more comfortable in with the addition of fireplace. With the loss of the site of the Masons' Lodge a new "store house" was built at some point for the needs of the Fabric on the corner between the north transept and the north aisle. A glaziers' chamber was built there in 1624. In the early seventeenth century the carpenters' workshop was moved from the Wright House and perhaps relocated into this area.[166] Further residential space was thus obtained in Precentors'Court, whilst the pressure on the densely occupied area of the Masons' Lodge continued in the form of multiple tenancies and occupation.[167]

---

[162] YMA, E3/53.

[163] YMA, Wb, fol. 301.

[164] YMA, E3/55-60.

[165] See Chapter 2, p. 84-5.

[166] See Chapter 2, p. 131.

[167] See Chapter 2, p. 74.

The prebendal mansions were redeveloped by their new tenants and it seems that by the late 1570s they were all refurbished and occupied. Minor works were added by new occupiers to upgrade and personalise the houses. The Deanery was also extensively redeveloped between the 1540s and the Civil War. The spatial arrangement suggests that this is likely to have happened during the sixteenth century. The Archbishop's Palace became the Ingram mansion in 1619. The Treasurer's house and St William's College were redeveloped by their new owners in several phases.

Increased demand for accommodation

The permanent establishment in York of the Council of the North coincided with a period of economic recovery in the City of York, fulfilling the hopes of its promoters. The legal business of the Council and of the Ecclesiastical courts was growing fast.[168] During quarter sessions the gentlemen lawyers were in York to work in the courts. Moreover, a growing number of county gentry came to town regularly at this time on legal business or just to participate in the social life. In fact networking and entertainment activities were developing around court sessions in the late sixteenth century. The City Communality established a race course as early as the 1530s to encourage gentry to visit, benefiting the economy of the city. Later there were archery competitions, animal fighting and falconry hunting in the forest of Galtres.[169] This resulted in an increase in demand for quality short term accommodation. Furthermore, suitors were also in need of temporary accommodation all year round, as the ecclesiastical courts worked full time. During the quarter sessions' "high season" the number of visitors would have increased further. In consequence of this, by 1596 there were at least 46 inns in the central area of York.[170]

In the Close the built environment was adapted to respond to this increased demand for accommodation. New lodgings were immediately leased to

---

[168] See Chapter 5.1.

[169] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 15, 20.

[170] Palliser, *Tudor York*, pp. 262-3.

gentlemen lawyers. The redevelopment of the Wright House, where an external staircase was added to gain access to new chambers above the workshops, finds a comparison in new housing and shop developments along the London Strand.[171] Another solution was short term accommodation in chambers above existing shops. This was a common practice to which restrictive clauses in the Dean and Chapter leases seems to refer. Moreover, subletting was subject to the approval of the Dean and Chapter, which suggests that lodgers in the Close were selected people. Lady Hoby in her sojourn in York was probably lodging in such accommodations in the Close or in its immediate proximity.[172] She appears to have had more than one chamber, in which she was receiving visits. In terms of quality and value for money, her lodgings in Westminster and in the Strand compared unfavourably with the ones in York.[173] Lodgings for persons of lower status, however, may have been much more modest. In London the increase in demand for rental accommodation was one of the reasons for the partition of chambers in the sixteenth century. New "chambers" were not defined by solid walls but by thin wood partitions or even by tapestry or pieces of canvass hanging from a beam.[174] In York, small houses built in the late medieval period could be easily partitioned and adapted according to needs.[175] St William's College may also have been divided into lodgings at this time and only in the seventeenth century was redeveloped as a single, high status residence.[176]

A third solution for short term accommodation was the revival of hospitality in the prebendal mansions. It has already been discussed that the nature of hospitality had changed by the mid sixteenth century. The mansions in the Close were thus redeveloped with new spatial arrangements and state of the art features, to offer a different kind of hospitality. Prestige was obtained by displaying good taste and education to selected groups of people of similar social

---

[171] Schofield, *Medieval London Houses*, pp. 55-6.

[172] Moody, *The Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby*, pp. 71-8.

[173] Moody, *The Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby*, p. 118

[174] Orlin, *Locating Privacy*, pp. 170-2.

[175] Rimmer, 'Small Houses', pp. 145-8.

[176] See Chapter 2, p. 117.

status or interests. [177] During the quarter session of the Council of the North the Lord Justices were regular guests in the redeveloped Subdeanery. In the 1576 lease, a clause specified that the Subdean retained the right to have a room in his former mansion when in visit to York, except during Assize weeks, when the justices were lodging there.[178] The kind of hospitality offered to them may have been similar to the one required by the absentee prebendaries when they came on Chapter business to York: "a convenient chamber" for themselves and for two servants, meals with meat and drinks and a stable and hay for their horses.[179] After its redevelopment the Archbishop's Palace returned to be the place for royal hospitality in York. Charles I was lavishly hosted in the Ingram Palace for many weeks a year, between 1639 and 1642.[180]

From the late 1560s the medieval mansions of the Close, with their attractive gardens, became in high demand. Urban mansions of medieval origin were sought after as high status residences in Norwich, London and Bristol.[181] Since the fifteenth century, merchants in Norwich had been building large urban mansions. They appropriated sites and formal elements of houses of the gentry and of religious and civic buildings. In the mid sixteenth century their refurbishment coincided with the election to civil office of family members. The upper floor became the higher status residential space, while reused architectural details from dissolved monastic buildings continued the process of cultural appropriation. The merchants' mansions were symbols of social identity and of political authority. In mid sixteenth century London the demand for mansions for redevelopment was even more urgent. A growing number of emerging merchants wanted a great house as an urban residence, especially when they became Aldermen. This resulted in a shortage of mansions so great that in the City of London the conversion of great houses into tenements was prohibited. Moreover

---

[177] Cooper, *Houses of the Gentry*.

[178] YMA, Wb, fols. 281v-282 (1st).

[179] Chapter 2. 5. 2, p. 114 ; YMA, Wb, fol. 116v.

[180] Butler, 'York Palace', pp. 30-1.

[181] King, 'The Interpretation'; R.H. Leech, 'The Symboic Hall: Historical Context and Merchant Culture in the Early Modern City', *Vernacular Architecture* 31 (2000): 1-10.

the Aldermen demanded the right to buy when one of such properties went on the market. [182] In the 1570s new mansions were built on the suburbs on green field or replacing cottages, among complaints of the local communities.[183]

The most sought after mansions by the merchants were the urban residences of the abbots of the dissolved monastic houses, often located within the city walls or just outside. At the highest level of society, however, the Episcopal mansions along the Strand were the most sought after residences. As discussed above, by the early sixteenth century they had lost their medieval meanings and were leased for different uses. The growth in importance of the central courts of law and of state administration in Westminster stimulated the rapid commercial and domestic development of this area. The Episcopal houses were close to Westminster, amidst ample gardens and with the advantage of boat access on the Thames. Aristocrats and courtiers bought them, even several of them in a row.[184] Experimentation of new ideas in architectural space and design were first introduced in these houses on the Strand and further elaborated in country houses. The most innovative, Somerset house (1547-1552) consisted of the redevelopment of the Inns of the Bishops of Worcester, Llandaff and Chester. Cecil house and later Arundel house were also on the cutting edge of domestic architecture.[185](Fig. 106 and 107) In all these examples innovation was built on tradition, with the medieval buildings visibly retained and transformed.

Similarly to the Strand, the York Minster Close contained or was in proximity of courts of law and a government institution. When the Council of the North became permanently based in York in 1561, the gentry serving as common lawyers needed a residence in York for part of the year. Some of them obtained the lease of a prebendal mansion within the Close. Others may have wished to do

---

[182] Orlin, *Locating Privacy*, pp.126-7.

[183] Orlin, *Locating Privacy*, pp. 73.

[184] C. Phillpotts, 'The Houses of Henry VIII's Courtiers in London', in D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist (eds), *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003), pp.301-2.

[185] Summerson, *Architecture in Britain*, pp. 43-46; M. Girouard, *Robert Smithson and the Architecture of the Elizabethan Era* (London, 1966), pp. 184-7.

so, because in 1573 Archbishop Grindall in his injunctions prohibited the lease of prebendal mansions to non members of the Church of York.[186] This was probably aimed at guaranteeing that there were enough available houses in the Close for the lawyers of the ecclesiastical courts and for the prebendary residentiaries. As already mentioned, civil lawyers of the ecclesiastical courts worked all year round. Although their social origin was varied, as judges their status was equal to the one of the gentry. However, they were exclusively urban dwellers and therefore their residence in one of the mansions would have been not only convenient and pleasant but a necessary display of social identity.

Transforming domestic space: privacy, consumerism or changed relationships in the household?

The transformation of the built environment of the Close involved important changes in the structure and use of domestic space. The most fundamental of these in the prebendal mansions was the flooring over of the central hall, previously open in height from ground level to the roof. Changes in the structure of dwellings also happened in lower status houses under the initiative of the Dean and Chapter. The demise of the hall resulted in the multiplication of rooms and their increasing specialisation. The reasons for the closure of the open hall, together with the multiplication of rooms on the upper floors, have been the object of much debate. The desire for more comfortable and warm homes has been seen as a contributing factor in this shift. This was stimulated by the increasing availability of technical innovations, such as glazed windows, and of consumer goods.[187] The impact of climate change, such as the sixteenth-century "little ice age", should not be underestimated.[188] The open hall, where the warmth was escaping into the high ceiling, was probably less energy efficient than smaller rooms with more fireplaces. However, houses are cultural products and social relations must be seen as the principal factors in shaping domestic space. In fact, alternative solutions could have been found to overcome climatic

---

[186] Raine, *The Statutes*, pp. 79-80.

[187] Hoskins, 'The Rebuilding'.

[188] H. H. Lamb, *Climate, History and the Modern World* (London, 1995), pp. 211–241.

factors. Some authors have explained these changes with a growing desire for privacy, connected with the ideology of individual responsibility, promoted by Protestantism.[189] For others, privacy was a consequence of the fragmentation of space caused by changes in feudal power relations and patronage.[190] More recently Matthew Johnson has questioned the relevance of privacy for changes in sixteenth-century domestic space.[191] Lena Orlin has gone further, arguing that the sixteenth century was a surveillance society and thus even the desire for privacy would have been suspicious.[192]

Another explanation for the demise of the hall is suggested by Johnson in his study on Suffolk farm houses.[193] He argues that the closure of the open hall was a consequence of changes in relationships between members of the household, reflecting major changes in society at large. As in the countryside, where closure of fields created new social boundaries, in the home, wall and flooring partitions created different classes of people. The communal space of the open hall, loosely framing the life of all members of the household, was replaced by more specialised rooms with more defined boundaries. This resulted in the segregation of people and activities. With reference to Tonnies and Weber, the household from a community (*Gemeinschaft*) became a society (*Gesellschaft*).[194] The debate has been recently revived by Orlin, who rejects Johnson's argument, suggesting that boundaries created by partitions separated things rather than people. The rise of consumerism, rather than a change in the social structure of the household, was the principal factor in the partitioning of the house. While the open hall was a flexible space, the partitioned house allowed for more settled

---

[189] P. Aries, 'Introduction', in R. Chartier (ed.), *A History of Private Life, iii. Passions of Renaissance*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge Mass. 1989), pp. 1-11; Cooper, *Houses of the Gentry*, pp. 273, 300.

[190] Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 84-6. M. Howard, *The Early Tudor Country House: Architecture and Politics, 1490-1550* (London, 1987), p. 108; S. Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547* (New Haven, 1993), p. 37.

[191] Johnson, *Behind the Castle Gate*, pp. 115-6.

[192] Orlin, *Locating Privacy*.

[193] M. Johnson, *Housing Culture. Traditional Architecture in an English Landscape* (London, 1993).

[194] Johnson, *Housing Culture*, pp. 106-7

furniture and more room for storage and display.[195] Orlin's argument is very attractive in view of what I have concluded in Chapter 5.1. If the consumption of goods in the household was important in maintaining not only social standing but even survival, then pride and pleasure in the ownership of goods would have been tainted with some anxiety. Thus, concerns about safe storage and appropriate display would have been paramount. However, I think that other solutions could have been adopted for this function and this could only have been a component of change rather than the principal reason.

Moreover Orlin defends her interpretation arguing that the practices of space can overcome physical barriers erected within the house. For Johnson small rooms impaired face to face relations, promoted by the communal space of the hall. Orlin argues instead that the double pile houses and small rooms created more opportunities for this, as people were brought closer together. Servants, children and women were not segregated, because they were circulating in the same space. However, the demise of the open hall represented a major change in the structure and use of domestic space. I support Johnson's argument that closure reflects radical changes in relationships within the household. The hall was a communal space, where all members of the household had a place and a right to belong. When the space is open and barriers are movable, practices of space can create or remove boundaries between activities and people. When the barriers are solid, practices of space are not enough to overcome their hindrance. Therefore the closure and partition of the house would have reflected changes already happening in the idea of family relations and households.

In support of Johnson's argument, it could be further suggested that children and young people were among the most affected by the demise of the central hall. It is not a coincidence that nurseries start appearing in seventeenth-century inventories.[196] Young children which in the hall would have participated in the life of the household became segregated. The nursery was considered a nuisance

---

[195] Orlin, *Locating Privacy*, pp. 96-105.

[196] RCHME, *Salisbury*, pp. 24-5.

to be located as far as possible from the reception areas of the house.[197] Although there were families in the Close with a large number of children, there is no mention of nurseries.[198] These may have been located in one of the several chambers, houses and offices listed in the leases. The demise of the hall in the houses of the commercial community of the Close meant that the relationship between master and apprentices was also changed. In late medieval workshops a master taught a craft and his household would have functioned as a community based in the hall. In sixteenth-century retail shops what was learned were social and business skills. The separation between the master and the apprentices within the house would have been part of their training. Moreover the idea of family as a "little commonwealth" with the father at its head was vital for maintaining a strong and well capitalised business.[199] The *habitus* around cultural meanings and space is learned in infancy; therefore the space of childhood is revealing of the expectations of society. Johnson's definition of the open hall as a frame loosely containing several activities is very similar to the definition of "holding environment" of the psychoanalyst Donald Winnicot.[200] This promotes the development of more immediate human relations similar to the idea of *Gemeinschaft.*

The relationship between changes in the household and the demise of the hall, however, appears to be more problematic in town houses. Jayne Rimmer has discussed the variety of spatial arrangements of the hall in late medieval town houses in York. In small households the hall would have been used as a common living room, where domestic activities such as spinning and even some food preparation would have taken place. In other houses it operated as a more formal reception. However, some of the smaller houses were built without a hall altogether. Shared tenures of these houses raises questions about multiple-

---

[197] Cooper, *Houses of the Gentry*, pp. 304-5.

[198] Cross, 'Exemplary Wives'.

[199] Grassby, *Business Community*, pp. 330-1.

[200] D.W. Winnicott, *Home Is Where We Start From: Essays by a Psychoanalyst* (New York, 1975).

occupancy and suggest a more varied nature for the urban household.[201]This
complexity has implications for the study of the sixteenth-century transformation
of town houses. Change in the domestic space of the Close will be interpreted
considering these issues.

Structure and use of town houses

Town houses newly built or redeveloped by the Dean and Chapter show changes
in the structure and use of space. Fabric accounts in conjunction with leases
provide information on the perception of domestic space and its transformation.
In the leases the list of appurtenances gives an indication of the type of rooms
within a property. Rather than a comprehensive description, the list of the
appurtenances seems to indicate the features that a type of property had or was
expected to have. Therefore in most cases the list of appurtenances express the
perception of housing types in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century.
However, this is complicated by the fact that the structure of the leases for the
smaller houses became more standardised only from the 1580s. Early leases
often contained the formula "with all appurtenances whatsoever" and later leases
for the same property simply copied the same formula. Nevertheless, one of the
most evident differences between houses is the presence or lack of the hall. Halls
and parlours are listed for the medieval row of houses in the west Minster Yard
between the Gate Lodge and St Peter School, for the Mason's Lodge and for the
house next to it. William Gibson's house also had a hall. The materials bought
and the hours worked by carpenters in its 1574 redevelopment suggest that the
original open hall was floored over. The closed hall and a parlour were perhaps
on the back of the two shops facing the street and new chambers and lofts were
obtained on the upper floors.[202] Substantial work and material for partitions was
also invested in for the Masons' Lodge. All those properties with a hall listed in
the appurtenance were built before 1550. However, other properties of late
medieval origin, such as the house of the Secretary of the Council and the houses

---

[201] Rimmer, 'Small Houses', pp. 211-5.

[202] YMA, Wc, fols. 97v-98

on both sides of the Minster Gate, may also have had a hall not mentioned in the appurtenances. In fact, in York most medieval town houses of this size would have had a hall. In mixed commercial properties its position was variable and could have been on the back of the shops fronting the street or on the upper floor.

By contrast in the 1570s new houses of substantial size were built without a hall. The building accounts of two new town houses are particularly significant. In the construction of the goldsmith William Rawson's house and of Foster's bookshops, parlours and chambers were accounted for. The hall, however, had disappeared from the vocabulary of the builders. This suggests that in the 1570s the hall was not considered necessary in three storey high town houses with shops. Moreover, in the language of the carpenters, the idea of a hall may have been connected with a particular technology of timber framing.[203] In the accounts of Rawnson's house the number of days worked by the carpenters is not reflected by the purchase or acquisition of trees in the woods. The fragmentation of domestic space allowed the re-use of reclaimed timbers. The consolidation of the frame relied on nails and iron bars, rather than on the properties of green wood. This change in working practices may have been a consequence of the demise of the hall. The frame of the hall and the display of its quality had lost by then its spatial and symbolic meanings. The demise of the hall and the multiplication of chambers in town houses of this size could reflect changes in the meaning of the household of the business community. An increase in the already established urban practice of lodging and of multiple-tenancy may have further stimulated this process.

The new mixed commercial and residential buildings in the Close had a parlour or a chamber on the ground floor and chambers, solars and lofts on the upper floors. The word "solars" or "sollers" in the late sixteenth century was a general definition for upper floor rooms.[204] A new development in carpentry technology, allowing the loft space to be habitable, was adopted in York at the end of the

---

[203] Johnson, *Housing Culture*, pp. 106-21 especially 111-114.

[204] Schofield, *Medieval London Houses*, p. 66.

fifteenth century. [205] This was the side purlin roof without crown post. Moreover, the construction of gables facing toward the street, as in the shops by the cathedral's South Door, meant that loft spaces could have more light, thus providing a more pleasant accommodation. The household of a shop keeper would have been comprised of his family, up to six apprentices and of occasional lodgers.[206] It is possible to establish neither how many people would have shared a chamber nor how these were partitioned. As Orlin pointed out, in London chambers were defined by flimsy partitions, or even by furniture or pieces of cloths, which provided neither visual nor aural privacy.[207] Moreover one room could have been called a house by its occupants, raising further questions on the nature of urban households.[208] Furthermore in late medieval York, rooms with divided partitions were easy to reposition.[209] The insecurity of the clerk documenting the number of chambers in which the two rooms of the prebendal mansion of Warthill were divided suggests this flexibility of use.[210]

William Rawnson's house, built in 1574, is the best documented example of the new houses with shops. The good standard of accommodation offered is indicated by the presence of glazed windows. These were increasingly used in town houses, but were still uncommon in this period.[211] The control of the interior space was planned at the moment of construction, when locks and keys had been purpose made for this building. This reinforces the suggestion in Chapter 4 that the prospective tenant may have participated in the decision. Front and back gates and doors were locked. Home security was a long term concern in York, even in this protected enclave.[212] This, being the house of a goldsmith, had additional security planned for the interior. The interior doors to the two shops

---

[205] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, fig. lxix; Schofield, Medieval London Houses, pp. 95-6.

[206] Grassby, *The Business Community*, pp. 344-5.

[207] Orlin, *Locating Privacy*, pp. 170, 177-192.

[208] Orlin, *Locating Privacy*, pp. 169-70.

[209] Rimmer, 'Small Houses', pp. 145-8.

[210] See Chapter 2, p. 102.

[211] See below p. 330.

[212]Rimmer, 'Small Houses', pp. 57, 135-6.

and to the buttery were provided with locks and keys, showing that both precious metals and food and drinks would have been under the control of the master. A locked chamber on the upper floor may have provided more private accommodation and safe storage space for the goldsmith. A locked loft may have had the same function; all other chambers were not locked.

Kitchens were never mentioned in leases and accounts of mixed use properties; this is in contrast with mansions and exclusively residential properties such as the Masons' Lodge, the house west of the Library and the Gate Lodge. This may have reflected a different lifestyle in the houses of gentlemen, where cooking activities were kept clearly separated. [213] It may also indicate that proper kitchens were only possible in masonry buildings; therefore in smaller urban houses cooking facilities may have been limited. A back chamber with a fireplace or braziers may have doubled as a cooking place. People may have bought bread and more elaborate preparations in food markets or shops.[214] Comparing inventories with building accounts, Rimmer suggests that when there was not a purpose built kitchen, occupiers may have used a chamber for this purpose.[215] This is confirmed by the 1616 inventory of John Foster, listing shelves in the kitchen which is not mentioned in other documents.[216] Storage space was indicated in all houses. In sixteenth-century London new cellars were dug to store an increasing quantity of goods.[217] In York all the shops have "sellars", which meant storage space, but it is not possible to establish where this was located.

In conclusion, the town houses which were redeveloped or built in the last quarter of the sixteenth century were transformed according to new ideas of

---

[213] YMA, Wb, fols. 333v-334

[214] M. Carlin, 'Fast Food and Urban Living Standards in Medieval England', in M. Carlin and J. Rosenthal (eds), *Food and Eating in Medieval Europe* (London, 1998), pp. 27-51.

[215] Rimmer, 'Small Houses', pp. 109, 228-9.

[216] Barnard and Bell, *John Foster's Inventory*, pp. 50.

[217] Schofield, *Medieval London Houses*, p. 80; Orlin, *Locating Privacy*, p. 314.

space. This may have reflected changes in the households of the business community. It could be suggested that it also reflected the expansion of a previous feature of urban life, such as the provision of short term or temporary accommodation to an increasingly travelling population.

The redevelopment of the mansions

In the best documented examples, such as the Subdeanery, the mansion of South Cave and the Deanery, the hall was floored over. A new gallery and other chambers were obtained on the upper floor and reached by a new wooden staircase. This transformation had an impact on the hierarchy of space and on the external structure of the mansions. The value of the window glass of the new gallery of the Subdeanery suggests that the upper floor of the hall wing was prominently visible from the exterior. The emphasis was on the upper floor as the principal suite of rooms and the exchange of gaze from the interior and exterior was established as important. The medieval tripartite structure of the mansion had been therefore obliterated. This is a considerable shift in the idea of a house. The layout or appearance may have not been perfectly symmetrical. However, it could be suggested that an upper floor joining two wings was the result of the conflation of developments already occurring in the late medieval "hall and wings house", with the long established continental tradition of the "*piano nobile*". [218] This term indicates the principal apartment of a double pile house. Although the external volume and the interior layout of the house were changed, the perception of its previous structure was harder to change. Cooper comments on the lack of spatial order in the inventories, but the evidence from the Subdeanery lease and the sale of the Deanery of 1650 suggests otherwise.[219] The rooms were listed range by range starting with the former upper end; they were not yet perceived as a suite of rooms on each floor. It must be concluded that the surveyor's perception of the original tripartite structure in converted houses

---

[218] N. Cooper, 'The Gentry House in the Age of Transition', in D. Gaimster and P. Stamper, *The Age of Transition. The Archaeology of English Culture 1400-1600*, The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 15, oxbow Monograph 98 (1997), pp. 115-26.

[219] Cooper, *Houses of the Gentry*, p. 274.

remained at least until the mid seventeenth century. This shows how tradition
and innovation were in continuous tension.

In the redeveloped mansions, gentlemen and lawyers were displaying appropriate
features and visual clues to their network of friends and colleagues. The well
documented 1576 redevelopment of the Subdeanery had all the features expected
in a late sixteenth-century conversion of a medieval mansion.[220] Its tenant
Richard Franklin was a gentleman working for the Council of the North and, as
already mentioned, he regularly offered hospitality to the judges.[221]The
redevelopment changed the function of the ground floor. The hall was reduced in
size and flanked by a chamber and a parlour. This was an informal living and
dining room, its proximity to the kitchen is an arrangement that became a
common feature at the end of the sixteenth century.[222] The presence of a portal in
this room suggests that it could have doubled as a bedroom for important
guests.[223] In fact this high status room would have been more suitable for a high
standard of hospitality than some of the smaller bedrooms on the upper floor.[224]
The wooden staircase at the former lower end of the hall created a ceremonial
way through the gallery towards the great chamber. This medieval room
remained the deepest in space, according to access analysis, although its meaning
shifted. From the most retired living and bedroom it became the main reception
of the house. Consequently the pathway to the great chamber increased in
importance and moved to the upper floor. Previously visitors used to walk from
the lower to the upper end through the hall, in full view of people who may not
have enjoyed the same privilege. In the redeveloped mansion they were
approaching through the gallery, a corridor made for display. The great chamber
was furnished as a grand reception room, with wainscot benches, fireplaces and
expensive window glass, perhaps decorated. The old staircase from the upper end
of the hall, which is not mentioned by the sources but should have been there,

---

[220] See Chapter 2. 2. 2, pp. 76-82.

[221] YMA, Wc fols. 90-90v.

[222] Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 103.

[223] Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, pp. 58-9, 102-3.

[224] YMA, Wb, fols. 281v-282. Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, pp. 108-9.

may have served as a service stair to the cellar in the undercroft and to the kitchen. This shows how the previous hierarchy of space had been reversed.

The partition and specialisation of space on the upper floor, with four chambers, a studio and a closet, the latter retained from the late medieval mansions, may have offered more privacy to the inhabitants. The desire for and achievement of privacy in the sixteenth-century house has been accepted by many authors. However, Orlin argues that the way in which this partitioned space was used does not indicate the possibility, or even the desirability, of privacy. Chambers and beds were shared by many, even in upper status contexts, and people were living closer to each other.[225] The change in the system of sanitation from medieval latrines to the use of the "close stool" has been interpreted as a sign that bed chambers were more private and their occupiers did not need to retire. Orlin argues against this and suggests that the inconvenience of the medieval privy was the cause for this change.[226] The medieval garderobe in the Subdeanery was a smelly feature that in 1347 was the object of a legal suit between neighbours.[227] It is probable than the sixteenth-century lawyers may have wished to avoid this unpleasantness. The presence of portals in the chambers and parlour of the Subdeanery suggests that these lobbies between two doors may have been a secluded space used for the "close stool".[228] A servant would have collected the chamber pot by opening the external door, without any inconvenience for other occupiers inside the chamber. Therefore it appears that chambers would have been shared. A room that has been particularly connected with the increase in privacy is the study or closet. Whether a masculine private space or a safe storage, not especially private, it was a room that represented the increasing importance of literacy.[229] Reading and writing requires space, quiet and concentration. Sometimes this was sought outside the home, as in the case of the

---

[225] Orlin, *Locating Privacy*, pp. 170-2.

[226] Orlin, *Locating Privacy*, pp. 160-3; A. Jackson- Bass, 'Sanitation in the English Country House 1500-1650', Unpublished MA Dissertation, University of York (2002).

[227] See p. 76.

[228] Thanks to A. Jackson- Bass for discussing this matter and suggesting this interpretation

[229] Cooper, *House of the Gentry*, pp. 300-1; A. Stewart 'The Early Modern Closet Discovered', *Representation 50*(1995): 83; Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, p. 56.

gentleman Philip Penrose who established his "place to write in" in a chamber behind the Masons' Lodge.[230]

In late sixteenth-century society reciprocal surveillance was encouraged, and thus an open desire for privacy would have been suspicious.[231] However, the opportunity for privacy was provided by spaces that were less confined and more public than chambers. Long galleries were used for daily walking exercise and for display.[232] In the sixteenth-century domestic redevelopment they are another example of conflation of traditions: a local one and foreign influences. The first originated from cloisters and covered walkways, as explained by Girouard. The second derived from the continental upper floor gallery.[233] Views of gardens or spectacular ones of the cathedral, as in the Subdeanery and in the mansion of South Cave, were part of this display. A few decades later the new gallery of the Ingram mansion offered a vantage point view of the gardens. Moreover, Roman sculptures were on display there: a punctual reference to increasing interest in the classical tradition and to the emergence of Antiquarianism.[234] Galleries were part of long domestic walks, extending with staircases from the "leads" on the roofs to the garden, as in the Deanery. These walks provided the opportunity for private conversation and intrigue without raising too much suspicion. The Ridolfi plot was organised by courtiers of the Council of the North when walking in galleries and gardens or during hunting expeditions, in York and in other locations.[235] The Deanery in 1538 was deemed to have insufficient access to open air and gardens to be the seat of the Council of the North.[236] Perhaps the requirement of a larger garden was not only related to healthy exercise but also to the need for discrete peripatetic conversation.

---

[230] See Chapter 2, p. 87.

[231] Orlin *Locating Privacy*, pp. 298-323.

[232] Girouard, *Life in the English Country House*, pp. 100-1; Cooper, *Houses of the Gentry*, 302-4; Schofield, 'Urban Housing 1400-1600', pp. 137.

[233] R. Coope, 'The "Long Gallery": Its Origins and Development Use and Decoration', *Architectural History* 29 (1986): 43-72.

[234] See Chapter 5.3.

[235] Orlin, *Locating Privacy*, pp. 259, 234-8.

[236] *L and P*, Henry viii, xiii (2) 768.

Chapels

Domestic chapels were a prominent feature of the medieval prebendal mansions in the Close; however, they disappear in post-Reformation sources.[237] The rejection of sacred space during the sixteenth century had been the reason for the abolition of a dedicated space of worship within the home. Chapels therefore were usually converted into chambers.[238] It was the habit of devoted households to have public prayers and the space for this activity became flexible. Lady Hoby's diary indicates that she was praying either in private in her closet or in public. Sometimes this meant that she was in her chamber with her servants, but mostly she referred to the common prayers of the household. These were held in the great chamber or alternatively in the hall.[239] In many country houses a portion of the closed hall, sometimes behind the stairs, was screened off and used as a chapel.[240] There were, however, exceptions to the abolition of chapels. Thomas Cecil, President of the Council of the North, retained the chapel in the redevelopment of Snape Castle (Yorkshire), which was the seat of his wife's family the Nevills. This has been interpreted as a statement of the connection with one of the most important aristocratic families in the North.[241] The continuity of the use of the Deanery chapel, consisting of a substantial stone wing, may have had a similar meaning. The spiritual authority of the Dean in the Close continued to be indicated by its chapel in the same way as the medieval crenellated Deanery walls continued to indicate his secular power. As already discussed, the Archbishop's chapel lost its meaning in the Reformation.

---

[237] Cross, *York Clergy Wills*, passim.

[238] A. Rickets, *The English Country House Chapel: Building a Protestant Tradition* (Reading, 2007).

[239] Moody, *The Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby*, p. xlviii.

[240] Rickets, *The English Country House Chapel*, pp. 58-149.

[241] A. Rickets, 'Designing for Protestant Worship: the Private Chapels of the Cecil Family', in A. Spicer and S. Hamilton (eds), *Defining the Holy. Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 123-6.

Style and identity

Transformation of the mansions changed the structure and use of interior space; on the exterior, the medieval structure of the inward looking courtyard house was retained. However, new windows, with a design influenced by new developments in architecture, marked on the exterior the most important rooms on the upper floor. The result was an innovative idea of house, yet solidly built on tradition. In this respect the level of reuse of existing fabric and its high visibility, without attempt of concealment, suggests that this message was important. The walls of the elevations consisted of a mixture of stones, retained or reused from previous buildings, and new or re-used bricks. This was not only the result of mending and reusing the medieval fabric for economic reasons, but may have also effectively communicated that new ideas in domestic space were built upon older traditions, therefore they were more understandable and acceptable.[242] However, in the early seventeenth century further stylistic innovation were introduced in the mansions. The curvilinear gable, or Dutch gable, was created in the Netherlands as a local translation of some of Alberti's designs.[243] It was adopted by high status houses in the south-east of England and from there it spread to the rest of the country. In the Minster Close the Treasurer's House is the most prominent example, but Dutch gables were also adopted in the mansions of Langtoft and Fenton. The early seventeenth-century redevelopment of the Treasurer's House was innovative because it transformed a courtyard mansion into a double pile house with a symmetrical façade. Even if there were medieval ranges in the back arranged around a courtyard, the house was provided with a new outward looking façade. The use, or perhaps reuse, of stones for this front, in contrast with the bricks on the back and sides, suggests that the setting of the building facing the Chapter house had been carefully considered. Moreover Paul Hunneyball has shown that in Hertfordshire the adoption of curvilinear gables was a statement of elite status of minor gentry's

---

[242] See Chapter 1, pp. 38-9 ; Eco, 'The Semiotics of Architecture' ; Broadbent, 'The Deep Structures of Architecture' ; Venturi, Scott Brown and Izenour, *Learning from Las Vegas* ; Jenks, 'The Architectural Sign'.

[243] Summerson, *Architecture in Britain*, p. 92.

families, imitating the style of the great houses.[244] Country gentry and lawyers during their visits to London were inspired by the architectural trends of the capital and sometimes even recruited the builders and sculptors for their houses.[245] The gables of the Treasurer's House have a profile similar to a house standing in the London Strand in 1619.[246] Moreover, "short wall anchor links" in the brick gable on the back of the Treasurer's house, suggest the presence or direct influence of Dutch builders.[247]

Architectural sculpture suggests stylistic quotations of other buildings. The origin of the design of the classical portal on the west front of the Treasurer's House can be traced to the façade of Somerset House in the Strand. This, however, does not mean that it was a direct copy, but it could have been mediated by other buildings. Stylistic quotations may reflect a network of social relations among the local gentry.[248] The presence in York of Nicholas Stone, working on monuments in York Minster around 1615, may be an indication of such a network. He was a sculptor and stone mason of national renown and at that time he may have worked on architectural and garden sculpture of gentry's houses around York. Lawyers and gentry in the Close would have been familiar with the architecture of the capital and may have used architectural details to create their own urban identity in York. They may have been particularly inspired by the Holborn and the Strand area, not only because it was a place where architectural trends were being set, but because it was the central place for legal and civil services in England.

---

[244] Hunneyball, *Architecture,* p. 184.

[245]Hunneyball, *Architecture*, pp. 180-1; P. Borsay, 'Culture, Status, and the English Urban Landscape', *History*, 67, n. 219 (1982): 5-6.

[246] Girouard, *Robert Smithson*, fig. 162.

[247] P. R. A. Reynolds, *Transmission and Recall: The Use of Short Wall Anchors in the Wide World* , PhD Thesis (University of York, 2008), http://www.zen156113.zen.co.uk/appendix-frameset.html, Appendix 3 database.

[248] Hunneyball, *Architecture*, pp. 169-84.

Conclusion

In conclusion it appears that there was urban planning in the Close during the major redevelopment of the 1560s and 1570s. The Dean and Chapter were mainly concerned with renovation of the existing building stock in the Close and in the construction of new mixed commercial and residential properties in the prominent area of Minster Gates. The workshops for the Fabric of the cathedral were still considered important and occupied a prime location in the Minster Yard. Therefore the Close, even if more built up, had retained its character of a mixture of land uses. From the mid 1580s, however, there was increased demand for accommodation, which precipitated unplanned changes in land use, such as the complete conversion of the workshops into residential space. New houses and major refurbishments were made at the expense of the landlord, yet the tenants made active choices about the features and space of houses and shops. The occupiers were also using the inner space in flexible ways. The mansions were adapted according to the taste and status of their new tenants. Transformations in the structure and use of domestic space represented wider changes happening in society. However, the multiciplity of solutions adopted in town houses seems to have reflected the varied nature of urban households. New ideas in the fabric of domestic buildings were incorporated in, or literally built upon, familiar traditions. Continuity and change were thus in dialogue in the ongoing transformation of the landscape of the Close.

6.3 Making new from old: the process of rebuilding

The cathedral landscape was transformed and maintained by the labour of the cathedral's craft community. The aim of this short chapter is to examine the working practices and materials used in the sixteenth and seventeenth-century redevelopment of the Close. It will focus on information about the cathedral craftsmen and their work as employees of the Dean and Chapter. Building materials and their movement to and within the Close will be discussed in two main themes: networks of supply with the hinterland and re-use of materials.

The study of sixteenth-century building practices is particularly interesting methodologically. In the Fabric Accounts materials are classified according to typology and characterised with quantitative information and indication of provenance. Craftspeople are also classified according to the material they were working. Materials thus determined the identity of a craft, but in a time of changing technologies these identities were not rigidly divided. For instance, from the fifteenth century, tilers were increasingly working with materials that used to define the practice of other crafts, such as masons, plasterers and even carpenters.[249] In the process of construction agency can be seen as a network between workers, materials and technologies.[250]

Change in working conditions and project management

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, when the construction of the cathedral was completed, the working practices and working conditions of the craftspeople changed. In the previous century, masons and carpenters were paid by the Fabric for the numbers of weeks worked in the year or quarterly.[251] By the second decade of the sixteenth century they were paid by day, or fraction of day, spent on a given project. Even the masons working on the rebuilding of St Michael-le-

---

[249] Giles, *An Archaeology of Social Identity*, p. 94.

[250] Latour, *Reassembling the Social*, pp. 63-86.

[251] YMA, E3/32.

Belfrey during the 1530s were not employed full time.[252] This was a less favourable contract; any disruption by weather or any sickness would have meant that the craftsmen were not paid.[253]Moreover this implies that part of their work was to be sought from other employers.

The Dean and Chapter, however, trusted and were protective of their craftspeople. Tenants of the houses by the cathedral South Door were bound by their leases to maintain drainage in front of their properties by continuing to appoint "the officers of the same cathedral church" and at the usual charges.[254] Tenants of all properties were to repair their tenements at their own costs. There was no restriction regarding which builders to employ, but the Clerk of the Work had to approve the standard of the work and employing a cathedral builder would have guaranteed good workmanship.

The wages of the cathedral craftspeople were throughout lower than ones offered to crafts people working in the country houses of northern England in the same period.[255] When working on these during the second half of the sixteenth century, master tilers and carpenters were paid between 14d and 16d a day and labourers 8d a day. By contrast the Fabric master craftsmen were paid 8d a day and the pay rose to 10d only in the 1580s. Labourers and apprentices were paid 6d with no increase. Bread and ales were included in the contract. It is not possible to establish if the Masons' Lodge and the mansion of Fenton were used to house the crafts community prior to their redevelopment in the 1570s. However, many of the crafts people were tenants of houses belonging to the Fabric in Petergate and perhaps, despite the lower pay, this was one of the advantages of the job.[256]

The structure of workforce management appears to have changed in the sixteenth century. In the previous century, masons, tilers and carpenters were listed

---

[252] Masinton, 'Sacred Space', p. 75.

[253] Airs, *The Tudor and Jacobean*, pp. 184-5.

[254] YMA, Wc, fols. 43v-44; Wc, fols. 241v-241.

[255] Airs, *The Tudor and Jacobean*, pp. 200-202.

[256] YMA, E3/ 60-61.

individually by name, followed by time worked and wages. They were employed by a large corporation performing all required building work on the cathedral and on the estate. By contrast, in the second half of the sixteenth century the workforce was organised in several small teams often working on the same project. A master carpenter or master tiler working for the Fabric was responsible for "his man", who was fully qualified and paid at the same rate as the master.[257] One or two apprentices and a variable number of labourers for unskilled tasks were also part of the team. Sawyers had their own team and prepared timber material prior to or during the project. Plumbers and glaziers also worked independently and were paid by day. It is not clear if smiths were paid only for their work or if they were also providing metal. In the best documented years of the redevelopment of the Close, these teams were working on two new projects at one time, in addition to a variety of smaller building work. It is possible to see that more teams were working together when roofs posts were to be lifted.

Workshops and working areas

Archival material has allowed to establish the location and presence of workshops and building sites. Moreover, due to a fortunate coincidence, standing-building evidence in conjunction with the survival of detailed building accounts has shown how the carpenters' workshop had been purpose built. Once the major construction works of the cathedral and of the church of St Michael-le-Belfrey were completed, the importance of the workshops as spaces for design and architectural sculpture declined. The fourteenth-century Masons' Lodge must have been a substantial building, housing tools and activities of the Masons' craft. A large carriage with four wheels, used to carry stones, timbers and other things and two other carriages used to carry stones away from the Lodge were part of the equipment.[258] This suggests that stones were worked and stored in the Lodge and its yard and then carried to the building sites. Some of

---

[257] YMA, E3/ 49-61.

[258] YMA, E3/3 A detailed list of implements is given such as axes, chisels, mallets, moulds, hatchets compasses, tracing boards, wheelbarrows, shovels, trowels, measures for lime and water, chains for wyndyng the stones, a big wheel for wyndyng stones and cement with four big cabels, a ladder and other more specialised tools.

the architectural designs may also have been done there, as is suggested by the presence of tracing boards and compasses. By the mid sixteenth century the Lodge would have become redundant as the headquarters of the cathedral's masons and may have lost the symbolic meanings associated with that craft.[259] The Masons' Loft, above the Chapter House vestry, ceased to be the designer office of the cathedral. No further drawings were made on the tracing floor after ones of the St-Michael-le-Belfrey windows.[260] Only one craftsman, Michael Stedman, was defined as a "free mason" in the Fabric Rolls in the second half of the sixteenth century. [261] Although he was performing various building tasks, such as covering graves and repairing the walls of Peter's Prison, his presence indicates that specialists in working limestone were needed for the maintenance of the cathedral fabric.

The rest of the masonry builders were defined as tilers. They were performing construction work using a variety of materials, their skills were not limited to brick and tile laying as they were also expert in stone building.[262] Moreover the difference between plasterers and tilers had completely disappeared.[263] Tilers in the sixteenth-century Close were processing lime to produce plaster and use it for wattle and daub construction and wall finishing. In addition they were undertaking roof work, drainage systems at roof and ground level, sewage and street paving. While the Masons' Lodge was converted for residential use at the beginning of the 1560s redevelopment, the Masons' well, the Lime Kiln, the Lime and Sand houses were still used for construction works in the Close until the mid 1580s. The lime kiln was still very important to process building material. Lime continued to be bought ready-made and carried from St Leonard landing on the river Ouse to the Lime House; otherwise it was produced from

---

259 See Chapter 2, p. 76.

260 A. B. Holton, 'The Working Space of the Medieval Master Mason: the Tracing Houses of York Minster and Wells Cathedral' in *Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Construction History,* Volume II (2006), pp. 1579-1597.

261 YMA, E3/ 58-60.

262 Giles, *An Archaeologyof Social Identity*, pp. 61-2.

263 Rimmer, 'Small Houses', pp. 49-50.

pounded lime stones burned in the adjacent lime kiln.[264] Old mortar was recovered from Roman buildings in the Close and stored in the sand house. It would have been pounded, sifted and mixed with new mortar or re-burned in the kiln to make plaster. Salzman cites three examples for this practice; Pevensey Castle in 1288, Collyweston in 1504 and Westminster in 1532, in which stones were dug up from old walls and old mortar was recovered to be reused.[265] When the area was finally redeveloped in 1586 these structures may have been relocated to the north of the cathedral. A "lead house", the workshop of the plumbers, was probably located there as well as a "store house". A glazier chamber was added in 1624.[266]

A dedicated and spacious carpenters' workshop shows that carpentry remained very important for maintenance and construction of buildings in the Close in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The cathedral's immense roofs required constant attention and carpenters and plumbers worked together at this task. Moreover reclaimed timbers from various sources needed adaptation before being reused in new buildings. Large timbers were carried into the Wright House from one doorway in its east end. A curving flagstone pathway on the tiled floor suggests that a stronger material was needed to support the weight of the wheeled or sledged timbers. These may have been worked in the larger room at the western end.

Building materials: a time for recycling

When the time employed by crafts people on a project is not matched by adequate purchase of building material, this can be an indication that changes in practices were taking place. Although the recycling of building material was a common practice in pre-industrial societies, making new from old was a

---

[264] YMA E3/53-4.

[265] Salzman, *Building in England*, pp. 151-2.

[266] See Chapter 2, p. 132.

prominent feature in the rebuilding of sixteenth-century England.[267] The construction of the Gothic Minster relied on a regional hinterland for the provision of building materials. Lime stones were shipped on the River Ouse from quarries to the south of York. They were unloaded at St Leonard's Landing and carried with sledges to the Minster Yard. Lime, sand, wood and sea coal were also imported in great quantity.[268] By contrast the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were a time of great recycling, undoubtedly encouraged by the destruction of the Dissolution. In the redevelopment of the Close, recycling consisted of the reuse of materials reclaimed from the demolished buildings of the Dean and Chapter estate, second-hand material bought from other sources and building material quarried from Roman buildings in the Close. New material was either bought or sourced and processed from the Dean and Chapter estate. The sourcing of materials for the redevelopment of the mansions is more difficult to establish. When buildings in the Close were demolished, nothing was lost. The movement of timbers stocked in the Palace and Minster Yards and sledged to and from tenements in the city suggest careful recycling.

It is significant that in contrast with the previous century, during the sixteenth century redevelopment of the Close stones were neither purchased nor shipped and sledged to the Close from outside locations. However, bricks and tiles were bought in greater quantity for domestic redevelopment. The latter were used for infilling of walls or roofing. Thack tiles and the more specialised ridge tiles were especially designed for the rooftop, their name and use does not seem to have changed since the earlier periods.[269] Jayne Rimmer has established that brickworks around York were supplying bricks for the construction of the Vicars Choral building projects in the fourteenth century.[270] They were located around York and one used by the Dean and Chapter was located in an area outside

---

[267] Howard, *The Building of Elizabethan*; D. Woodward, '"Swords into Ploughshares": Recycling in Pre-Industrial England', *The Economic History Review*, Second Series, 38, 2 (1985): 175-191.

[268] YMA E3/1-32.

[269] Roof tiles, see Chapter 2; Rimmer, 'Small Houses', p. 130.

[270] Rimmer, 'Small Houses', p. 6-8; P. Smith, *The Medieval Brickmaking Industry in England 1400-1450*, BAR British Series 138 (1985), pp. 23-38.

Micklegate. However, in 1568-9 a certain Clinton was paid for "leading 1000 thack tyles fur(na?)che of North Street to the shop" and for bringing other 14 loads. [271] If my transcription of the abbreviate word is correct, it indicates the existence of a brick furnace in the proximity of North Street. This in turn indicates that the former Black Friars precinct may have been put to industrial uses. This was a well endowed, high status friary of professional preachers. In 1455-6 part of the cloister with cells and studies had been destroyed by fire; indulgences were bestowed by the Archbishop to encourage donation towards rebuilding. By in 1538 it must have been renovated and in excellent order because a petition was made to Cromwell to use it as the seat of the Council in the North.[272] It was considered an open and convenient place, and to reinforce the argument, previously belonging to a royal estate. However, the petition was rejected and the friary buildings may have been abandoned. If I have misinterpreted the word and there was not a furnace there, the tiles from North Street may have come from the friary's fabric.

The use of bricks in the redevelopment of the Close show how a building technique which did not have a long-established tradition was being increasingly adopted. The Roman tradition of brick building seems to have been lost or absent in England's medieval domestic buildings.[273] Building in brick is different than building in stone. In stone the corner joints, with blocks of different lengths are strongly bonding the walls together. This is not possible in brick construction, where static stability is achieved by an expert articulation of buttresses, small pillars, blind arches, niches, vaulted ceilings and especially by tapering the wall from bottom to top. In countries where there was a long established tradition in brick buildings, such as in Northern and Central Italy, these devices had been incorporated into the style of even the most modest of buildings. By contrast in

---

[271] YMA, E3/51

[272] W. Page, 'Friaries: Friaries in York' in *VCH, A History of the County of York*: Volume 3. London (1974), pp. 283-296; Raine, *Fabric Rolls*, pp. 71, 74; L. and P. Hen. VIII, xiii (2), 768.

[273] I have learned about brick construction talking with master bricklayers and structural engineers, when I was working in field and building archaeology in Italy. In particular I am grateful to structural engineer Alessandro Rota, for explaining how traditional brick buildings respond to different forces, during the redevelopment of 21 Via Mazzini, Pontestura (Italy).

the sixteenth and seventeenth-century Close, new brick surfaces were still built with reliance on the support of a structure in timber or stone. The need to adjust to the different possibilities of this material contributed to the creation of a distinctive style in architecture. Corner stones were used to join together and make rigid, plain faces of brick walls. New techniques to strengthen plain walls, such as the short wall anchor links, were imported from the Netherlands and used with a decorative effect.

As I have already explained in Chapter 5.2, in some substantial projects such as the construction of the Wright House and of the goldsmith's shop, the number of days worked by carpenters is not matched by purchase or harvesting of timber. This suggests that a great proportion of timber was reused on the Dean and Chapter projects. The concomitant use of iron bars and long nails further suggests the use of old wood.[274] However, new wood was still used in the construction of new Dean and Chapter properties, such as the shops by the cathedral South Door, and for repairs.[275] Timbers were sourced in their wood of Langwith, in the parish of Wheldrake, about 10 Km to the south east of the city. Teams of sawyers selected and prepared timbers, which were then carried to York on wagons.

Other specialist wood material such as boards and stakes were bought readymade. In one occasion a board was bought from a shipwright, indicating recycling of material from ships, which was a common practice.[276] However, this may have been a decorated barge board to display on the front of the new-built houses.[277] Other material bought readymade were bunches of laths, either the stronger hard lath or the more flexible sap laths, to make ceilings and interior partitions.[278] In the mansions wainscot oak for furniture and fittings in that period

---

[274] See pp. 89 and 98.

[275] See p. 88.

[276] YMA E3/50; Woodward, 'Swords into Ploughshares', p. 187

[277] Giles, *An Archaeology of Social Identity*, p. 94.

[278] See Chapters 2. 2. 2, 2. 3. 2 and 2. 3. 3.

would have been imported from the Baltic.[279] In addition soft wood was used for fittings, such as the fir for the floorboards, staircases and garden palisade of the Subdeanery. In the second half of the sixteenth century the use of soft wood for construction was increasing. For example the building briefing for the Globe theatre explicitly required that oak should be used for structural poles rather than soft wood. The solution to this was to recycle the timbers of the Burbage theatre.[280] In this context it is easier to understand the reasons for reclaiming the roof timbers of the Archbishop's Palace great hall in the 1550s.[281]

Metals were precious natural resources and routinely recycled. The cathedral roof was made of lead and lead was used in domestic buildings for the gutters at least. Roof gutters were also made from a wood plank lined with lead.[282] Elm wood was used by plumbers to cast lead in the lead house.[283] Quantities of lead were bought almost every year for these needs, this material may have been new or reclaimed from other buildings, especially after the dissolution. However, in 1532, there is evidence for the processing of lead ore, when John Bargman was paid for "clensing the diche wher the leid ashis waz wesshid".[284] This is the first mention of "lead ash" (or litharge of lead) predating the 1620 one known so far.[285] The purchase of a load of elm wood to smelt lead in the lead house also indicates this activity. Iron was bought in the form of nails to be used on several projects. However, the smiths were custom making fixtures and fittings, keys and locks for every project and carrying out a variety of repairs. In contrast with the previous century, no iron was ever bought by the Fabric. Therefore it was either recycled from the Dean and Chapter estate or was supplied by the smiths, either new or old.

---

[279] N. Cox and K. Dannehl, *Dictionary of Traded Goods and Commodities, 1550-1820* (Wolverhampton, 2007), wainscott.

[280] Woodward, 'Swords into Ploughshares', p. 180.

[282] YMA, E3/51

[283] YMA, E3/59.

[284] YMA, E3/42.

[285] Cox and Dannehl, *Dictionary*, lead ash.

Glass was considered a portable fitting rather than part of the building. Town houses and mansions in the Close were glazed at a time when English production of glass had not started yet; it was becoming more common but was still a precious imported commodity.[286] In the Close the presence of the cathedral glaziers, provided with a new workshop in 1624, may have encouraged the early use for this material in the domestic context.

A special knowledge: understanding reuse of material of Antiquity

Reuse of building material cannot be assumed to be simply utilitarian, but may have had a symbolic or ideological meaning. I have already discussed in Chapter 4 the meanings of the reuse of stones from demolished religious buildings. In chapter 6.2 I have touched on the recycling of the stones of the Archbishop's Palace and have argued that the visibility and even the lack of intention to disguise wall scars, irregularities and the disparate nature of the material reused, was communicating important messages of continuity in a rapidly changing society. I have also discussed how classical quotations were increasingly used in architectural details on buildings in the Close. The issue of ideological and symbolic reuse of the material culture of a past tradition was first explored with an anthropological approach by Aby Warburg in the 1920s. In order to argue against Burchart's concept of Renaissance he went as far as doing a comparative study on a *pueblo* in Arizona, where a local "renaissance" of the past was happening at the time.[287] During the past 40 years the symbolic and political reuse of Roman building material, either as *spolia* itself or as quotations of the visual vocabulary of antiquity, has been extensively explored by archaeologists and architectural historians in several contexts.[288] The ideological reuse of antiquity and the classical tradition are still a very active field of enquiry; here, however, I wish to discuss an episode of clearly utilitarian reuse of Roman material.

[286] Schofield, *Medieval London Houses*, pp. 106, 108; E. S. Godfrey, *The Development of English Glassmaking 1560-1640* (Oxford, 1975).

[287] Settis, *Futuro del Classico*, pp. 96-101.

[288] Eaton, *Plundering the Past*; S. Perring, *Memory of Antiquity*, for a summary of the past two decades.

The well documented construction of the Wright House in conjunction with the standing evidence is compelling. It was built to be a heavy duty workshop constructed from reused stone, tiles and timber material reclaimed within the Close. (Fig. 113-123) What is remarkable in the account of the excavation robbing Roman walls from the Palace Yard, is the extent of the knowledge by the master masons of what lay buried in the Close. The sequence of events suggested in Chapter 2 shows that an area yielding enough stone blocks to build walls for a total length of 60 m and c. 1.80 m high had been excavated. This suggests that the masons had a good idea of the location and quality of Roman material. The fact that they were able to recover the mortar and to sift it, suggests that stones may not only have been lifted from layers of rubble and collapse, but that walls *in situ* may have been pulled apart. The master masons were on site to direct work and to select material, the lifting of stones was then left to the apprentices and labourers. The fabric of the Wright House's walls reflects the composition of the walls of the Roman barracks. The majority were large blocks of limestone, with a smaller proportion of orange gritstone. This was appropriately used on the base of the walls and on corners. Occasional blocks of grey sandstone belonging to the Romanesque cathedral were also incorporated into the fabric. Gritstone, probably from the Fortress walls, is abundantly used to form the base of the walls in the medieval churches of York, making use of the strength and polichromy of that stone.

The strength and the decorative value of these stones were recognised by seventeenth-century builders. The blocks used in the construction of the Ingram's almshouses in Bootham can be identified as belonging to the Roman barracks, most probably from the Close. A single grey block of sandstone, with tooling similar to that of the Romanesque cathedral, reinforces this suggestion. Large limestones provide the base for brick walls and grit is used for a decorative effect in rows and in the string course. (Fig. 109) A Romanesque portal possibly was also removed from the Archbishop's Palace. In this case however, the use of *spolia* along a main road was a display of status and charity of the patron. The *Romanitas* of the Secretary of the Council of the North was further affirmed by

the Roman sculptures displayed in the gallery of the Ingram mansion and in its gardens.[289] Given the archaeological knowledge displayed by the masons these were likely to have been dug up in the Palace Yard. From the late sixteenth century, aristocrats were importing antique statuary from abroad for their galleries and gardens. William Cecil furnished his garden in the Strand with Roman inscriptions from excavation at Silchester and other aristocrats with access to archaeological sites did the same.[290] Ingram's redevelopment of the Archbishop's Palace may have had to do with its potential as a garden, as I will suggest in the next section, but also its potential as a quarry for portable antiquities and building materials.

Conclusion

The second half of the sixteenth century was a time of changes in working practices of the crafts community. The workers seem to have been organised as contractors rather than being the employees of a large corporation as in the previous century. Changes in attitude towards building space and design by patrons, perhaps under the influence of different traditions, would have required a great degree of creativity and adaptability to new techniques and materials from the craftspeople. Axes of communication with the hinterland, represented by the river, St Leonard Landing and the West Minster Gates, continued to be used. However, with the completion of the cathedral, the quantity of material transported into the Close, such as stone, lime and lead, had declined. Reclaimed or new building materials were sourced locally and the Close was a quarry of prestigious material from Antiquity.

---

[289] See Chapter 6.4., p. 354.

[290] Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden,* pp. 195-202; L. W. Hepple '"The Museum Garden"': Displaying Classical Antiquities in Elizabethan and Jacobean England', *Garden History* 29, n. 2 (2001): 109-20.

6.4 Environment and Gardens

This section will examine ideas and practices concerning the natural environment of the Close. This includes the management of natural resources, concerns with pollution and order in urban open space and provisions for animals and gardens. Attitudes toward cleanness and order in the urban environment of the early modern town have been recently investigated by several scholars.[291] The idea of squalor of the sixteenth and seventeenth-century urban environment and the lack of concern for dirt and disease has been challenged. These studies have established that not only that order of the built environment was related to good governance, but also that the health of the citizens was related to the health of the political system. The relationship with nature and gardening is also strongly represented in the evidence for the Close.

Urban order and street space

It has already been discussed how regeneration of the built environment was connected with ideas of urban order, health and good governance.[292] Maintenance of public streets and concerns with pollution and management of the environment were part of the same humanistic ideas. The environment in the City of York was well regulated. Pam Hartshorne has studied the wardmotes court orders in York between 1491 and 1586 and has dispelled the myths of the filthy street of the sixteenth-century town. Although it was an independent jurisdiction, the Close lay within the Bootham ward.[293] This shows that concerns about health and pollution were part of the common good of the town, thus overruling other administrative boundaries. For instance in 1580 the Wardmote

---

[291] Fay, 'Health and Disease'; Hartshorne, 'The Street and the Perception'; M. Jenner, 'The Politics of London Air: John Evelyn's Fumifugium and the Restoration', *Historical Journal* (1995); M. Jenner, 'From Conduit Community to Commercial Network? Water in London 1500-1725', in P. Griffiths and M.S.R.Jenner (eds) *Londinopolis: Essays in the Social and Cultural History of Early Modern London* (Manchester UP, 2000); M. Jenner, 'Airs, Waters, Places 1500-1800', in P. Elmer (ed.), *The Healing Arts: Health, Disease and Society in Europe 1500-1800* (Manchester UP, 2004), pp. 284-314.

[292] See Chapter 6.1.

[293] Hartshorne, 'The Street and the Perception', pp. 55-60.

ordered the Dean to scour a drainage channel in the Deanery yard running towards the King's Ditch in Goodramgate.[294] Street paving was considered very important not only for order but for the management of meteoric water. Landlords, including the Dean and Chapter, were responsible for the portion of public street fronting their property. In 1577 the Wardmote fined the Dean and Chapter and ordered the paving of the area of Petergate to the south of St Michael-le Belfrey and in front of the Minster Gates.[295] The tiler John Gell, with his man and apprentice, worked there for eleven days.

Within the Close, street paving was entirely the responsibility of the Fabric. Repairs were carried out when needed on a continuous basis all over the Minster Yard.[296] However, two major phases of extensive paving are recognisable. In 1574 two teams, each composed of two tilers and four labourers, worked for 20 days in paving the Minster Yard.[297] Sand, gravel and 45 loads of cobbles were used for the job. In 1584 two teams, each composed of two tilers and a labourer, worked for 30 days in paving to the west of the Minster and other places, using 42 loads of cobbles and other stones.[298] Phases of paving are recognisable in the photo from archaeological excavation to the south-west of the cathedral. One of these is about 0.50m under the modern surface and it is made of blocks of black granite.[299] An unpaved area was left as burial ground to the west of St Michael-le-Belfrey. During the course of a century, due to constant burials, a high mound was formed in front of the church. In 1715 the cemetery was relocated because during rainy days mud was spread by passing carriages across the paved areas.[300]

---

[294] Hartshorne, 'The Street and the Perception', p. 243, Wardmote E31, p. 280.

[295] Hartshorne, 'The Street and the Perception', pp. 112-3 and 207. YMA, E3/55.

[296] YMA, E3/47, 50, 55, 58.

[297] YMA, E3/53.

[298] YMA, E3/60.

[299] YMA, Green Photographic Collection, YM 3596.

[300] YMA, Wf, fols. 148v-150.

Water management

Good water management was necessary not only for the preservation of street paving; above all it was seen as important for the health of the urban population. Clean water in the Minster Close was provided by wells. Its location on a river terrace between two rivers suggests that the aquifer was very easy to reach. Five wells are attested by the written sources. One was located in Minster Gates and seems to have served as drinking fountain; therefore water may have been mechanically pumped to the surface.[301] This would have been a very convenient public facility. The Masons' Well served the lodge and the cathedral building site. However, early seventeenth-century leases required tenants of the Mason's Lodge to leave convenient and uncontested access to this facility according to custom. This means that the well supplied water to the neighbourhood. Its fabric and implements were kept constantly in good order by the Fabric. Another well was located inside La Zouche chapel, which abbutts the cathedral south side and open onto the south aisle of the choir. The well was mentioned in the Visitations of 1519 and was serving the needs of the cathedral interior. On the outside of the north transept there was a well within the "store house".[302]There is no information about private wells, which may have been within the mansion curtilage. It cannot be excluded that supplies of water may have been brought from the river in leather sacks on horseback by water carriers. A plan for a water conduit in York was made in 1552-3, initiated by 1616-28 and had lapsed by 1634.[303] Water was brought from the river to fill and to maintain the ponds of the Ingram mansion and the four brick-built fish thanks.[304]

The Ditch under the bastions drained the area of the Close; its maintenance was important for avoiding flooding and marshy gardens.[305] Drainage of rain water

---

[301] Raine, *Medieval York*, p. 34, probates of Katherine Packoc in 1468 and of Alice Blackburn in 1469 and unreferenced eighteenth century deed. A. Raine, 'The Minster Wells', The Friends of York Minster, 15 (1943), pp. 12-6.

[302] See Chapter 2, p. 123.

[303] Palliser, *Tudor York*, p.161.

[304] Butler, 'York Palace', p. 38.

[305] YCR, AY 181. a.

appears to have been very important around the cathedral, perhaps to avoid waterlogging against the lime stones. The amount of work spent on arranging the ground channel system in the backyard of the Masons 'Lodge by the Masons' well, suggests that the soil against the cathedral's wall was to be kept well drained.[306] The water that was channelled was unlikely to have been the modest spillage from the well's bucket, but the one from the cathedral gargoyles. In 1584 water from the drainage at the back of the Masons' Lodge was channelled in a gutter along the side of the Library, to join a gutter or channel running in front of the south transept into two sinks. These could have been soakaways dispersing meteoric water and household water. Similar drainage systems may have been in place in other parts of the Minster Yard. Raine mentions the discovery of an unusual well, measuring about 2.9 m by 1m and 2.5 m in depth.[307] It was lined in seventeenth-century masonry and its bottom was covered in silt. This was probably a sort of soakaway. It was located in the middle of the road between Canon Bell's house and the Minster, most probably between the East front and the mansion of Langtoft.

A covered drainage system was possibly established or improved in 1574 when two wooden grates for the sinks in the Mister Yard were made.[308] In 1581 the drainage in front of the south transept was further improved.[309] A gutter running from the end of the Library to the grate against the Minster's stairs was paved with rubble stones. The area between the shops and the gutter was paved as well. The work required four tilers for eight days, helped by two labourers. The tenants of the shops and housing developments by the Minster south door were responsible for the maintenance of the drainage system in the public space in front of their property.[310] The sinks and the gutters before the grates were also to be cleaned and scoured. This work was to be carried out exclusively by the

---

[306] YMA, E3/60.

[307] Raine, 'The Minster Wells'.

[308] YMA, E3/53. Perhaps the drainege is the paved one visible in the exacavations in Dean Gates of 1971-2 YMA, Green Photographic Collection.

[309] YMA, E3/59

[310] YMA, Wb 373-373v; Wc 241v-241; We 40v-41; Wc 43v-44; Wc 293-293v.

officers of the Fabric in the same manner and at the same charges as it was customary. The job of cleaning the drains and the grates in this location and to dispose of the rubbish was carried out between one and three times a year and took two days for two labourers.[311] This request is unique in the Dean and Chapter leases, moreover the quantity of waste accumulated in the sinks suggests that activities in these houses may have created debris which was emptied into the drainage system. This may have been the case if the bookbinders were using glue or were pulping waste paper to make cardboards for book covers. For example, the city corporation prohibited parchment makers from living in the best area of the city because they were polluting it with the waste of their trade.[312]

The study on the wardmote court records in York has highlighted how the maintenance of the drainage system concerned the whole town regardless of different liberties or jurisdictions. Maintaining the drainage, thus avoiding floods and damage, was necessary for the common good of urban dwellers.

Rubbish and dirt

The Wardmote court records indicate that dumping dung and rubbish in the sewage and drainage system was forbidden. Not only did it obstruct the sinks and grates, silting up the ditches, but also dirt out of place was perceived as disorderly and dangerous.[313] The preoccupation with dung and filth in the wrong place also emerges from evidence in the Close. In the seventeenth-century leases of allotments in the Deanery Yard, the tenants were prohibited to leave dung hills or filth in their plots.[314] However, later in the seventeenth century it appears that the manure from the Deanery stables was kept in a midden within the Deanery Yard and was probably used as an excellent fertiliser for horticulture. Human

---

[311] YMA, E3/55; E3/56; E3/59; E3/60; E3/61; E3/62/1. The maintenance did not necessarily stop but the Fabric Rolls at this point become less detailed in describing the nature of small jobs.

[312] Giles, *An Archaeology of Social Identity*, p. 195, citing YCA B33 f. 33r.

[313] Hartshorne, 'The Street and the Perception', pp. 232-7

[314] YMA, We, 263-264. S3/5b.

waste, however, was already considered unacceptable for this purpose in a medieval manorial context. [315] In the sixteenth century it was also excluded from the urban environment. A cart allocated to each ward collected dung and rubbish from doorsteps three times a week. This was carried to dumps outside the walls. The one for Bootham ward was next to St Leonard's Landing.[316] Hills of dung left by passing animals in the Minster Yard were also considered out of place, thus sweeping and tidying of the street space was regularly carried out by labourers.[317]

In the redeveloped mansions new attention was given to the tidiness of access courtyards. Activities producing smell or smoke were relocated as far as possible from the residential quarters. In the Deanery the pastry, and possibly brewery, was moved away from the house into the Yard. The old pastry and the slaughterhouse were leased to tenants, which were prohibited from establishing noisome activities there.[318] Small buildings for keeping fuel, such as coal houses and turf houses were kept out of sight. In the Ingram mansion utilitarian buildings, such as the stable, wash houses and coal houses, were hidden at the back of the house.[319] Pollution by smoke became a growing concern in the second half of the seventeenth century. The increase in the number of fireplaces and increased use of coal over wood as domestic fuel may have started to have an impact on the quality of the air. The houses by the cathedral south door were not only a blemish, but they also infested the church with smoke and were considered a fire hazard.[320]

---

[315] R. Jones, 'Manure and Medieval Social Order', in M. J. Allen, N. Sharples and T. O'Connor, (eds), *Land and People. Papers in Memory of John G. Evans*, Prehistoric Society Research Paper 2 (2009), pp. 215-225.

[316] Hartshorne, 'The Street and the Perception', p. 234.

[317] YMA, E3/ 54-64.

[318] YMA, S3/5b. Palliser, *Communities,* p. 88.

[319] Butler, 'York Palace', p. 36.

[320] YMA , We fol. 186.

The protection of public health in the Close was evident during the plague outbreak of 1603. The gates of the Close were shut for several months.[321] This reflected a similar policy in the city of York. However, breaches of security of the city walls meant that the plague spread fast between the population, leaving 2,000 dead. The *cordon sanitaire* in the Close, however, seems to have worked; this would explain the much higher survival rate in the parish of St Michael-le-Belfrey compared to the rest of the city.[322] The inhabitants in houses with double access would have had access to water and food in the Close, keeping their doors closed toward the city. They were tenants of the Dean and Chapter and the isolation of the Close much depended on their collaboration.

Animals

Animals were living in the Close and some of them were housed in purpose built accommodation. Stables for horses were a constant feature of all the prebendal mansions. They were located when possible by gatehouses and were a necessary feature for hospitality before and after redevelopment. In addition, stables unconnected with houses such as "The Hell", the stable in Precentors' Court, the coach house or simply spaces to keep horses in neighbour's yards, were leased to the gentry and to the trade community.[323] Animals were also raised for economic purposes. The green areas within the Close were not wasted for production of food and clothing. The Palace Yard until 1616 was used as pasture along with the city bastions. This may have supported sheep and cows. The vast green field of the Deanery Yard may have also been used as pasture.

Other animals were bred as high status food and for symbolic purposes. Dovecotes were a feature of the mansions' gardens.[324] The feudal right to own a dovecote was established by the Normans. From the fourteenth century an

---

[321] YML, Thomas Beckwith, *History of York 1140-1785,* fol. 3.

[322] C. Galley, *The Demography of Early Modern Towns: York in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Liverpool, 1998), pp 78-80; Palliser, *Towns and Local Communities*, p. 98.

[323] See Chapter 2 for these buildings and Map 5. Barnard and Bell, *John Foster's Inventory*, p. 13. The stationer Foster kept a horse in his neighbour's yard.

[324] See Chapter 2 for Fenton, Ingram Mansion and Stillington.

increasing number of yeomen had permission by their landlords to build one and with the Dissolution these restrictions were weakened. However, even at the beginning of the seventeenth century there were restrictions on building dovecotes, because they remained a symbol of privilege.[325] Pigeons in fact were farmed not only for food, but for other uses. They were used in falconry for training purposes, and this was a very high status activity. Moreover their manure was used as a fertiliser and from the second half of the sixteenth century for the domestic production of gun powder.[326] Other small buildings may have been connected with hunting or breeding activities. The little house abutting the Chapter House was used for "layinge of fowell in". The house could have been used by goldsmith Rawson to keep hens.[327]

The grounds of the Ingram mansion were populated by animals.[328] This provided the delicacies for the dinners offered to Ingram's royal guests. Pheasants were bred and kept in an aviary. Their eggs were much appreciated and 350 of them were offered in just one week during a visit of King Charles I. Four brick built tanks were used to breed fish, even sturgeon, for the table. The tanks were in the open air but enclosed by a wall and a locked gate to protect them from poachers. There were also fishes in the decorative ponds. Swans were put there in advance of royal visits; since the twelfth century they were believed to belong to the monarchs and thus had a symbolic meaning. [329] Conies or rabbits were abundant in the grounds. They also had a symbolic biblical meaning and may have been part of the iconographic programme of the garden.[330] Other animal were represented by their exclusion. The fir pale in the Subdeanery garden could be interpreted as a limit between the tamed nature of the formal garden and the wilderness of the park. The pale was widely used in country houses of the time as

---

[325] P. Hansell and J. Hansell, *Doves and Dovecotes* (Bath, 1988), pp. 80-1.

[326] Ibid., pp. 23-32.

[327] YMA, Wc, fols 227v-228.

[328] Butler, 'York Palace', pp. 38-9, gives a summary from several documentary sources in the Temple Newsam archives WYL, TN/YO.

[329] Butler, 'York Palace', pp. 38-9.

[330] D. Stocker and M. Stocker, 'Sacred Profanity: Breeding and the Symbolic Landscape of the Warren', *World Archaeology* 28:2 (1996): 265-72.

the boundary of a deer park, which was an aristocratic feature. There was not such a park behind the Subdeanery's pale, but the deer parks of the Forest of Galtres were just beyond the city wall.[331]

A community of untamed animals represented the only instance of nuisance in this well managed environment. Pigeon as unwelcome inhabitants of the cathedral front are attested since 1498, when nets were bought and people employed to capture them.[332] There were occasional mentions throughout the sixteenth century.[333]

Green plots and orchards

In the Minster Yard every piece of green field, no matter how small, was leased as an allotment. There were several plots on the south side of the choir and of the vestry. Another small parcel was in the corner between the Chapter House buttresses and the cathedral East doorway. Tenants were forbidden to build upon them; they were to be kept as a garden or plot of grass.[334] The grounds of the former prebendal house of Warthill were also leased as gardens. The tenants were gentry and lawyers inhabitant of the Close. The Deanery Yard was also divided into several allotments in the seventeenth century, leased to freemen of the city, tenants of the Dean's estate in Petergate.[335] This intensive use of urban land for horticulture is connected to ideas of improvement in the health of urban dwellers; this in turn was seen as a sign of good governance. Trees were perceived as a component of a healthy urban environment. Isla Fay has explained the development of urban horticulture in fifteen and sixteenth-century Norwich, in the context of pre-modern ideas of health and medicine.[336]

---

[331] Johnson, *Behind the Caste Gates*, pp. 158-9; C. Gilbert, 'New Park, Huby –An Early Seventeenth Century Hunting Lodge', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 45 (1973): 185-88.

[332] YMA E3/ 31.

[333] Not much is known about urban pigeon before the nineteenth century. Their taphonomy and behaviour are in the process of being studied, T. P. O'Connor personal communication, 27 April 2010.

[334] See Chapter 2, pp. 91-2, 113.

[335] YMA, S3/5b.

[336]Fay, 'Health and Disease', pp. 246-286.

According to principles of Galenic and herbal medicine, not only fruits and vegetables, but also pure or balsamic air has the power to maintain good health and to heal. Before the Dissolution herbal medicine was practiced in the religious houses and these had orchards and gardens. In York the city Corporation was keen to preserve this resource and knowledge, and the orchards of the dissolved religious houses, such as Blackfriars, continued to produce fruits and vegetables.[337] Moreover the city tenants were encouraged to grow fruit trees in their gardens. By the early seventeenth century York was the most important centre for nursery gardening in England.[338] In the Close all the mansions had orchards. For other inhabitants renting an allotment in the Minster Yard may have provided the households with fresh fruits and vegetables.

Horticulture was considered the only manual activity fit for a gentleman. In addition of being healthy exercise it was an expression of good husbandry of the domestic domain and contributed to the construction of social order.[339] Books with advice on gardening, such as Thomas Hill's *The Gardener's Labyrinth,* were sold by the stationer John Foster.[340] Cultivation of herbs and fruits and the preparation of medicines, fragrant waters, pickles and preserves were the duties of the mistress of the house. These activities were carried out in still rooms, which would have needed space for long tables, shelving and metal stills and vats. In the mansions such rooms may have been in one of the outbuildings mentioned in the leases. The Foster's bookshop sold books dedicated to herb cultivation and recipes such as John Gerard's *Great Herball*, published in 1597, Hugh Platt's *Delights for Ladies*, first published in 1602 and William Lawsons' *A New Orchard and Garden* in 1618.[341]

---

[337] Palliser, *Towns and Local Communities*, p 89-90; J. Harvey, *Early Nurserymen* (London and Chichester, 1974), p. 63.

[338] J. Harvey, *Early Nurserymen* (London and Chichester, 1974), p. 63.

[339] Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden,* pp. 113-7; J. Roberts 'Gardens of the Gentry in the Late Tudor Period', *Garden History* 27: 1 (1999), p. 95

[340] Barnard and Bell, *John Foster's Inventory*.

[341] Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden,* pp. 109, 146-7.

Formal gardens and the garden of the Ingram Mansion

The mansions had formal private gardens, in close proximity to the house, providing views from the interior and pleasant walks. It is has not been possible to obtain much information on their appearance, but garden design was an important display of status and taste to a social network. William Cecil for instance, was a leading example; he was passionate about his gardens and involved in their design.[342]

The garden of the Ingram mansion has all the features of a high status garden. Its precise setting in the context of the development of garden history of the 1620s deserves a separate study, but a few points can be highlighted here. The gardens created by Ingram in the Palace grounds were considered impressive by contemporary visitors.[343] Their development occurred in the late 1610s and 1620s, a time of great innovation in English gardening, when gardens became more extensive and more elaborate. Ingram's gardens had all features expected in the gardens of top urban mansions, already present in Burghley house in the Strand.[344] Gardens were also connected with health and exercise and the Ingram mansion has all the features to practice sport in the company of friends such as a bowling green and a covered tennis court. (Fig. 16) A banqueting house was located somewhere in ground, perhaps close to the decorative water garden.

Another role of the garden was to be an "open air museum". Carved beasts on poles in formal gardens was a long established medieval tradition. Archaeological magnetic resistivity in Dean Park has identified features consistent with the presence of garden features at regular intervals. These may be

---

[342]Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden*, pp. 113-7.

[343]Palliser, *York As They Saw It,* cites comments on the Ingram mansion by seventeenth century travellers to York: J. J. Cartwright, *Chapters in the History of Wakefield* (Wakefield, 1872), pp. 327-35, from BL Lansdowne MS.213; J. C. Hodgson, *North Country Diaries*, Surtees Society (Second Series) CXXIV (1915): 3-5; C. Jackson, ed., *The Diary of Abraham de la Pryme*, Surtees Society LIV(1870):7; J. C. Hodgson, *Six North Country Diaries*, Surtees Society (Second Series) CXVIII (1910): 4-5; D. Defoe, *A Tour Through the England and Wales*, vol. II (London, 1928), pp. 227-234

[344] Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden*, pp. 10, 25-6.

related to the statues of Roman Emperors mentioned by visitors.[345] They remarked on their worn appearance, suggesting that these were probably antiquities, perhaps found in the Palace Yard.[346] Roman statues of Emperors were especially sought after in gardens of the time. The display of antiquities in gardens and galleries had become fashionable in sixteenth-century Rome. In England, Roman originals were preferred to copies, thus antiquities were imported if necessary. [347] Lord Burghley in 1561 obtained his series of twelve Emperors from Venice and other antiquities from Spain. Arundel furnished his new gallery with statues he brought back from his trip to Italy in 1615.

It could be argued that the garden had a political programme and that Ingram may have seen the potential of Palace Yard becoming a state of the art garden. High status Jacobean gardens were designed according to an iconographic programme, symbolising the order and authority of the king.[348] Ingram was one of the wealthiest men in England, but he was not yet part of the aristocracy. As Secretary of the Council of the North, he may have wanted to support the monarchy and Charles I and his family were guests in the mansions several times. The Palace Yard offered a unique opportunity to build a garden with a powerful iconography in a politically important location. Such gardens are known from descriptions of theatrical performances, notably the 1614 *Masque of Flowers*, by paintings, by reports of foreigner travellers in 1610-18 and by the design of the gardens of New College in Oxford.[349] (Fig.110-111) The most important features of these symbolic gardens were the powerful crenellated walls that surrounded them. They continued the medieval tradition of the *hortus conclusus*, a garden enclosed by walls sometimes reminiscent of city walls. However, stepped bastions, with terraces of orchards and avenues of trees from

---

[345] Giles, 'Documentary', p. 83.

[346] Jackson, *The Diary of Abraham de la Pryme*, p. 7.

[347] Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden,* pp. 196-8. PRO SP 12/19, CSP foreign 1561-2, 125.

[348] R. Strong, *The Renaissance Garden in England* (London, 1979), pp.113-117; Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden,* pp. 124-8.

[349] Strong, *The Renaissance Garden*, pp. 113-7.

which the geometric formal gardens below could be seen, were an innovation under the influence of Italian late sixteenth-century gardens, such as Villa Lante in Viterbo or Villa D'Este in Tivoli.[350] It deserves to be noted that these two gardens are on the margins of a town. Another comparison could be made with the 1616 Tuilerie gardens, which also use Paris' walls and bastions in the same way. Ingram in 1616 would have realised the suitability of the Palace Yard for such a project. The city walls were an authentic backdrop to the *hortus conclusus* and the bastions were developed with earthworks. An inner formal garden was bounded by low walls. It had square beds, with central mounds surmounted by statues and carved animals. The design of this garden would have been appreciated by an elevated position, such as the oriel and gallery of the house. From the walks on the city walls it was possible to see the gardens below and the country on the other side. The walls were separating the tamed and civilised nature of gardens from the wilderness of the forest of Galtres on the other side. This was a gardening idea developed in the Italian sixteenth-century classical tradition; however the idea of observing the deer hunting park from a lordly house was already established in the English culture. The naming of the north tower of the Roman fortress as "Robin Hood" Tower from 1622 is intriguing, giving the royal connection of the garden and its owner.[351] This panoramic location overlooking the ponds would have been excellent for a banqueting house. It is possible that a masque regarding Robin Hood was performed here, perhaps in the presence of the royals. This popular subject may have been acted in this context to exorcise the fear of subversion.[352] However, from the late sixteenth century the carachter of Robin Hood was being gentrified and identified as Robert Earl of Huntingdon. Plays such as Andrew Munday's "The Downfall of and Death of Robert, Earl of Huntingdon", written in 1598, followed by Martin Parker's "A True Tale of Robin Hood", written in 1632, were performed in aristocratic context at a time when there was confict between gentry on one part and aristocracy and the crown on the other side, on forestation and

---

[350] Henderson, *The Tudor House and Garden*, pp. 137-41.

[351] RCHME, *The Defences*, pp. 124.

[352] See Chapter 4, p. 223.

hunting rights.[353] From the 1630s Arthur Ingram, after the *Act of Deforestation*, obtained the control of the Forest of Galtres from the king and transformed a medieval landscape into productive arable land.[354]

Conclusion

The natural environment of the Close was well managed and orderly during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Order and paving of the street reflected the concern for improvement of the built environment already remarked in chapter 5.3. Cleanness, water and waste disposal were particularly strong concerns and were effectively regulated. The management of gardens, green fields and animals within the Close was not only connected to economic considerations but to contemporary ideas of health and medicine. Purity and health in fact, were not only achieved with control of dangerous dirt or out of place, but were actively constructed by knowing and balancing the life force within plants, animals, water and air. The effect of good governance and its connections with health, order and prosperity within the town and its hinterland are thus expressed in the landscape of the Close. The landscaping of the former Archbishop's Palace Yard shows the emergence of new ideas. The contrast between tamed nature and wilderness will be a metaphor developed to support political order at home and in the Empire in the following centuries. The city walls in this context became the limits between the orderly and the wild. Thus their role in defining the civilising city in respect of the unruly countryside was re-interpreted once again.[355]

---

[353] C. Hill, *Liberty Against the Law* (Harmonsworth, 1996), pp. 76-77, 87.

[354] A. F. Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram c. 1565-1642. A Study of the Origins of an English Landed Family* (Oxford, 1961).

[355] See Chapter 1, pp. 26-7. For reinterpretations of city walls see O. Creighton, 'Contested Townscapes: the Walled City as World Heritage', in *World Archaeology* 39: 3 (2007): 339-354

CHAPTER 7: Conclusion

This study had three broad aims. The first was to explore the impact of religious, economic and cultural changes on the landscape of the secular cathedral of York in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century. The second was to understand how communities living and frequenting the Close were connected to this landscape and environment. The third aim was to establish the urban nature of the Close and how this understanding could contribute to the wider debate on Early Modern towns. I have developed the enquiry throughout several themes and engaged with the historiography and academic debate for each specific point. Here I will draw together and highlight themes that have emerged, which are important for understanding changes from the medieval to the early modern society.

An interdisciplinary methodology applied with a social-antropological outlook has been used to interpret the material culture of the landscape and built environment of the Close. This practice not only transcends disciplinary boundaries but produces new forms of interdisciplinary knowledge, which are indispensable for studying the complexity of historic buildings and landscapes. Interdisciplinarity can be understood as a space in itself. It is not simply an area where different epistemologies meet, but it is a new space "in between", where there is room for experimentation and where the interpretation reflexively moves between disciplines.[1] This research shows how it is possible to use different disciplinary approaches to create a thematic narrative while avoiding compartmentalisation. However, a thorough understanding of the epistemology and of the practice of each disciplinary field is a necessary condition for this type of study.

One of the questions asked by the research was how the Reformation affected a secular cathedral where there was institutional continuity. The case for the vitality of the traditional religion at the eve of the Reformation has been made by

---

[1] J. Rendell, 'Architectural Research and Disciplinarity', *Architecture Research Quarterly*, v. 8, n. 4 (2004): 141–7; J. Rendell, *Site-Writing: The Architecture of Art Criticism*, (London, 2010).

Emon Duffy[2]. The buildings and material culture of York Minster reinforce his argument and indicate that the Close was still an important liturgical centre and that the traditional religion was vital. Allegations of decay were used by the historiography to argue for the decline of secular cathedrals closes at the eve of the Reformation.[3] However, I have argued in Chapter 6.1 that these were often made in anticipation of redevelopment and in York Minster Close there was uninterrupted investment in building projects up to the onset of Reformation. The prebendal houses, however, were not fully occupied, representing a shift in the meaning of hospitality; the built environment overall was well maintained. Archaeological evidence for the Reformation in monastic cathedrals is often characterised by a process of destruction, decay or complete rebuilding, reflecting institutional changes from monastic community to secular chapter. In the secular cathedra of York Minster the transformation of the built environment was much more subtle. At the Reformation, despite the loss of resident liturgical communities of priests, there was not widespread destruction of buildings, or a wide-scale and sudden remodelling of the built environment. However, I have demonstrated that a close examination of the documentary sources can reveal that there was much activity and investment in the form of strategic re-acquisition of properties confiscated by the Crown. Thus a general impression of stagnation in the built environment until the 1560s was counterbalanced by a lively political culture concerning real estate. This involved collaborating with the Communality of York to limit the impact of the Dissolution on the city's social services in a period of economic crisis. The lack of impetus for new construction projects in the Close may have been influenced not so much by resistance to the Reformation, but by the social and economic situation of the city.

The sacred landscape, however, was redefined by several episodes of iconoclasm. Recent approaches have considered the psychological and theological implications of iconoclasm, which is a complex and shaded process. People attitude towards the sacred did not necessarily reflect religious doctrine,

---

[2] Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars.*

[3] Lehmberg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals,* pp. 36-7, 67.

because there were also anthropological and psychological factors involved. In this study a fine-grained approach to the material culture of iconoclasm has demonstrated that details of the destruction of objects can reveal conflicts between the action and the beliefs of iconoclasts. Moreover different episodes of iconoclasm should be considered separately, because they may represent different or evolving attitudes towards the sacred during the long Reformation. The pre-Reformation Close was a gated enclave, protecting the religious community and delimiting the medieval sacred landscape. After the redefinition of sacred space the Close continued as a gated enclosure, its role however, was to control access and to protect and bound a privileged community of gentry, professionals and clergy.

One of the consequences of changes in the idea of sacred landscape was the presence of women within the close. Before the Reformation the "purity and danger" attitude that contributed to the definition of medieval sacred space was also directed towards women.[4] They were impure and dangerous unless kept under control and in the right place. Clerical marriage was prohibited and female presence was considered a threat to the clerical communities in the Close. The bridge over Goodramgate from the Close to the Bedern was planned to preserve the Vicar Chorals from female contacts in this seedy area of the city.[5] Tenants of properties bordering the Close were controlled by the Dean and Chapter to discourage the presence of prostitutes. Even after clerical marriage was allowed in 1547, the wife of the headmaster of Holgate's School was prohibited to live in the Close.[6] The presence of women within the Close was transitory or marginal. Women frequented the Close to worship in the churches, to attend court cases and as guests and servants in the Archbishop's Palace and in the mansions. After the Reformation, with the expansion of shops within the Close, women were present as part of the trading community. Widows were tenants and shopkeepers therefore single women were not perceived as a threat. The establishment of maternity clinics in the Close shows that the previous taboo about pollution of

---

[4] Douglas, *Purity and Danger*.

[5] See Chapter 2. 4. 2 p. 118.

[6] See Chapter 4, p. 275.

sacred space disappeared. With clerical marriage well established in Elizabeth's reign and with a new lay community, the role of women in the mansions also changed. As mistresses of the house they would have had decision power on interior decoration and on the running of the household. Nurseries for their numerous children would have been located within the house. Wives participated with their husband in the moral and healthy activity of gardening, some even renting small gardens and perhaps buying books on herbalism, cookery and gardening dedicated to women, in the Foster's bookshop.[7] Services in the cathedral choir, once reserved to clergymen, were attended by women and their families. They were commemorated with life-size portraits in the Lady Chapel, replacing the images of Mary with new female ones. The Close had become more inclusive in terms of gender, however, the presence of women in the Close was not benign. They were the wives of preachers and lawyers, the "exemplary wives and godly matrons" who had to set an example of good behaviour, promoting new family values and new ideas of patriarchal household.[8] The Ecclesiastical Courts, where their husbands worked, were important for controlling and shaping society. They were increasingly dealing with cases of sexual slander brought by women fearful of the consequence of being found not conforming to the expectations of society. Partitioning of domestic buildings may also have created solid barriers within the house, which may have segregated people and activities according to gender and age.

I have used the landscape of the Close to discuss the transformation of medieval into early modern society. Economic themes have emerged from the research, pointing to the beginning of capitalist society. Iconoclasm directed against the images attracting conspicuous donations was motivated by theology, but it may have also represented direct intervention of the state in manipulating the economy. Relocation from images to text had a major impact on the landscape. Liturgy and literacy became closely associated and bookshops were conveniently located by the cathedral doors. Resources previously given to the images of saints were deflected towards consumption in the household. The work of the

---

[7] See Chapter 6.4, p. 352.

[8] Cross, 'Exemplary Wives'.

Ecclesiastical Courts underpinned the development of credit and new shops were stimulating demand for consumption. The relationship between urban landlords and tenants was also changing. Proof of ownership relied on documentation and on physical barriers rather than on collective memory and ritual practices. This shows that changes in the urban context reflect new social relationships, similar to the "closure" of the countryside.

Another important aspect was the role of the landscape of the Close in shaping changes in society. According to Bourdieu there are different forms of capital, one of which is "cultural capital". [9] Education had become a medium of social mobility for talented youth. They could access this through a reformed system of secondary education, which in York was connected to the Close, and by a university education partly funded by former prebendal land. New forms "social capital" or networking, were also articulated by the landscape of the Close. Mansions and lodgings were adapted to new rules of hospitality different from the previous feudal ones. Classical culture and taste were on display in the redeveloped mansions and created a common identity for the network of educated gentlemen and lawyers and clergy. The Close provided a new urban experience for the North of England comparable, even if on a lesser scale, with the development of the Strand in London. The idea of the periodical residence in towns during a "social season" was a feature of life of English upper classes, which was had its beginning in the late sixteenth century. A luxury shopping experience was developed to suit these new ways of life.

I have argued that the vitality of urban life in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries could not be assessed against the parameters of an idealistic "Renaissance" and I have contributed to the debate challenging ideas of sixteenth-century urban decay and backwardness, especially in the northern regions. The landscape of the Close from the late sixteenth century shows a shift from an economy prevalently based of production and exchange to one prevalently based on retail and services. However, this shift did not happen by chance. Despite demographic and economic difficulties in the city of York, the

---

[9] P. Bourdieu, 'The Forms of Capital', in G. J Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (New York, 1986), pp. 241-258.

political choices made with respect to development and investment demonstrated vision in formulating long term strategies and willingness to improve the life standards and economy of the city. These ideas of good governance, order in the environment and health were developed in the context of European humanism.

Rebuilding and transformation of the built environment was not confined to specific periods but followed phases of investment and of stagnation throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A major phase of redevelopment, between the 1560s until the mid 1580s, apparently coincides with the period of "great rebuilding" suggested by Hoskins for the English countryside.[10] However, the reason for this chronology in York was local. It has been discussed in Chapter 6 how other cities had a different chronology for the redevelopment of cathedral closes. Investment in public buildings and in the residential sector by the Dean and Chapter and by the tenants of the mansions was considerable. Domestic space was remodelled for the needs of the new community. The partition and adaptation of the inner space of houses had an impact on the process of construction, allowing the reuse of material rather than requiring new natural resources such as trees. This shift in construction techniques, as Johnson has suggested for country dwellings, reflects changes happening in the structure of society and on ideas of household.[11] However, in the urban context there may have been multiples ideas of household already in the late medieval period, therefore change in urban dwellings will require further study, as Rimmer has already suggested.[12] Moreover the scarcity of documented building work in the early seventeenth century does not mean that the Close was in a phase of stagnation. A detailed examination of the tenancy of bookshops in the Close had shown that there was commercial expansion and investment; however, these did not involve remodelling of buildings.

A recurring theme developed throughout the thesis is how people create and respond to rapid change. Continuity, relocation and recovery of past material and practices are all part of the creative process of change. For instance meanings

---

[10] Hoskins, 'The Rebuilding'.

[11] Johnson, *Housing Culture*.

[12] Rimmer, 'Small Houses'.

attached to sacred space were not all discarded at the Reformation. Despite initial prohibition from ruling authorities, some of the changes were resisted, and practices, such as burial in the cathedral, were retained. Other practices were not lost but became relocated within the Close. However, previously communal practices became individualised. There was also a return to never forgotten shamanic traditions, which the Ecclesiastical courts tried to curb. I have also suggested that some of the practices that were lost, suppressed and rejected re-emerged after a generation or even centuries later. A communal consumption of art not only emerged as a renewed interest for the aesthetics of the church building, but later re-emerged with the creation of public museums and galleries. In Chapter 1 I have discussed how both architecture and material culture are a form of communication. New messages to be effective need to contain familiar elements and to introduce innovative ones. In Chapter 6. 2 and 6. 3 I have suggested that the visibility of old material underlying new construction and innovative forms in remodelled buildings may have represented the safety of continuity in a time of rapid change. I have argued that creative and innovative solutions were achieved when the new was built upon the old. Furthermore the redevelopment of the medieval mansions shows the integration within established building traditions of new influences from the continent. Gentry and civil servants were developing a social identity by remodelling the medieval mansions. New classicist aesthetics was integrated in the fabric of the house, the models of which were transmitted within a national and local social network.

The significance of the landscape of York Minster Close during the Reformation transcends the local and the religious dimension. The end of the medieval traditional religion made an impact initiating the transformation of the cathedral landscape, lasting several decades. The post-Reformation cathedral landscape connected together the established religion, courts of law, consumer society, urban culture and education, professional networks and new ideas of urbanism. These are field of discourse associate with the beginning of modernity. Although York Minster was in a unique position, because it was an Archbishopric and was connected with the seat of the Council of the North, these were features present

364

also in other cathedral closes.[13] Therefore post-Reformation cathedral closes were place within cities where social changes were not merely reflected, but generated.

The identification of the original function and historical development of standing buildings in the Close is significant for the conservation of York Minster precinct. For instance the purpose and extension of some of the prebendal mansions, such as the mansions of Ullerskelf and Langtoft, or the significance of 2-3-4 Precentors' Court were not known before this study.[14] Fragments of stone walls were identified by the RCHME around the Close, but their context and significance could have only been explained by meticulous work on the documentary sources, as the case of the Wright house demonstrates.[15] The survival of leases, detailed building accounts and standing evidence for this building provides a small but perfect example of interdisciplinary methodology. In addition to other elements, which contribute to a better understanding of the medieval topography of the Close have emerged, such as the location of the church of St John-del-Pyke and the location and demolition of the chapel of St Mary and the Holy Angels. However, other problems, such as the change in street system in relation to the closure of the east gate of the Roman Fortress, would require archaeological fieldwork.

This study has identified areas where further research needs be to be carried out. The Ingram Mansion and its gardens are one of several building projects of the upward mobile entrepreneur Sir Arthur Ingram. His career as a financier, foreign trade dealer and owner of the monopoly of mined alum, has already been studied.[16] His activity as a builder and estate developer, including de-forestation, has received insufficient attention. In addition a detailed study of the redevelopment of the Archbishop's Palace could shed new light on this important medieval complex.

---

[13] Gilchrist, *Norwich Cathedral Close;* M. Hobbs, *Chichester Cathedral. An Historical Survey* (Chichester, 1994); Blaney, *St Paul's Cross Churchyard*; RCHME, *Salisbury*; Levack, *The Civil Lawyers in England*.

[14] Field Archaeology Specialists, 'Conservation Plan', Vol. 2.

[15] RCHME, *York. The Central Area*, pp. 199-200.

[16] Upton, *Sir Arthur Ingram.*

Finally, information obtained with this interdisciplinary methodology, can evoke some of the experience of living in the Close. I hope to have provided not the description of a distant landscape but a narrative about communities living and transforming their material world. The local level and the fine-grained details of everyday life are interconnected with a wider political, economic and cultural context.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Archaeological surveys in Precentors' Court, York.

Survey at 2 and 3 Precentors' Court (The Wright House)

During two days in July and September 2007, building survey was carried out in the cellars of 2 and 3 Precentor's Court in advance of the sale of these properties by the Dean and Chapter. The presence of the sixteenth-century carpenters' workshop in that location and its construction had been already established by the documentary sources. The RHME survey of York noted the presence of earlier stone walls on the cellars of the terrace houses built in c. 1720.[1] The purpose of the survey was to identify and to record the phases of the building belonging to the sixteenth-century workshop. It was decided that photography and hand measured survey of plan and details of the elevation were adequate for this purpose. The workshop continued in the property to the west, 4 Precentors' Court. (Map 28 and 29)

Four cellars, two in each property, were surveyed. In the east cellar of 2 Precentors' Court stone walls were conserved on three sides, up to a height of 1.25 m. A later brick partition constitutes the west wall. On the northern wall there was a blocked opening 1.20 m wide with a step of 0.55m above floor level. (Fig. 113-114) This was c. 1.25m below the modern street level. The wall of the eighteenth-century house is stepped back 0.25m from the edge of the stone wall. On the floor under the blocked opening there are two flagstones aligned to form a path. The floor is made of tiles laid flat, measuring on average 0.23m by 0.12m. (Fig, 113) There has been subsidence in a circular pattern, the centre point of which is toward the west of the cellar and is followed by the base of the eighteenth-century partition. (Fig. 114) Therefore it pre-date the partition. This subsidence has disturbed the tiles and this suggests that there was a pit under the sixteenth-century building, which had been filled not to long before the

---

[1] RCHME, *The Central Area*, pp. 199-200.

construction of the floor. Repairs to the floor have not been examined in this survey. A curving path of seven flagstones continues to the south of the cellar into the next room. (Map. 29, Fig. 114-116). The cellar to the west has been disturbed by other structures, such as a chimney stack. Stone walls are conserved to the south and to the north. A blocked opening, representing a window, under the present street high is visible in the northern stone wall and suggests that this was a window of the original building. A partition made of reused timber vertical stakes, with a noggin of tiles and a gray mortar, forms the east wall of a coal hole. (Fig. 117) This partition could date to the seventeenth century but it could also be a later development. A graffiti or production stamp on a tile needs further investigation. This cellar is separated from the one of 3 Precentor's Court by a brick wall.

In 3 Precentors' Court the floor is modern concrete and the ceiling is 1.75m in height. The northern wall preserves stone courses up to a height of 1. 30m. (Fig. 118, 119) On the western portion a blocked window suggest there was another brick phase before the 1720 redevelopment. (Fig. 121) The stone wall continues into a partition to the east side of the cellar. The western and southern walls are modern or eighteenth-century partitions in bricks. The next cellar represents an expansion of the workshop into an L shape. Its eastern and southern walls are made of stone up to a height of 1.75m. (Fig. 122, 123). The western wall is modern or eighteenth century. An opening, which could have been up to 2m wide, constituted the access between the two sections of the L shaped building.

The building materials and construction of the workshop have been discussed in Chapter 2. Its use has been discussed in Chapter 6.3. I wish to draw attention in the photographs to the size of the limestone and gritstone blocks. The archive of the survey consists of more sections, drawings and photographs, which will be presented in a separate work

Survey at 10 Precentors' Court (Mansion of Fenton)

A TST survey and high definition photography for rectified photography and selective hand measured survey have been carried in the week starting on 28

January 2008. The purpose was to identify in situ walls in this building of medieval date to understand the phases of transformation of the building. The interpretation of the phases of development has been discussed in Chapter 2. The results and the CAD drawings of the survey, including photographic material and drawings, will be presented in a separate work.

Appendix 2 List of the principal documentary sources from the York Minster Archives

YMA, Wa-f Dean and Chapter Lease Registers

Wa 1v	2 May 1508
Wa 149-150	15 July 1541
Wb 282	25 February 1575
Wb 116v	7 September 1558
Wb 129v-130	28 May 1562
Wb 138-138v	2 June 1564
Wb 159v-160	21 January 1569
Wb 281v-282 (1st)	21 January 1576
Wb 289-290	28 November 1576
Wb 295v-296	1 March 1577
Wb 301	18 November 1578
Wb 302	8 December 1578
Wb 305v-306	8 April 1580
Wb 312	9 February 1579
Wb 315v	27 September 1582
Wb 318	1 February 1583
Wb 321v	4 January 1583
Wb 333v-334	5 August 1584
Wb 338-339	23 april 1585
Wb 36v-37	5 December 1547
Wb 370v-371	8 February 1588
Wb 373-373v	7 December 1585
Wc 156v-157	16 May 1603
Wc 97v-98	9 January 1596
Wc 117-117v	20 May 1596
Wc 160v-161	11 february 1605
Wc 194-195	20 April 1613
Wc 218-218v	24 September 1616

Wc 226-226v	3 June 1617
Wc 227v-228	18 June 1617
Wc 228v-229	18 June 1617
Wc 237v-238	20 September 1622
Wc 23v-24	8 May 1588
Wc 240v-241	5 July 1617
Wc 241v-241	5 July 1617
Wc 244	26 July 1617
Wc 248	7 August 1617
Wc 270	9 April 1619
Wc 27-27v	28 october 1590
Wc 274v-275	26 June 1617
Wc 275-276	26 June 1617
Wc 276-276v	26 June 1617
Wc 276v-277v	26 June 1617
Wc 27v	5 April 1592
Wc 281v-282v	27 June 1617
Wc 288v-289	8 July 1617
Wc 289v-290	8 July 1617
Wc 293-293v	26 September 1617
Wc 297-297v	5 October 1617
Wc 300v-301	25 November 1618
Wc 301-301v	25 November 1618
Wc 304v-305	27 March 1620
Wc 43v	27 September 1595
Wc 43v-44	29 December 1594
Wc 5v-6	11 November 1588
Wc 6v-7	15 March 1589
Wc 81-81v	13 March 1594
Wc 90-90v	10 June 1595
Wd 114 v	27 May 1633
Wd 115v	9 November 1633
Wd 115v	9 November 1633

Wd 115v	20 October 1621
Wd 144v	3 January 1632
Wd 145	3 January 1632
Wd 158v-159	29 April 1633
Wd 159-161	23 October 1634
Wd 24v	13 September 1626
Wd 25-26	19 January 1627
Wd 43v	5 April 1626
Wd 44v-45	2 April 1618
Wd 49v-50	13 September 1637
Wd 50-50v	19 January 1627
Wd 71-71v	30 July 1630
Wd 78v	19 December 1631
Wd 86-86v	23 December 1628
We 11-11v Part II	23 January 1661
We 11v-12	24 January 1661
We 125v-126v	12 November 1669
We 126v-127	12 November 1669
We 12v	4 February 1661
We 13v-14 Part II	4 February 1661
We 14-14v	4 February 1661
We 150-150v	22 December 1671
We 151v	20 March 1672
We 185-185v	9 January 1675
We 186	1674?
We 200-201	15 January 1677
We 214-214v-215	17 June 1661
We 223-223v	22 May 1679
We 24-24v	5 June 1661
We 254v	9 February 1678
We 260v-261	25 May 1681
We 281-281v	13 February 1683
We 326	13 June 1691

We 327-327v	13 June 1691
We 328v-329	25 August 1691
We 332v-333	17 February 1692
We 333-334	16 February 1692
We 333-334v	16 February 1692
We 341-341v	27 September 1692
We 342v-343	22 november 1692
We 343v-344	22 November 1692
We 346-347	29 May 1693
We 34v	8 June 1661
We 35v	26 June 1661
We 362v-363	29 August 1693
We 362v-363	29 August 1693
We 36-36v	15 June 1661
We 363v-364	8 October 1696
We 363v-364	8 October 1696
We 37v-38	28 June 1661
We 396-396v	24 January 1701
We 400-401	3 August 1701
We 404	4 November 1701
We 40v-41	26 June 1661
We 4-4v Part II	2 October 1660
We 45	10 June 1661
We 45	10 June 1661
We 46v	10 June 1661
We 46v	10 June 1661
We 50v-51	10 July 1661
We 52-52v	21 August 1661
We 6 Part I	18 March 1641
We 67v-68	11 January 1662
We 6v Pt II	14 November 1660
We 70-70v	29 January 1662
We 7-7v Part I	11 March 1641

We 7v-8 Pt1	29 March 1641
We 9v Part II	11 Jannuary 1661
Wf 202-203	15 January 1719
Wf 97-97v	4 June 1712
Wf 148v-149	17 November 1715
Wf 161v-162v	20 August 1716
Wf 162v-163	25 August 1716
Wf 170v-171	27 July 1717
Wf 203-204	15 January 1720
Wf 207v-208	4 June 1720
Wf 208v-209	4 June 1720
Wf 247v-248	15 February 1723
Wf 277v-278	12 January 1726
Wf 278	13 January 1726
Wf 284-285	20 September 1726
Wf 77	18 February 1710
Wf 78-78v	18 February 1710

YMA S3/5b Deanery Lease Register

S3/5b, 189-90	25 June 1662
S3/5b, 191	20 April1653
S3/5b, 1 -2	5 June 1617
S3/5b, 106-107	1630
S3/5b, 171-2	20 November 1661.
S3/5b, 173-4	20 November 1661.
S3/5b, 185-6	20 February 1661
S3/5b, 186	20 February 1662.
S3/5b, 3- 4	10 June 1614
S3/5b, 45-7	19 August 1619
S3/5b, 48-49-50	18 March 1619
S3/5b, 55-7	20 September 1618

S3/5b, 61-4	23 October 1618
S3/5b, 64-5	23 March 1624
S3/5b, 66-7	23 March 1624
S3/5b, 67-68	3 June 1624
S3/5b, 69-70	10 June 1624
S3/5b, 81	23 September 1625
S3/5b, 82-83	1625
S3/5b, 84	29 October 1625
S3/5b, 85	26 August 1625
S3/5b, 85	26 August 1625
S3/5b,107-8	17 Feb 1631
S3/5b,110-111	16 February 1634
S3/5b,112	
S3/5b,115	4 February 1631
S3/5b,116	4 Feb 1631
S3/5b,130-1	12 February 1626
S3/5b,132-3	26 March 1635
S3/5b,134-36	5 June 1635
S3/5b,136-7	26 August 1635
S3/5b,139	12 January 1661
S3/5b,153	10 June 1661
S3/5b,167-8	11 September 1661
S3/5b,175-6	26 November 1661
S3/5b,80	23 Sept 1625
S3/5b,98-100	23 December 1628
S3/5b,98-99	23 December 1628

YMA M2/5   Dean and Chapter Appropriation Register

M2/5, 343v-344	9 September 1492
M2/5, 239	8 March 1451
M2/5, 301v	5 July 1482
M2/5, 349-349v	9 May 1494

M2/5, 363-364   20 January 1500

M2/5, 375   29 April 1505

YMA E3/33-66 York Minster Fabric Accounts, Fabric
Rolls

E3/33   1505
E3/34   1507-1508
E3/35   1509-1510
E3/36   1515-1516
E3/37   1518-1519
E3/38   1525-1526
E3/39   1527-1528
E3/40   1529-1530
E3/41   1530-1531
E3/42   1531-1532
E3/43   1535-1536
E3/44   1537-1538
E3/45   1543-1545
E3/46   1548-1549
E3/47   1550-1551
E3/48   1557-1558
E3/49   1558-1559
E3/50   1568-1569
E3/51   1569-1570
E3/52   1571-1572
E3/53   1574-1575
E3/54   1576-1577
E3/55   1578-1579
E3/56   1579-1580
E3/57   1580-1581
E3/58   1581-1582
E3/59   1582-1583

E3/60   1584-1585

E3/61   1587-1588

E3/62/1   1607-1608

E3/62/2   1611-1612

E3/62/3   1623-1624

E3/63/1   1624-1625

E3/63/2   1628-1629

E3/64   1639-1640

E3/65   1660-1693

Appendix 3 List of maps and plans used to produce GIS maps

The following maps were used to compose the mosaic in ArcGIS for the creation of maps in Vol. 2, Map 4 to 17.

OS Maps

OS Digital Master Map of York, British National Grid Reference System 460341 451774 (Crown Copyright).

OS Map of 1852.

Unpublished historic maps and plans

BIHR, Map 24, c. 1840 from 18th C original.

BHIR, CC. Ab. 11/85, late 18th early 19th C, plan of the Archbishop's Palace and bastions.

BIHR, CC. VC. 11, 1S, Plan of Cambhall Garth, York, 1833.

BIHR, CC.P/Str 10 York 8-15; 18th C plan of the Mansion of Strensall.

WYL, TN/YO, Plans of the Ingram Mansion and grounds 1782.

York Museums Trust (Yorkshire Museum) Accession Register, Plan of excavation in Precentors' Court, by Mr Naylor, builder, 1835.

Published plans

Brown, *York Minster*, p. 108, fig. 3. 28, plan of excavations in the north-west corner of the cathedral.

Phillips, *Excavations at York Minster*, p. 51, plan of excavations of the Archbishop's gateway and St Mary and the Holy Angels.

RCHME, *City of York*, pp. 72-3, figs. 43 and 44, Treasurer's House.

RCHME, *City of York*, p. 200, fig. 124, 2-4a Precentor's Court.

Plans from unpublished archaeological excavations

Dean, '12 Minster Yard', p. 6, fig. 2 and p. 13 fig. 7, foundations of theArchbishop's Exchequer.

Dean 'Minster Yard and Minster Gates', p. 8 fig. 1, site and trench location.

Field Archaeology Specialists, 'Archaeological Excavation and Survey, York Minster Library', Unpublished Field Report (York, March 2000), plan of excavations and geophysical surveys in Dean Park.

Bibliography

Unpublished primary sources

BIHR. York, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research

    CC. Ab. 9, Archbishop's Palace.

    CC. P. 9-10, Prebendal Records.

WYL. Leeds, West Yorkshire Archives

    TN/YO A9, 13, Indenture of Lease of Archbishop's Palace to Arthur Ingram.

YMA. York, York Minster Archives

    02/MY/29, Indenture of Sale of the Deanery to William Allanson 1650.

    E1/63-100, Chamberlain Accounts Rolls.

    E3/1-32, Fabric Accounts Rolls c.1350-1500 (transcription,York Archaeological Trust, ed., unpublished draft).

    E3/33-66, Fabric Accounts Rolls, 1500-1702.

    E4a, Fabric Accounts Books, 1671-1709.

    F3/1-19, Accounts of the Bailiffs of the Liberty of St Peter and Court of Leet.

    YMA, H12/3, f. 174, 191, Chapter Acts.

    M2/5, Register of Appropriations.

    S3/5b, Deanery Lease Register.

    VC/9/6, Vicar Choral Fabric Accounts Rolls, .

    Wa-g, Dean and Chapter Lease Registers, 1500-1722.

YML. York, York Minster Library

    XVI L17, Beckwith, Thomas, *History of York 1140-1788.*

    XVI L14, Hutton, Matthew, *Antiquities of Yorkshire*, 1659.

    MS L1/7, Torr, James, *The Antiquities of York Minster Collected out of the Records of the Said Church and Some Other Authorities.* 1690-1.

York Museums Trust. Yorkshire Museum.

    Acquisition Register, St William's Shrines.

    Longley, K. M., St William's Shrines, York Minster, Found in Precentors' Court. 1974.

Published primary sources

Aquinas, Thomas, *Summa Theologica*. Ed. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, vols. 60. London and New York, 1964.

Browne, J., ed. *Fabrics Rolls and Documents of York Minster: or, a Defence of the History of the Metropolitan Church of St Peter*. York, 1836.

Dickens, A. G., ed. *Archbishop Holgate's Apology*. The English Historical Review 56. 1941.

Drake, F. *Eboracum: or, the History and Antiquities of the City of York*. London, 1736.

Farrer, W., ed., *Early Yorkshire Charters*. Vol. 1. Edinburgh, 1914-16.

Frere, W. H., ed., *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*. Alcuin Club Collection, XIV, vol. 2. New York, 1910.

Gairdner, J., ed., *L and P, Henry VIII*, vol. 13 part 2. 1893.

Halfpenny, J. *Fragmenta Vetusta, or the Remains of Ancient Buildings in York, Drawn and Etched* (York, 1807).

Hargrove, W. *History and Description of the Ancient City of York*, 2 vols (York, 1818).

Moody, J., ed. *The Private Life of an Elizabethan Lady. The Diary of Lady Margaret Hoby 1599-1605*. Stroud, 1988.

Raine, A., ed. *York Civic Records*. Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series 106, 108, 110, 112, 115, 119, 138. 1939-1953.

Raine, J. , ed. *Fabric Rolls of York Minster with an Appendix of Illustrative Documents*. Surtees Society 35. 1859.

Raine, J. , ed. *The Statutes of the Cathedral Church of York*. 2nd edn. Leeds, 1900.

Salmon, William, *Polygraphice or The Arts of Drawing, Engraving, Etching, Limning, Painting, Vernishing, Japaning, Gilding, etc.* 8th edn. London, 1701.

Tringham, N. J., ed. *Charters of the Vicars Choral of York Minster: City of York and Its Suburbs to 1546*. York, 1993.

Woodward, F.H., ed. *Deed of Foundation of the Free School of Robert Holgate, York*. The Archbishop Holgate Society, Record Series 1. 1948.

Secondary sources

Airs, M. *The Tudor and Jacobean Great House: A Building History*. Stroud, 1995.

Anderson, C. *Inigo Jones and the Classical Tradition*. Cambridge, 2007.

Appiah, K. A. 'Thick Translation'. *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. L. Venuti. London, 2000. Pp. 417-429

Archer, I.W. 'Material Londoners?'. *Material London.* Ed. L.C. Orlin. Philadelphia, 2000. Pp. 174-92.

Archer, I.W. 'Popular Politics in the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries'. *Londinopolis: Essays in the Cultural and Social History of Early Modern London*. Eds P. Griffiths and M.S.R. Jenner. Manchester, 2000.

Aries, P. 'Introduction'. *A History of Private Life, iii. Passions of Renaissance.* Ed. R. Chartier, trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge Mass., 1989. Pp. 1-11

Arlaud, B. Bournouf, J. Esquieu, Y. Reynaud, J.F. and Vialettes, M. 'Lyon'. *Les Chanoines dans la Ville. Recherches sur la Topographie des Quartiers Canoniaux en France.* Ed. J.C. Picard. Paris, 1994. Pp. 271-285.

Aston, M. 'Public Worship and Iconoclasm'. *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* Eds D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist. The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology, Monograph 1. 2003. Pp. 9-28.

Aston, M. *Faith and Fire: Popular and Unpopular Religion 1350-1600.* London and Rio Grande, 1993.

Atkin , M., Carter, A.and Evans, D. *Excavations in Norwich 1971-8 Part II.* East Anglian Archaeology 26. 1985.

Aveling, J.C.H. *Catholic Recusancy in the City of York.* Catholic Record Society Publications, Monograph Series 2. 1970.

Aylmer, G. E and R. Cant, R. *A History of York Minster.* Oxford, 1977.

Aylmer, G. E. 'Funeral Monuments and Other Post-Medieval Sculpture'. *A History of York Minster*. Eds G.E. Aylmer and R. Cant. Oxford, 1977. Pp. 430-86.

Aylmer, G. E. 'The Council in the North: a Note on the Location of the Secretary's Office'. *York Historian* 2 (1978): 21-3.

Bakhtin, M. *Rabelais and His World.* English Translation. Bloomington, 1984.

Barber, P. 'Mapmaking in England ca 1470-1650'. *The History of Cartography. Cartography in the European Renaissance*. Vol. 3, part 2. Ed. D. Woodward.Chicago and London, 2007. Pp. 1589-1670.

Barnard J. and Bell, M. 'The English Provinces. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557-1695, vol. 4*. Eds J. Barnard and D. F. Mckenzie. Cambridge, 2002. Pp. 665-686.

Barnard, J. and M. Bell, M. *The Early Seventeenth Century York Book Trade and John Foster's Inventory of 1616.* Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, Literary and Historical Section 24, pt 2. 1994.

Barnard, J. and Mckenzie, D. F. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557-1695*, vol. 4. Cambridge, 2002.

Barr, C. B. L. 'The Minster Library'. *A History of York Minster*. Eds G.E. Aylmer and R. Cant. Oxford, 1977. Pp. 487-539

Barrett, J. 'Fields of Discourse: reconstituting a social archaeology'. *Critique of Anthropology* 7 (1988): 5-16.

Barrett, J. and Ko, I. 'A Phenomenology of Landscape. A Crisis in British Landscape Archaeology?'. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 9 (2009): 275-294.

Barron, C. 'The Expansion of Education in Fifteenth Century London'. *The Cloister and the World: Essays in Medieval History in Honour of Barbara Harvey*. Eds J. Blair and B. Golding. Oxford, 1996. Pp. 219-245.

Barron, C. *The Medieval Guildhall of London*. London, 1974.

Bateman, N. 'John Carpenter's Library: Corporate Charity and London's Guildhall'. *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580*. Eds D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist. The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology, Monograph 1. 2003. Pp. 356-370

Bendall, S. and Speed, J. 'Draft Town Maps for John Speed's "Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine"'. *Imago Mundi* 54 (2002): 30-35.

Berger, R. M. *The Most Necessary Luxuries. The Mercers' Company of Coventry 1550-1680*. Pennsylvania, 1993.

Beuckers, K. G. 'Zu den Obergeschlosskapellen am Querhaus der Kathedrale von Nidaros und ihrer Liturgischen Nutzung'. *The Medieval Cathedral of Trondheim. Architectural and Ritual Constructions in their European Context*. Ed. M. S, Andas. Turnhout, 2007. Pp. 209-251.

Binsky, P. *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets. Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400*. New Haven and London, 1995.

Blaney, P. W. M. 'John Day and the Bookshop That Never Was'. *Material London*. Ed. L.C. Orlin. Philadelphia, 2000. Pp. 322-343.

Blaney, P. W. M. *The Bookshops in St Paul's Cross Churchyard*. The Bibliographical Society London, Occasional Papers 6.1990.

Borsay, P. 'Politeness and Elegance: The Cultural Re-Fashioning of Eighteenth-Century York'. *Eighteenth-Century York: Culture, Space and Society*. Ed. M. Hallett and J. Rendall. Borthwick Text and Calendar 30. 2003. Pp. 1-12.

Borsay, P. 'Culture, Status, and the English Urban Landscape', *History*, 67, n. 219 (1982): 1-12.

Borsay. P. *The English Urban Renaissance: Culture and Society in the Provincial Town, 1660-1770*. Oxford, 1989.

Bourdieu, P. 'The Forms of Capital'. *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Ed. G. J Richardson. New York, 1986. Pp. 241-258.

Bourdieu, P. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge, 1977.

Boutcher, W. 'Pilgrimage to Parnassus: Local Intellectual Traditions, Humanist Education and the Cultural Geography of Sixteenth-Century England'. *Pedagogy and Power. Rethorics of Classical Learning*. Eds Y. L. Too and N. Livingstone. Cambridge, 1998. Pp. 110-147.

Brand, P. 'Lawyers' Time in England in the Later Middle Ages'. *Time in the Medieval World*. Eds C. Humphrey and W. M. Ormrod. Woodbridge, 2001. Pp. 73-104.

Broadbent, G. 'The Deep Structures of Architecture'. *Sign, Symbols and Architecture*. Eds G. Broadbent, R. Bunt and C. Jenks. Chichester, 1980. Pp. 119-169.

Brodie, A, Croom, J. and Davies, J. O. *English Prisons. An Architectural History.* Swindon, 2002.

Brooks, F.W. *York and the Council of the North*. Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 6.1954.

Brown Fortini, P. *Venice and Antiquity*. New Haven and London, 1996.

Brown, S. *The Medieval Courts of the York Minster Peculiar.* Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Paper 66. 1984.

Brown, S. *York Minster. An Architectural History c1220-1500*. Swindon, 2003.

Browne, J. *The History of the Metropolitan Church of St. Peter York*. 2 Vols. London, Oxford and York. 1847.

Buisseret, D. *The Mapmaker's Quest. Depicting New Worlds in Renaissance Europe*. Oxford, 2003.

Burckhardt, J. *The Civilisation of the Renaissance in Italy*. 3rd ed. London, 1995.

Burke, P. *What is Cultural History?*, 2nd edition. Cambridge, 2008.

Butler, R.M. 'Notes on the Minster Close at York'. *York Historian* 14 (1997):10-25.

Butler, R.M. 'York Palace, a Vanished Jacobean Mansion'. *York Historian* 8 (1988): 25-45.

Camille, M. *Image on the Edge: The Margins on Medieval Art*. London, 1992.

Camp, J. M. *The Athenian Agora : Excavations in the Heart of Classical Athens*, New Aspects of Antiquity. London, 1986.

Carlin, M. 'Fast Food and Urban Living Standards in Medieval England'. *Food and Eating in Medieval Europe*. Eds M. Carlin and J. Rosenthal. London, 1998. Pp. 27-51.

Cartwright, J. J. *Chapters in the History of Wakefield*. Wakefield, 1872.

Cazes, Q. *Le Quartier Canonial de la Cathédrale Saint-Étienne de Toulouse*. Archéologie du Midi Médiéval 2. 1998.

Cherry, J. 'Pilgrim Ampullae of York Minster and the Healing Oil of the Shrine of St William'. *Beyond Pilgrim Souvenirs and Secular Badges*. Ed. S. Blick. Oxford, 2007. Pp. 48-63.

Clark, P. *Cambridge Urban History of Britain, 1540-1840*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, 2000.

Clark, P.and Slack, P. *English Towns in Transition 1500-1700*. Oxford, 1976.

Clemente, C. *Guida alla Storia Romana: Eventi, Strutture Sociali, Metodi di Ricerca*. Milano, 1981.

Cliffe, J. T. *The Yorkshire Gentry from the Reformation to the Civil War*. London, 1969.

Coarelli, F. *Il Foro Romano*. Roma, 1983.

Coldstream, N. *Medieval Architecture*. Oxford, 2002.

Colin, H. *A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects, 1600-1840*. 3rd ed. New Heaven and London, 1995.

Collectif, *Le Village Médiéval et Son Environnement. Études Offertes à Jean-Marie Pesez*. Paris,1998.

Collinson, P. 'Comment on Eamon Duffy's Neale Lecture and Colloquium'.*England's Long Reformation 1500-1800*. Ed. N. Tyacke. London, 1998. Pp. 71-86.

Collinson, P. 'From Iconoclasm to Iconophobia: the Cultural Impact of the Second English Reformation'. *Impact of the English Reformation 1500-1640*. Ed. P.Marshall. London, 1997. Pp. 278-308.

Collinson, P. Hunt, A. and Walsham, A. 'Religious Publishing in England 1557-1640'. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557-1695, vol. 4*. Eds J. Barnard and D. F. Mckenzie. Cambridge, 2002.

Collinson, P. *The Sixteenth Century 1485-1603*. The Short Oxford History of the British Isles. Oxford, 2002.

Collinson, P.*The Birthpangs of Protestant England : Religious and Cultural Change in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Oxford, 1988.

Cook, G. H. *Letters to Cromwell and Others on the Suppression of the Monasteries*. London, 1965.

Coope, R. 'The "Long Gallery": Its Origins and Development Use and Decoration'. *Architectural History* 29 (1986): 43-72.

Cooper, N. 'The Gentry House in the Age of Transition'. *The Age of Transition. The Archaeology of English Culture 1400-1600*. Eds D. Gaimster and P. Stamper. The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 15, Oxbow Monograph 98. 1997. Pp. 115-126.

Cooper, N. *Houses of the Gentry, 1480-1680.* New Haven and London, 1999.

Cooper, T. P. *The Sign of the Crown. Stationers, Early Printers and Bookshops within the Minster Gates, York*. York, 1925.

Cosgrove, D. *Mappings*. London, 1999.

Coster, W. 'A Microcosm of Community: Burial Space and Society in Chester, 1598 to 1633'. *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe*. Eds W. Coster and A.Spicer. Cambridge, 2005. Pp. 124-143.

Coster, W. and Spicer, A. *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, 2005.

Coulson, C. 'Hierarchism in Conventual Crenellation. An Essay in the Sociology and Metaphysics of Medieval Fortification'. *Medieval Archaeology* 26 (1982): 69-100.

Cox, J. C. *Sanctuaries and Sanctuary Seekers*. London, 1911.

Cox, N. and Dannehl, K. *Dictionary of Traded Goods and Commodities, 1550-1820*. Wolverhampton, 2007.

Creighton, O. 'Contested Townscapes: the Walled City as World Heritage'. *World Archaeology* 39: 3 (2007): 339-354

Cross, C. 'Exemplary Wives and Godly Matrons: Women's Contribution to the Life of York Minster between the Reformation and the Civil War'. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 77 (2005): 169-179.

Cross, C. 'From the Reformation to the Restoration'. *A History of York Minster.* Ed. G.E. Aylmer and R. Cant. Oxford, 1977. Pp. 193-232.

Cross, C. 'Priests into Ministers: The Establishment of Protestant Practice in the City of York 1530-1630'. *Reformation Principles and Practice*. Ed. P. N. Brooks. London, 1980. Pp. 205-225.

Cross, C. 'York Clerical Piety and St Peter's School on the Eve of the Reformation'.*York Historian* 2 (1978): 17-20.

Cross, C. *York Clergy Wills, 1520-1600, I Minster Clergy*. Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Texts and Calendars: Records of the Northern Province 10. 1984.

Cunich, P. 'Layton'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol 32. Eds H. C. G. Matthew and B. Harrison. 2004. Pp. 934-936.

Cunich, P. 'The Dissolutions and their Aftermath'. *A Companion to Tudor Britain.* Eds R. Tittler and N. Jones. Oxford, 2004. Pp. 221-236.

Curl, J.S. *Oxford Dictionary of Architecture*. Oxford, 1999.

Davies, R. *York Printers and Stationers*. London, 1868.

De Certeau, M. *L'Invention du Quotidien. 1 Arts de Faire*. Paris, 1990.

Deetz, J. *In Small Things Forgotten. An Archaeology of Early American Life*.2nd edition. New York, 1996.

Defoe, D. *A Tour Through the England and Wales*. Vol. II. London, 1928.

Derrett, J. D. M. *Henry Swinburne (?1551-1624). Civil Lawyer of York*. Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 44. 1973.

Dickens, A. G., Elton, G. R. and Wormald, F. *The English Reformation*. London, 1964.

Dickens, A. G., Powell, K., and Tonkin, J., *The Reformation in Historical Thought*. Oxford, 1985.

Dickens, A. G., *Robert Holgate, Archbishop of York and President of the King's Council in the North*. Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, St Anthony's Hall Publications 8. 1955.

Dickens, A. G., *The Marian Reaction in the Diocese of York. Part II, the Laity.* Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, St Anthony's Hall Publications 12, 1957.

Dobson, B. 'The Later Middle Ages, 1215-1500'. *A History of York Minster.* Eds G.E. Aylmer and R. Cant. Oxford, 1977. Pp. 44-111.

Dobson, R. B., 'The Political Role of the Archbishops of York during the Reign of Edward I'. *Thirteenth Century England III*. Eds P.R. Cross, and S. D. Lloyd. Woodbridge, 1991. Pp. 47-51.

Dohrn van Rossum, G. *History of the Hour: Clocks and Modern Temporal Orders*. Chicago, 1996.

Douglas, M. *Purity and Danger.* 2nd edn. Abingdon and New York, 2002.

Drake, F. *Eboracum, or, the History and Antiquities of the City of York*. Classical Town Histories. Wakefield, 1978.

Duff, G. *The English Provincial Printers, Stationers and Bookbinders to 1557*. Cambridge, 1912.

Duffy, E. 'The Long Reformation: Catholicism, Protestantism and the Multitude'. *England's Long Reformation 1500-1800*. Ed. N. Tyacke. London, 1998. Pp. 33-70.

Duffy, E. *The Stripping of the Altars : Traditional Religion in England C.1400-C.1580*. 2nd ed. New Haven and London, 2005.

Duffy, E. *The Voices of Morebath. Reformation and Rebellion in an English Village*. New Heaven and London, 2001.

Durkheim, E. *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. New York, 1912.

Dyer, A. *Decline and Growth in English Towns 1400-1640*. Cambridge, 1991.

Dyer, A., 'The Urban Economy'. *A Companion to Tudor Britain*. Eds R. Tittler and N. Jones. Oxford, 2004. Pp. 330-346.

Eco, U, 'Function and Sign: The Semiotics of Architecture'. *Sign, Symbols and Architecture*. Eds G. Broadbent, R. Bunt and C. Jenks. Chichester, 1980. Pp. 11-70.

Eco, U. 'The Frame of Comic "Freedom"'. *Carnival!*. Ed. T. Seebock. Approaches to Semiotic, 64. 1984. Pp. 1-9.

Edmonds , M. *Ancestral Geographies: Landscape Monuments and Memory*. London, 1999.

Eliade, M. *The Sacred and the Profane*. New York, 1959.

Ellis, S. G. 'The Limits of Power: the English Crown and the British Isles'. *The Sixteenth Century 1485-1603*. Ed. P. Collinson . Oxford, 2002.

Ellis, S. G. 'The Limits of Power: the English Crown and the British Isles'. *The Sixteenth Century 1485-1603*. Ed. P. Collinson. Oxford, 2002. Pp. 47-80.

Elmer, P. 'Medicine, Witchcraft and the Poetic of Healing in Late Seventeenth Century England'. *Medicine and Religion in Enlightenment Europe*. Eds O. P. Gell and A. Cunningham, Medicine and Religion in Enlightenment Europe. Aldershot, 2007.

Elton, G. R., Cross, C., Loades, D. M. and Scarisbrick, J. J. *Law and Government under the Tudors*. Cambridge, 1988.

Esquieu, Y. 'Narbonne'. *Les Chanoines dans la Ville. Recherches sur la Topographie des Quartiers Canoniaux en France*. Ed. J. C. Picard. Paris, 1994. Pp. 317-328.

Esquieu, Y. *Autour de nos Cathédrales. Quartiers Canoniaux du Sillon Rhodanien et du Littoral Méditerranéen*. Paris, 1992.

Estabrook, C. B. 'Ritual, Space, and Authority in Seventeenth-Century English Cathedral Cities'. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32, no. 4 (2002): 593-620.

Fairclough, G. 'Meaningful Construction. Spatial and Functional Analysis of Medieval Buildings'. *Antiquity* 66 (1992): 348-366.

Finch, 'A Reformation of Meaning': Commemoration and the Parish Church c.1450-c.1550'. *The Archaeology of Reformation c.1480-1580.* Eds D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist. Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1. 2003. Pp. 437-449.

Finch, J. 'The Monuments'. *Norwich Cathedral: Church, City And Dioceses 1096-1996.* Eds I.Atherton, E. Fernie, C. Harper-Bill and A. Hassell-Smith. London, 1996.

Finch, J. 'Three Men in a Boat: Biographies and Narrative in the Historic Landscape'. *Landscape Research* 33 n. 5 (2008): 511-530.

Finch, J. Church Monuments in Norfolk before 1850: An Archaeology of Commemoration. Oxford, 2000.

Fines, J., 'Cathedral and Reformation'. *Chichester Cathedral. An Historical Survey*. Ed. M. Hobbs. Chichester, 1994. Pp. 47-68.

Fletcher, D. 'The Ordnance Survey's Nineteenth Century Boundary Survey: Context, Characteristics and Impact'. *Imago Mundi* 51 (1999): 131-46

Foucault, M. 'The Eye of Power'. *Power/Knowledge: selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977.* Ed. C. Gordon. New York, 1980. Pp. 146-65.

French, T. *York Minster: the St William Window*, CVMA, 5. 1999.

Frugoni, C. *A Distant City. Images of Urban Experience in the Medieval World*. Princeton, 1991.

Fumerton, P. 'London's Vagrant Economy: Making Space for "Low" Subjectivity'. *Material London*. Ed. L. C. Orlin. Philadelphia, 2000. Pp. 206-27.

Gadamer, H. G. *Truth and Method* (London, 2004).

Gaimster, D. and Gilchrist, R. *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology, Monograph 1. 2003.

Gaimster, D. and Stamper, P. *The Age of Transition. The Archaeology of English Culture 1400-1600* . The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 15. Oxbow Monograph 98.1977.

Galley, C. *The Demography of Early Modern Towns: York in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Liverpool, 1998.

Gambles, K. *Purey Cust Nuffield Hospital and the Minster Yard*, C5 Case Study RIBA Candidate.2007.

Gamboni, D. *The Destruction of Art: Iconoclasm and Vandalism since the French Revolution*. London, 1997.

Gee, E. A. 'The Topography of Altars Chantries and Shrines in York Minster'. *The Antiquaries Journal* 64 (1984): 337-350.

Geertz, C. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York, 1972.

Gent, L. and Llewellyn, N. *Renaissance Bodies. The Human Figure in English Culture c. 1540-1660*. London, 1990. Pp. 218-240.

Giddens, A. *Central Problems in Social Theory*. Basingstoke,1979.

Giddens, A. *Constitution of Society: Outline of a Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge, 1984.

Gilbert, C. 'New Park, Huby: An Early Seventeenth Century Hunting Lodge'. *The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 45 (1973): 185-88.

Gilchrist, R. '"Dust to Dust" Revealing the Reformation Dead'. *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580*. Eds D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist. The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1 (2003). Pp. 399-414.

Gilchrist, R. *Contemplation and Action. The Other Monasticism*. Leicester, 1995.

Gilchrist, R. *Norwich Cathedral Close. The Evolution of the English Cathedral Landscape*. Woodbridge, 2005.

Giles, K. 'Marking Time? A 15th Century Liturgical Calendar in the Wall Paintings of Pickering Parish Church'. *Church Archaeology* 4 (2000): 42-51.

Giles, K. 'Public Space in Town and Village, 1100-1500'. *Town and Country in the Middle Ages*. Eds K. Giles and C. Dyer. The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monographs 22. 2005. Pp. 293-311.

Giles, K. 'Reforming Corporate Charity: Guilds and Fraternities in Pre- and Post-Reformation York'. *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580*. Eds D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist. The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology, Monograph 1. 2003. Pp. 325-339.

Giles, K. *An Archaeology of Social Identity: Guildhalls in York c. 1350-1630*. BAR, British Series 315. 2000.

Ginzburg, C. *Il Formaggio e i Vermi. Il Cosmo di un Mugnaio del '500*. Torino, 1976.

Girouard, M. *Life in the English Country House*. New Haven and London, 1978.

Gittos, H. 'Creating the Sacred: Anglo-Saxon Rites for Consecrating Cemeteries'. *Burial in Early Medieval England and Wales*. Eds S. Lucy and A. Reynolds. London, 2002. Pp. 195-208.

Gittos, H. *Sacred Space in Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford, 2001.

Godfrey, E. S. *The Development of English Glassmaking 1560-1640*. Oxford, 1975.

Goldberg, P. J. P. *Richard Scrope, Archbishop, Rebel and Martyr*. Donington, 2007.

Goldberg, P. J. P. *Women Work and Life Cycle in a Medieval Economy: Women in York and Yorkshire 1300-1520*. Oxford, 1996.

Goody, J. *The Domestication of Savage Mind. Cambridge*, 1977.

Gordon, A. 'Performing London: the Map and the City in Ceremony'. *Literature, Mapping and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain.* Ed. A. Gordon and B. Klein. Cambridge, 2001. Pp. 69-88.

Gordon, A. and Klein, B. *Literature, Mapping and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge, 2001.

Gowing, L. '"The Freedom of the streets": Women and Social Space, 1560-1640'. *Londinopolis: Essays in the Cultural and Social History of Early Modern London*. Eds P. Griffiths and M. S. R. Jenner. Manchester, 2000. Pp. 130-151.

Grassby, R. *The Business Community of Seventeenth Century England*. Cambridge, 1995.

Graves, P. 'From an Archaeology of Iconoclasm to an Anthropology of the Body. Images, Punishment and Personhood in England, 1500-1660'. *Current Anthropology* 49 (2008): 35-57.

Graves, P. 'Lincoln Architectural Fragments: Current Research'. *Lincoln Archaeology* 5 (1994): 47-9.

Graves, P. 'Sensing and Believing: Exploring Worlds of Difference in Pre-Modern England: a Contribution to the Debate Opened by Kate Giles'. *World Archaeology* 39:4 (2007): 515-531.

Graves, P. *The Form and Fabric of Belief: An Archaeology of the Lay Experience of Religion in Medieval Norfolk and Devon*. BAR, British Series 311. 2000.

Gray, A. *The Mansion House of the Treasurers of York Minster, Now Treasurer's House and Gray's Court*. York, 1933.

Green, A. *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century*. London, 1894.

Gregory, D. *Geographical Imaginations*. Oxford, 1994.

Grenville, J. *Medieval Housing*. Leicester, 1997.

Griffith, P. 'Politics Made Visible: Order, Residence and Uniformity in Cheapside, 1600-45'. *Londinopolis: Essays in the Cultural and Social History of Early Modern London.* Eds P. Griffiths and M.S.R. Jenner. Manchester, 2000. Pp. 176-196.

Griffiths, P. and Jenner M.S.R. *Londinopolis: Essays in the Cultural and Social History of Early Modern London*. Manchester, 2000.

Grosse, C. 'Places of Sanctification: the Liturgical Sacrality of Genevan Reformed Churches, 1535-1566'. *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe*. Eds W. Coster and A. Spicer. Cambridge, 2005. Pp. 60-80.

Guy, J. 'Monarchy and Counsel: Models of the State'. *The Sixteenth Century 1485-160.* Ed. P. Collinson. Oxford, 2002. Pp.117-9.

Guy, J. 'Monarchy and Counsel: Models of the State'. *The Sixteenth Century 1485-1603.* Ed. P. Collinson. Oxford, 2002. Pp. 113-145.

Lamb, H. H.. *Climate, History and the Modern World*. London, 1995.

Haigh, C. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors*. 4th impr. Oxford, 1995.

Hall, D. 'The Sanctuary of St Cuthbert'. *St Cuthbert, His Cult and His Community to AD 1200*. Eds G. Bonner, D. Rollason and C. Stancliffe. Woodbridge, 1989. Pp. 425-436.

Hall, J. 'Cistercian Eastern Ranges'. *The Medieval Cloister in England and Wales*. Ed. M. Henig and J. Mc Neill. JBAA 159. 2007. Pp. 208-222.

Hall, R. and Stocker, D. *Vicars Choral at English Cathedrals. Cantate Domino. History, Architecture and Archaeology*. Oxford, 2005.

Hallett, M. 'Pictorial Improvement: York in Eighteenth Century Graphic Art'. *Eighteenth Century York: Culture, Space, Society*. Eds M. Hallett and J. Rendall. Borthwick Texts and Calendars 30 (2003). Pp. 24-49.

Hallett, M. and Rendall, J. *Eighteenth Century York: Culture, Space Society*, Borthwick Texts and Calendars 30. 2003.

Hamilton Thompson, A. 'The Chapel of St Mary and the Holy Angels'. *The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 36 (1944): 63-77.

Hamilton, S. and Spicer, A. 'Defining the Holy: the Delineation of Sacred Space'. *Defining the Holy. Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Eds A. Spicer and S. Hamilton. Aldershot, 2005. Pp. 1-23.

Hansell, P. and Hansell, J. *Doves and Dovecotes*. Bath, 1988.

Harding, V. 'Space, Property and Propriety in Urban England'. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 32: 4 (2002): 549-569.

Harding, V. *The Dead and the Living in Paris and London 1500-1670*. Cambridge, 2002.

Harley, J. B. 'Maps, Knowledge and Power'. *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design and Use of Past Environments*. Ed. D. Cosgrove and S. Daniels. Cambridge, 1988. Pp. 277-312.

Harley, J. B. *The New Nature of Maps. Essays in the History of Cartography*. Baltimore and London, 2001.

Harrison, F. *Life in a Medieval College. The History of the Vicars Choral of York*. London, 1952.

Harvey, J. *Early Nurserymen*. London and Chichester, 1974.

Harvey, P. D. A. *Maps in Tudor England*. Chicago, 1987.

Hayes, D. M. 'From Boundaries Blurred to Boundaries Defined. Clerical Emphases on the Limits of Sacred Space in England and France during the later Middle Ages'. *Holy Ground: Theoretical Issues Relating to the Landscape and Material Culture of Ritual Space Objects*. Eds A. T. Smith and A. Brookes. BAR, International Series 956. 2001. Pp. 85-90.

Hayes, D. M. *Body and Sacred Place in Medieval Europe, 1100-1389, Studies in Medieval History and Culture*. New York and London, 2003.

Heal, B. 'Sacred Image and Sacred Space in Lutheran Germany'. *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe.* Eds W. Coster and A. Spicer. Cambridge, 2005. Pp. 39-59;

Helmholz, R. H. *The Oxford History of the Laws of England. The Canon Law and Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction from 597 to the 1640.* Oxford, 2004

Henderson, P. *The Tudor House and Garden. Architecture and Landscape in the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries.* New Haven and London, 2005.

Henig, M. and Mc Neill, J. *The Medieval Cloister in England and Wales.* JBAA 159. 2007.

Hepple, L. W. '"The Museum Garden"': Displaying Classical Antiquities in Elizabethan and Jacobean England'. *Garden History* 29, n. 2 (2001): 109-20.

Hickman, D. 'From Catholic to Protestant: the Changing Meaning of Testamentary Religious Provisions in Elizabethan London'. *England's Long Reformation, 1500-1800.* Ed. N. Tyacke. London, 1998. Pp. 117-140.

Hill Curth, L. *English Almanacs, Astrology and Popular Medicine: 1550-1700.* Manchester, 2007.

Hill, R.M.T and Brooke , C.N.L. 'From 627 until the Early Thirteenth century'. *A History of York Minster.* Ed. G.E. Aylmer and R. Cant. Oxford, 1977. Pp. 1-43.

Hodder, I. *The Archaeology of Contextual Meanings.* Cambridge, 1987.

Hodgson, J. C. *North Country Diaries.* Surtees Society, Second Series 124. 1915.

Hodgson, J. C. *Six North Country Diaries.* Surtees Society, Second Series 118. 1910.

Hohler, C. 'The Palm Sunday Procession and the West Front of Salisbury Cathedral'. *The Medieval Cathedral of Trondheim. Architectural and Ritual Constructions in their European Context.* Ed. M. S. Andas. Turnhout, 2007. Pp. 280-290.

Holmes, P. J. *Elizabethan Casuistry.* Catholic Record Society 67. 1981.

Holton, A. B. 'The Working Space of the Medieval Master Mason: the Tracing Houses of York Minster and Wells Cathedral'. *Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Construction History* Volume II. 2006. Pp. 1579-1597.

Horrox, R. Beverley Minster. An Illustrate History. Cambridge, 2000.

Hoskins, W. G. 'The Rebuilding of Rural England, 1570-1640'. *Past and Present* 4 (1953): 44-59.

Howard, D. *Venice and the East.* New Haven and London, 2000.

Howard, M. 'Inventories, Surveys and Histories of Great Houses' *Architectural History* 41 (1998): 14-29.

Howard, M. *The Building of Elizabethan and Jacobean England.* New Haven and London, 2007.

Howard, M. *The Early Tudor Country House: Architecture and Politics, 1490-1550.* London, 1987.

Howe, J. 'Creating Symbolic Landscape: Medieval Development of Sacred Space'. *Inventing Medieval Landscapes: Senses of Place in Western Europe*. Eds J. Howe and M. Wolfe. Gainesville, 2002. Pp. 208-223.

Humphrey, C. 'Time and Urban Culture in Late Medieval England'. *Time in the Medieval World*. Eds C. Humphrey and W. M. Ormrod. Woodbridge, 2001. Pp. 105-118.

Humphrey, C. *The Politics of Carnival : Festive Misrule in Medieval England*. New York and Manchester, 2001.

Hunneyball, P. M. *Architecture and Image-Building in Seventeenth Century Hertfordshire*. Oxford, 2004.

Hunt, J. D. *Garden and Grove: The Italian Renaissance Garden in the English Imagination, 1600-1750*. London and Melbourne, 1986.

Hunter, M. 'Iconoclasm and Consumption; or Household Management According to Thomas Cromwell'. *Iconoclasm: Contested Objects, Contested Terms*. Ed. S. Boldrick and R. Clay. Aldershot, 2007. Pp. 51-73.

Hutton, R. *The Rise and Fall of Merry England*. Oxford, 1994.

Insoll, T. 'Are Archaeologists Afraid of Gods? Some Thoughts on Archaeology and Religion'. *Belief in the Past, The Proceedings of the 2002 Manchester Conference on Archaeology and Religion*. Ed. T. Insoll. BAR, International Series 1212. 2004. Pp. 1-6.

Insoll, T. *Archaeology, Ritual, Religion*. London, 2004.

Ives, E. W. 'Crime, Sanctuary and Royal Authority under Henry VIII'. *On the Laws and Customs of England*. Ed. M. S. Arnold. Chapel Hill, 1981. Pp. 296-320.

Jack, S.M. *Towns in Tudor and Stuart Britain*. New York, 1997.

Jackson, C. ed., *The Diary of Abraham de la Pryme*. Surtees Society 54. 1870.

Jacob, C. 'Towards a Cultural History of Cartography', *Imago Mundi* 48 (1996): 191-198.

Jardine, L. *Wordly Goods. A New History of the Renaissance*. New York and London, 1996.

Jenkins, M. *Urban Myths: the Communities of Micklegate, York*. University of York, PhD thesis. Forthcoming.

Jenks, C, 'The Architectural Sign'. *Sign, Symbols and Architecture*. Eds G. Broadbent, R. Bunt and C. Jenks. Chichester, 1980. Pp. 71-118.

Jenner, M. 'Airs, Waters, Places 1500-1800'. *The Healing Arts: Health, Disease and Society in Europe 1500-1800*. Ed. P. Elmer. Manchester, 2004. Pp 284-314.

Jenner, M. 'From Conduit Community to Commercial Network? Water in London 1500-1725'. *Londinopolis: Essays in the Cultural and Social History of Early Modern London*. Eds P. Griffiths and M.S.R. Jenner. Manchester, 2000. Pp. 250-272.

Jenner, M. 'The Politics of London Air: John Evelyn's 'Fumifugium' and the Restoration'. *Historical Journal* 38 (1995): 535-51.

Johnson, M. *Ideas of Landscape*. Malden and Oxford, 2007.

Johnson, M. 'Rethinking the Great Rebuilding'. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 12 (1993): 117-125.

Johnson, M. *An Archaeology of Capitalism*. Oxford, 1996.

Johnson, M. *Behind the Castle Gate. From Medieval to Renaissance*. London and New York, 2002.

Johnson, M. *Housing Culture. Traditional Architecture in an English Landscape*. London, 1993.

Jones, N. L. and Tittler, R. *A Companion to Tudor Britain*. Malden and Oxford, 2004.

Jones, R. 'Manure and Medieval Social Order'. *Land and People. Papers in Memory of John G. Evans*. Eds M. J. Allen, N. Sharples and T. O'Connor. Prehistoric Society Research Paper 2. 2009. Pp. 215-225.

Kassel, L. *Medicine and Magic in Elizabethan London: Simon Foreman, Asrologer, Alchemist and Physician*. Oxford, 2005.

King, C. 'The Interpretation of Urban Buildings: Power, Memory and Appropriation in Norwich Merchants' Houses, *c*. 1400-1660'. *World Archaeology* 41:4 (2009): 471-488.

Klein, B. *Maps and the Writing of Space in Early Modern England and Ireland*. Basingstoke, 2001.

Koerner, J. 'The Icon as Iconoclash'. *Iconoclash: Beyond the Image Wars in Science, Religion and Art*. Eds B. Latour, P. Weibel. London, and Cambridge MA, 2002. Pp.164-213.

Lake, P. 'The Laudian Style: Order, Uniformity and the Pursuit of the Beauty of Holiness in the 1630's'. Ed. K. Fincham, *The Early Stuart Church, 1603– 1642*. Palo Alto, 1993. Pp. 161-185.

Lamburn, D. J. 'The Minster and the Reformation'. *Beverley Minster. An Illustrate History*. Ed. R. Horrox. Cambridge, 2000. Pp. 55-64.

Latour, B. 'What Is Iconoclash? Or Is There a World beyond the Image Wars?'. *Iconoclash: Beyond the Image Wars in Science, Religion and Art*. Eds B. Latour, P. Weibel. London and Cambridge MA, 2002. Pp. 14-37.

Latour, B. *Reassembling the Social. An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford, 2005.

Latour, B. 'An attempt at writing a"Compositionist Manifesto"'. *New Literary History*, forthcoming, http://www.bruno-latour.fr/articles/article/120-COMPO-MANIFESTO.pdf

Latour, B. Weibel, P. *Iconoclash: Beyond the Image Wars in Science, Religion and Art*. London, and Cambridge MA, 2002.

Le Goff, J. *Time, Work and Culture*. Chicago and London, 1980.

Le Roy Ladurie, E. *Montaillou, Village Occitan de 1294 a 1324*. Paris, 1975.

Leach, F. *Early Yorkshire Schools, vol. 1*. The Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series vol. 27. 1898.

Leak, A. *The Liberty of St Peter of York 1800-1838*. Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Paper 77. 1990.

Leech, R.H. 'The Symbolic Hall: Historical Context and Merchant Culture in the Early Modern City'. *Vernacular Architecture* 31 (2000): 1-10.

Leedham-Green E. and McKitterick, D. 'Ownership: Private and Public Libraries'. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557-1695,* vol. 4. Eds J. Barnard and D. F. Mckenzie. Cambridge, 2002. Pp. 323-338.

Lefebvre, H. *La Production de l' Espace*. Paris, 2000.

Lehmberg, S. E. *The Reformation of Cathedrals: Cathedrals in English Society, 1485-1603*. Princeton, 1988.

Lemire, B. *The Business of Everyday Life. Gender, Practice and Social Politics in England, c. 1600-1900*. Manchester, 2005.

Levack, B. P. The *Civil Lawyers in England, 1603-1641. A Political Study*. Oxford, 1973.

Levy Peck, L. 'Building, Buying and Collecting in London, 1600-1625'. *Material London*. Ed. L.C. Orlin. Philadelphia, 2000. Pp. 268-290.

Lindley, P. *Tomb Destruction and Scholarship. Medieval Monuments in Early Modern England*. Donington, 2007.

Llewellyn, N. 'The Royal Body: Monuments to the Dead for the Living'. *Renaissance Bodies. The Human Figure in English Culture c. 1540-1660*. Eds L. Gent and N. Llewellyn. London, 1990.

Longley, K. M. *Ecclesiastical Cause Papers at York: Dean and Chapter Court 1350-1843*. Borthwhich Texts and Calendars. Records of the Northern Province, 6. 1980.

Girouard, M. *Robert Smithson and the Architecture of the Elizabethan Era* (London, 1966).

MacCulloch, D. 'The Change of Religion'. *The Sixteenth Century 1485-1603*. Ed. P. Collinson. Oxford, 2002. Pp. 83-111.

MacCulloch, *D. Reformation. Europe's House Divided, 1490-1700*. London, 2003.

MacDonald, M. 'Religion, Social Change and Psychological Healing in England 1600-1800'. *The Church and Healing*. Ed. W. J. Sheils. The Ecclesiastical History Society, Studies in Church History 19. 1982. Pp. 101-125.

Machin, R. 'The Great Rebuilding Reassessed'. *Past and Present* 77 (1977): 33-56.

MacSheffrey, S. 'Boundaries of London Sanctuaries'. Forthcoming.

Marchant, R. A. *The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Dioceses of York, 1560-1642*. London, 1960.

Markus, T. A. *Buildings and Power. Freedom and Control in the Origin of Modern Building Types*. London and New York, 1993.

Marquand, A. *Robbia Heraldry*. London 1919.

Marshall, P. *Beliefs and the Dead in Reformation England*. Oxford, 2002.

McCutcheon, M. L. *Yorkshire Fairs and Markets to the end of the Eighteenth Century*. Thoresby Society 39. 1940.

McRee, B. R. 'Traditional Religion'. *A Companion to Tudor Britain*. Eds R. Tittler and N. Jones. Oxford, 2004. Pp. 207-220.

Megarry R. E. and Wade, H. W. R. *The Law of Real Property*. London, 1959.

Miller, M. C. *The Bishop's Palace*. Ithaca and London, 2000.

Moran, J. *Education and Learning in the City of York, 1300-1560*. Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 55 (1979).

Moreland, J. 'Archaeology and Text: Subservience or Enlightenment'. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35 (2006): 135-51.

Moreland, J. *Archaeology and Text*. London, 2001.

Moreland, J.'The World(s) of the Cross'. *World Archaeology* 31:2(1999):194-213.

Morris, R., 'The Archaeological Study of Cathedrals in England, 1800-2000. A Review and Speculation'. *The Archaeology of Cathedrals*. Eds T. Tatton-Brown and J. Munby. Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph 42 (1996). Pp. 1-7.

Morris, R.K. 'Monastic Architecture: Destruction and Reconstruction'. *The Archaeology of Reformation c.1480-1580*. Eds D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist. Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1. 2003. Pp. 235-51

Morrison, K. A. *English Shops and Shopping: An Architectural History*. New Haven and London, 2003.

Muldrew, C. 'From a 'Light Cloak' to an 'Iron Cage': Historical Changes in the Relation between Community and Individualism'. *Communities in Early Modern England*. Ed. A. Shepard and P. Withington. Manchester, 2000. Pp. 156-179.

Muldrew, C. *The Economy of Obligation. The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England*. Basingstoke and London, 1998.

Murray, H. *Directory of York Goldsmiths Silversmiths and Associated Craftsmen*. York, 1998.

Mutchow Towers, S. *Control on Religious Printing in Early Stuart England*. Woodbridge, 2005.

Newton J. and J. Bath, J. *Witchcraft and the Act of 1604*. Leiden and Boston, 2008.

Norton, C. 'Richard Scrope and York Minster'. *Richard Scrope, Archbishop, Rebel and Martyr*. Ed. P. J. P. Goldberg. Donington, 2007. Pp. 138-213.

Norton, C. 'The Anglo-Saxon Cathedral at York and the Topography of the Anglian City'. *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 151 (1998): 1-42.

Norton, C. 'The Buildings of St Mary's Abbey, York and Their Destruction'. *The Antiquaries Journal* 74 (1994): 256-88.

Norton, C. *Archbishop Thomas of Bayeux and the Norman Cathedral at York*, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 100. 2001.

Norton, C. *St. William of York*. Woodbridge, 2006.

Ong, W. J. *Orality and Literacy*. London, 2002.

Orlin, L.C. 'Boundary Disputes in Early Modern London'. *Material London*. Ed. L.C. Orlin. Philadelphia, 2000. Pp. 344-376

Orlin, L.C. *Locating Privacy in Tudor London*. Oxford, 2007.

Orlin, L.C. *Material London*. Philadelphia, 2000.

Orlin, L.C. *Private Matters and Public Culture in Post-Reformation England*. Ithaca, 1994.

Ottaway, P. *Excavations and Observations on the Defences and Adjacent Sites, 1971-90.* The Archaeology of York. Vol. 3. The Legionary Fortress.1996.

Owen, D. M. 'From the Restoration until 1822'. *A History of York Minster*. Ed. G. E. Aylmer and R. Cant. Oxford, 1977. Pp 233-271.

Page, W. 'Friaries: Friaries in York'. *VCH. A History of the County of York*. Volume 3. Ed. W. Page. London, 1974.

Palliser, D. M. and Palliser, M. *York as They Saw It: From Alcuin to Lord Esher*. York, 1979.

Palliser, D. M. *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain 600-1540*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, 2000.

Palliser, D. M. *Tudor York*. Oxford, 1979.

Palliser, D. *Towns and Local Communities in Medieval and Early Modern England*. Aldershot, 2006.

Palmer, R. 'The Church, Leprosy and Plague in Medieval and Early Modern Europe'. *The Church and Healing*. Ed. W. J. Sheils. The Ecclesiastical History Society, Studies in Church History 19. 1982. Pp. 79-99.

Panofsky, E. *Tomb Sculpture: Its Changing Aspects from Ancient Egypt to Bernini*. London, 1964.

Parry, G., *The Trophies of Time : English Antiquarians of the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford and New York, 1995.

Paster, G.K. 'Purgation as the Allure of Mastery: Early Modern Medicine and the Technology of the Self'. *Material London*. Ed. L.C. Orlin. Philadelphia, 2000. Pp. 193-205.

Pattinson R. and H. Murray, H. *Monuments in York Minster. An Illustrated Inventory*. York, 2001.

Pearson, S. 'Medieval Houses in English Towns: Form and Location'. *Vernacular Architecture* 40 (2009): 1-22.

Pearson, S. 'Rural and Urban Houses, 1100-1500: "Urban Adaptation" Reconsidered'. *Town and Country in the Middle Ages 1100-1500*. Eds C,

Dyer and K. Giles. The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monographs 22. 2005. Pp. 43-59.

Pelling, M. *Medical Conflicts in Early Modern London. Patronage, Physicians and Irregular Practicioners, 1550-1640*. Oxford, 2003.

Perring, D. *Roman London*. London, 1991.

Pesez, J. M. 'Histoire de la Culture Matérielle'. *La Nouvelle Histoire*. Ed. J. Le Goff. Paris,1978. Pp. 98-130.

Pesez, J. M. *Archéologie du Village et de la Maison Rurale au Moyen Âge* (Lyon,1998).

Pesez, J. M. *Brucato: Histoire et Archéologie d'un Habitat Médiéval en Sicile*. Collections de École Française de Rome 78.1984.

Phillips, D. and Haywood, B. *Excavations at York Minster, Vol. I: From Roman Fortress to Norman Cathedral*. London, 1995.

Phillips, D. *Excavations at York Minster, Vol II. The Cathedral of Thomas of Bayeux*. London, 1985.

Phillpotts, C. 'The Houses of Henry VIII's Courtiers in London'. *The Archaeology of Reformation c.1480-1580.* Eds D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist. Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology Monograph 1. 2003. Pp. 299-309.

Phytian-Adams, C. *Desolation of City: Coventry and the Urban Crisis of the Late Middle Ages*. Cambridge, 1979.

Picard, J. C. *Les Chanoines dans la Ville. Recherches sur la Topographie des Quartiers Canoniaux en France*. Paris, 1994.

Platt, C. *The Great Rebuilding of Tudor and Stuart England*. London, 1994.

Potter, A. E. *Bells and Bellringers of York Minster*. York, 1987.

Quiney, A. *Town Houses of Medieval Britain*. New Haven and London, 2003.

Raine, A. 'The Minster Wells'. *The Friends of York Minster* 15 (1943): 12-6.

Raine, A. *History of St Peter's School: York AD 627 to the Present*. London, 1926.

Raine, A. *Medieval York. A Topographical Survey Based on Original Sources. London*, 1955.

Rambelli,F. and Reinders, E. 'What Does Iconoclasm Create? What Does Preservation Destroy? Reflection on Iconoclasm in East Asia'. *Iconoclasm: Contested Objects, Contested Terms.* Eds S. Boldrick and R. Clay. Aldershot, 2007. Pp. 15-34.

Rawcliffe, C. *Medicine for the Soul: the Life, Death and Resurrection of an English Medieval Hospital. St Giles, Norwich. Stroud*, 1999.

Reed, M. 'The Urban Landscape 1540-1700'. *Cambridge Urban History of Britain, 1540-1840.* Vol. 2. Ed. P. Clark. Cambridge, 2000. Pp. 289-313.

Rees Jones, S. 'A Short History of the College of the Vicars Choral'. *The Vicars Choral of York Minster: The College at Bedern*. Ed. J. D. Richards. York, 2001. Pp. 380-396.

Rees Jones, S. 'God and Mammon: the Role of the City Estate of the Vicar Choral'. *Vicars Choral at English Cathedrals. Cantate Domino. History, Architecture and Archaeology.* Eds R. Hall and D. Stocker. Oxford, 2005. Pp. 192-199.

Rees Jones, S. 'Town Planning in Late Medieval York'. *The Archaeology of Yorkshire : An Assessment at the Beginning of the 21st Century.* Eds T.G. Manby, S. Moorhouse and P. Ottaway. Yorkshire Archaeological Society. Occasional Papers 3. 2003.

Rees Jones, S.'The Household and the English Urban Government in the Later Middle Ages'. *The Household in Late Medieval Cities: Italy and North Western Europe Compared.* Eds M. Carlier and T. Soens. Garant, 2001. Pp. 71-87.

Reid, R. R. *The King's Council in the North.* London, 1921.

Rendell, J. 'Architectural Research and Disciplinarity'. *Architecture Research Quarterly*, v. 8, n. 4 (2004): 141–7.

Rendell, J. *Site-Writing: The Architecture of Art Criticism.* London, 2010.

Richard, J. D. *The Vicars Choral of York Minster: The College at the Bedern.* York, 2001.

Richardson, A. 'Corridors of Power: A Case Study in Access Analysis from Medieval Salisbury, England'. *Antiquity* 77: 296 (2003): 373-384.

Richardson, A. 'Gender and Space in English Royal Palaces, c.1160-1540: A Study in Access Analysis and Imagery'. *Medieval Archaeology* 47 (2003): 131-165.

Richardson, H. *The Medieval Fairs and Markets of York.* Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, St Anthony's Hall Publications 20. 1961.

Rickets, A. 'Designing for Protestant Worship: the Private Chapels of the Cecil Family'. *Defining the Holy. Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe.* Eds A. Spicer and S. Hamilton. Aldershot, 2005. Pp. 115-136.

Rickets, A. *The English Country House Chapel: Building a Protestant Tradition.* Reading, 2007.

Ritchie, C. I. A. *The Ecclesiastical Courts of York.* Arbroath, 1956.

Roberts J. 'Gardens of the Gentry in the Late Tudor Period'. *Garden History* 27: 1 (1999): 89-108.

Rollason, D. Gore, D. and Fellow-Jensen, J. *Sources for York History toAD1100.* The Archaeology of York 1. 1998.

Rosenwein, B. H. *Negotiating Space : Power, Restraint, and Privileges of Immunity in Early Medieval Europe.* Ithaca, 1999.

Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England), *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the City of York; Volume 3, South West of the Ouse.* London, 1972.

Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England), *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the City of York; Volume 2, The Defences.* London, 1972.

Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England), *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the City of York; Volume 4, Outside the City Walls East of the Ouse*. London, 1975.

Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England), *An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the City of York; Volume 5, The Central Area.* London, 1981.

Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England), *Salisbury. The Houses of the Close*. London, 1993.

Said, E. *Orientalism.* London, 1978.

Salzman, L. F. *Building in England Down to 1540. A Documentary History*. Oxford 1967.

Scarisbrick, J. J. *The Reformation and the English People*. Oxford, 1984

Schofield, J. 'The Topography and Buildings of London, ca. 1600'. *Material London*. Ed. L.C. Orlin. Philadelphia, 2000. Pp. 296-322.

Schofield, J. and Stell, G. 'The Built Environment 1300-1540'. *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain 600-1540.* Vol. 1. Ed. D. M. Palliser. Cambridge, 2000. Pp. 371-393.

Schofield, J. *Medieval London Houses.* New Haven and London, 1995.

Schofield, J. *The London Surveys of Ralph Treswell*. London, 1987.

Seed, P. *Ceremonies of Possession in Europe's Conquest of the New World, 1492-1640*. Cambridge, 1995.

Seidel, M. *Da Jacopo della Quercia a Donatello. La Arti a Siena nel Primo Rinascimento*. Siena, 2010.

Settis, S. 'Continuita', Distanza, Conoscenza. Tre Usi dell'Antico'. *Memoria dell'Antico nell'Arte Italiana.* Vol 3. Ed. S. Settis. Torino, 1986. Pp. 374-487.

Settis, S. *Futuro del 'Classico.* Torino, 2004.

Shammas, C. *The Pre-Industrial Consumer in England and America*. Oxford, 1990.

Sharpe, J.A. *Defamation and Sexual Slander in Early Modern England: the Church Courts at York*. Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 58. 1980.

Sheils, W. 'Catholics and Recusants'. *A Companion to Tudor Britain.* Eds R. Tittler and N. Jones. Oxford, 2004. Pp. 254-270.

Shepard, A. and Withington, P. *Communities in Early Modern England.* Manchester, 2000.

Sherlock, P. *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England*. Aldershot, 2008.

Shneider, J. 'Fantastical Colors in Foggy London: The New Fashion Potential of the Late Sixteenth Century'. *Material London*. Ed. L.C. Orlin. Philadelphia, 2000. Pp. 109-27.

Simmons, R. C. 'ABC, Almanacs, Ballads, Chapbooks, Popular Piety and Text Books'. *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, 1557-1695, vol. 4*. Eds J. Barnard and D. F. McKenzie. Cambridge, 2002.

Slack, P. 'Great and Good Towns 1540-1700'. *Cambridge Urban History of Britain, 1540-1840,* vol. 2. Ed. P. Clark. Cambridge, 2000. Pp.347-373;

Slack, P. 'Great and Good Towns 1540-1700'. *Cambridge Urban History of Britain, 1540-1840.* Vol. 2. Ed. P. Clark. Cambridge, 2000. Pp. 347-376.

Slack, P. *From Reformation to Improvement. Public Welfare in Early Modern England*. Oxford, 1999.

Slack, P. *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England*. Cambridge, 1991.

Smail, D.L. *Imaginary Cartographies: Possession and Identity in Late Medieval Marseille*. Ithaca, 2000.

Smith, P. The Medieval Brickmaking Industry in England 1400-1450. BAR British Series 138. 1985. Pp. 23-38.

Spantigati, C. E. *Il Sacro Monte di Crea*. Torino, 1999.

Spicer, A. '"God Will Have a House": Defining Sacred Space and Rites of Consecration in Early Seventeenth Century England'. *Defining the Holy. Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe.* Eds A. Spicer and S. Hamilton. Aldershot, 2005. Pp. 207-230.

Spicer, A. '"What Kinde of House a Kirk is": Conventicles, Consecrations and the Concept of Sacred Space in Post-Reformation Scotland'. *Sacred Space in Early Modern Europe*. Eds W. Coster and A. Spicer. Cambridge, 2005. Pp. 81-103.

Spicer, A. and Hamilton, S. *Defining the Holy. Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Aldershot, 2005.

Spicer,A. '(Re)Building the Sacred Landscape: Orléans, 1560-1610'. *French History*, 21 (2007): 247-268.

Spicer, A. *Calvinist Churches in Early Modern Europe*. Manchester and New York. 2008.

Stewart J.O.R. and Cooke, J.J. *The Stonebow and Guildhall.* Lincoln, 1990.

Stewart, A. 'The Early Modern Closet Discovered'. *Representation* 50 (1995): 76-100.

Stobart, J., Hann, A. and Morgan, V. *Spaces of Consumption. Leisure and Shopping in the English Town, c. 1680-1830*. London and New York, 2007.

Stocker ,D. and Everson, P. 'Rubbish Recycled: A Study of the Re-use of Stone in Lincolnshire'. *Stone: Quarrying and Building in England A. D. 43-1625*. Ed. D. Parson. Chichester, 1990. Pp. 83-101.

Stocker, D. *'Fons and Origo'* the Symbolic Death, Burial and Resurrection of English Font Stones', *Church Archaeology* 1(1997): 17-25.

Stocker, D. and Stocker, M. 'Sacred Profanity: Breeding and the Symbolic Landscape of the Warren'. *World Archaeology* 28:2 (1996): 265-272.

Stow, J. *The Annales of England.* 2nd edn. London, 1631.

Strong, R. *The Renaissance Garden in England*. London, 1979.

Sturge, K. *Representing Others: Translation, Ethnography and the Museum.* Manchester, 2007.

Sweet, R. *Antiquaries: The Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth Century Britain.* Hambledon and London, 2004.

Tarlow, S. 'Reformation and Transformation: what happened to Catholic Things in a Protestant World?'. *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* Eds D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist. The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology, Monograph 1. 2003. Pp. 108-121.

Tatton-Brown, T. and Munby, J., *The Archaeology of Cathedrals.* Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, Monograph 42 (1996).

Tatton-Brown, T. 'The Buildings of the Bishop's Palace and the Close'. *Chichester Cathedral. An Historical Survey*. Ed. M. Hobbs. Chichester, 1994. Pp. 225-46.

Tatton-Brown, T. *Great Cathedrals of England*. London, 1989.

Tavernor, R. *Palladio and Palladianism*. London, 1979.

Thirsk, J. *Economic Policy and Projects: The Development of a Consumer Society in Early Modern England*. Oxford, 1978.

Thomas, J. *Interpretive Archaeology: A Reader*. London, 2000.

Thompson , E. P. 'Patrician Society Plebeian Culture'. *Journal of Social History* 7 (1974): 382-405.

Thompson, E. P. 'Anthropology and the Discipline of Historical Context', *Midland History* 1: 3 (1972): 41-55.

Thompson, M. *Medieval Bishop's Houses in England and Wales*. Aldershot, 1998.

Thoresby, R. *Ducatus Leodiensis*. Ed. T.D. Whitaker. Wakefield, 1816.

Thoresby, R. *Ducatus Leodiensis*. London, 1715.

Thornley, D. 'The Destruction of Sanctuary'. *Tudor Studies Presented to A. F. Pollard*. Ed. R. W. Seton-Watson. London, 1924. Pp. 182-207.

Thornton, P. *Seventeenth-Century Interior Decoration in England, France and Holland*. New Haven and London, 1978.

Thurley, S. *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547*. New Haven, 1993.

Tilley, C. *A Phenomenology of Landscape*. London, 1994.

Tillott, P. M. *VCH of the County of Yorkshire. The City of York*. Oxford, 1961.

Tittler, R. '"For the Re-edification of Townes": The Rebuilding Statutes of Henry VIII'. *Albion* 22/4 (1990): 591-605.

Tittler, R. 'Portraiture, Politics and Society'. *A Companion to Tudor Britain*. Ed. R. Tittler and N. Jones. Oxford, 2004. Pp. 448-469.

Tittler, R. *Architecture and Power: The Town Hall and the English Urban Community, C. 1500-1640*. Oxford and New York, 1991.

Tittler, R. *The Face of the City : Civic Portraiture and Civic Identity in Early Modern England, Politics, Culture and Society in Early Modern Britain.* Manchester, 2007.

Tittler, R. *The Reformation and the Towns in England : Politics and Political Culture, C. 1540-1640.* Oxford and New York, 1998.

Tittler, R. *Townspeople and Nation. English Urban Experiences 1540-1640.* Stanford California, 2001.

Tyacke, N. *England's Long Reformation, 1500-1800.* London, 1998.

Upton, A. F. *Sir Arthur Ingram c. 1565-1642. A Study of the Origins of an English Landed Family.* Oxford, 1961.

Vattimo, G. *The End of Modernity: Nihilism and Hermeneutics in Post-Modern Culture.* Translated by Jon R. Snyder. Cambridge, 1988.

Venturi, R., Scott Brown, D. and Izenour, S. *Learning from Las Vegas. The Forgotten Symbolism of Architectural Form.* Cambridge Ma, 1986.

Verzone, P. *From Theodoric to Charlemagne.* London, 1968.

Ward, S. ʻDissolution or Reformation?ʼ. *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* Eds D. Gaimster and R. Gilchrist. The Society for Post Medieval Archaeology, Monograph 1. 2003. Pp. 267-279.

Weber, M. *The Protestant Ethic and the "Spirit" of Capitalism and other Writings.* New York and London, 2000.

Welch, E. *Shopping in the Renaissance. Consumer Cultures in Italy 1400-1600.* New Haven and London, 2005.

Wharton, A. J. *Refiguring the Post Classical City. Dura Europos, Jerash , Jerusalem and Ravenna.* Cambridge, 1995.

White, E. *The St Christopher and St George Guild of York.* Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Borthwick Papers 72. 1987.

Williams, R. L. ʻForbidden Sacred Spaces in Reformation Englandʼ. *Defining the Holy. Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe.* Eds A. Spicer and S. Hamilton. Aldershot, 2005. Pp.95-114.

Wilson, B.and Mee, F. *The Medieval Parish Churches of York: the Pictorial Evidence.* Archaeology of York Supplementary Series 1. 1998.

Wilson, C. *The Shrines of St William of York.* York, 1977.

Winnicott, D.W. *Home Is Where We Start From: Essays by a Psychoanalyst.* New York, 1975.

Withington, P. *The Politics of Commonwealth.* Cambridge, 2005.

Witmore, C. L. ʻSymmetrical Archaeologyʼ. *World Archaeology*, 39:4 (2007): 589-596.

Wood, M. *The English Medieval House.* London, 1965.

Woodward, D. ʻ"Swords into Ploughshares": Recycling in Pre-Industrial Englandʼ. *The Economic History Review*, Second Series 38 (1985): 175-191.

Woodward, D. *The History of Cartography. Cartography in the European Renaissance*. Vol. 3, part 2. Chicago and London, 2007.

Woodward, F.H. *Archbishop Holgate's School York. Some Notes on the Foundation*. York, 1961.

Woolgar, C. M. *The Great Household in Late Medieval England*. New Haven, 1999.

World Archaeology 39:1 (2007).

York Civic Trust. *York Minster Revealed.* An Exhibition of York Minster from the 17th Century to the Present. York, 2007.

Unpublished theses and dissertations

Asher, C. 'The Shrine of St William of York. Recording, Reconstruction and Interpretation'. Unpublished Undergraduate Dissertation. University of York, 2009.

Fay, I. 'Health and Disease in Medieval and Tudor Norwich'. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of East Anglia, 2007.

Gardner, W. S, 'The Role of Central Planning in English Romanesque Chapter House Design'. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Princeton University. 1976.

Hartshorne, P. B. 'The Street and the Perception of Public Space in York, 1476-1586'. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of York, 2004.

Jackson- Bass, A. 'Sanitation in the English Country House 1500-1650'. Unpublished MA Dissertation. University of York, 2002.

Masinton, A. W. 'Sacred Space: Priorities, Perception and the Presence of God in Late Medieval Yorkshire Parish Churches'.4 Vols. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of York, 2006.

Oakes, R. 'Pennies to Heaven: the Nature and Public Donations made to the Fabric fund of York Minster 1469-1485'. Unpublished MA Dissertation. University of York, 2003.

Perring, S. 'Memory of Antiquity in English Medieval Architecture: The Case of York Minster Chapter House'. Unpublished MA Dissertation. University of York, 2004.

Rees Jones, S. R. 'Property, Tenure and Rents: Some Aspects of the Topography and Economy of Medieval York'. Unpublished DPhil Thesis. University of York, 1987.

Rimmer, J. 'Small Houses in Medieval York and Norwich'. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of York, 2007.

Reynolds, P. R. A. 'Transmission and Recall: The Use of Short Wall Anchors in the Wide World'. PhD Thesis. University of York, 2008.

Saunders, O. M. 'Minster and Parish: The Sixteenth Century Reconstruction of the Church of St. Michael-le-Belfrey in York'. Unpublished MA Dissertation. University of York, 1996.

Other unpublished sources

AHRC, 'Landscape and Environment Research Programme Specification' (2005).

Dean, G. '12 Mister Yard, York. A Report of an Archaeological Watching Brief'. York Archaeological Trust, Report 49. 2003.

Dean, G. 'Minster Yard and Minster Gates. Excavations and Watching Brief'. Report, York Archaeological Trust, Report 11. 2008.

Field Archaeology Specialists, 'Archaeological Excavation and Survey, York Minster Library. Field Report'. York, 2000.

Field Archaeology Specialists, 'York Minster and Minster Precincts, York: Conservation Management Plan'. York, 2008.

Giles, K. 'Documentary and Cartographic Research'. Archaeological Excavation and Survey, York Minster Library. Field Report. Field Archaeology Specialists. York, 2000. Pp. 72-92.

Thurley, S. 'Archaeology and Artifice: the Office of Works and the Fabrication of Medieval History'. The Beatrice De Cardi Lecture. York 14 September 2007.