# URBI ET SUBURBI:

The landscape and settlement of York, south-west of the river Ouse, between the 9th and 16th centuries.

Simon Batchelor. BA(Hons), MA

Master of Arts by Research in Archaeological Studies

University of York.

Archaeology.

March 2020

## Abstract:

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine the landscape and settlement of a little understood area of the city of York. Drawing on archaeological data and landscape analysis it aims to present a picture of how this area developed between the mid-9th and mid-16th centuries. Archaeological data is drawn from those excavations which reached period appropriate deposits, whilst landscape data is drawn from maps, plans, photographs and documentary sources. GIS software and historic maps have been used to illustrate this development. Evidence from earlier periods will also be outlined in order to illustrate their influence, if any, upon the medieval landscape.

## Contents:



## Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| RCHM(E) | Royal Commission for Historic Monuments (England) |
| VCH | Victoria County History |
| YAT | York Archaeological Trust |
| YATGAZ | YAT archive of archaeology (online resource) |
| YCHCCAA | York Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal. |
| YHECP | York Historic Environment Characterisation Project. |
| YPSR | Yorkshire Philosophical Society (annual) Report. |

## Maps:

All maps have been drawn on the base maps available from the ARCGIS application provided by York City Council this can be found at https://cyc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=6e02c41a806e46879e7dc215f1275afb.
Map data has been drawn from both this application and from historic maps provided by https://digimap.edina.ac.uk/

Map 1: Study Area
Map 2.1: The settlement and parish of Clementhorpe as defined by Harvey (1965).
Map 2.2: The combined parish of St. Mary, Bishophill Snr., and St. Clement 1850.
Map 2.3: The parishes within the study area 1850
Map 3: Plan Zones.
Map 4: Plan Zone 1: Plan Areas.
Map 5.1: Plan Zone 1, relationship to character areas identified by YHEPC.
Map 5.2: Plan Zone 2, relationship to character areas identified by YHEPC.
Map 5.3: Plan Zone 3. relationship to character areas identified by YHEPC.
Map 6: Plan Zone 1, plan areas relationship to character areas identified by YHEPC.
Map 7: Roman Occupation of Plan Zone 1.
Map 8: Location of the Old Baile
Map 9: Plan Zone 2, the suburb.
Map 10: Plan Zone 2, Roman occupation.
Map 11: Clementhorpe Priory, showing recorded structures and excavation sites.
Map 12: Clementhorpe Priory and estate.
Map 13: Enclosures identified from Lund's Plan of Micklegate Stray.
Map 14: Middlethorpe, Field boundaries identified from Parsons' Plan of Dringhouses.
Map 15: Middlethorpe and The Street Lands – The true boundary of Middlethorpe?
Map 16: Middlethorpe, fields containing the personal name "Bustard".
Map 17: Middlethorpe, land granted to Whitby Abbey by Roger de Mowbray.
Map 18: Proposed Location of Bustardthorpe.
Map 19: Roman approach roads to York.
Map 20: Basy Urban Manor (After Rees Jones)
Map 21: Basy Urban Manor, tenement plot alignments, version 1.
Map 22: Basy Urban Manor, tenement plot alignments, version 2.
Map 23: Tenement plots in Skeldergate.
Map 24: Pre-Conquest Churches south west of the river Ouse.
Map 25: Pre- Conquest estates of Christ Church/Holy Trinity granted to FitzErfast.
Map 26: The parishes of pre-Conquest churches south west of the river Ouse.
Map 27: Parish of St. Clement.
Map 28: Possible location of suburban manors in Clementhorpe.
Map 29: Clementhorpe, possible tenement boundaries.
Map 30: The Cranegarth buildings as shown in the 18th century.

## Plates

## Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank Helen Batchelor for her much needed support and encouragement, if it were not for her belief in me this project would never have been undertaken. Dr. Aleksandra McClain of the Department of Archaeology, my academic supervisor, who has guided me through this process, offering advice, encouragement, guidance and a critical eye on my tendency to write a local history rather than an archaeological study. Sarah Rees Jones of the Centre for Medieval Studies, who suggested that I look beyond the boundaries of my initial proposal and that it was more suited to archaeological, rather than historical, research. Helen Goodchild and Claire Boardman, who tried valiantly to teach me how to use GIS. My colleagues in the Graduate School of the Department of Archaeology for their support and good humour. The staff of the university libraries and the Minster Library for all their help. The members of the Clements Hall Local History Group and the Bishophill Local History Group for their support and interest.

## 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. All sources are acknowledged as References.

This dissertation has inspired a further essay, yet untitled, which is currently in preparation and that I intend to submit for the Sheldon Memorial Trust Essay Prize. I have acknowledged this intended work within this dissertation.

Covid-19 has influenced this work, due to the closure of the University Libraries during the period I had intended to use in order to re-check references some of this has not been possible, unchecked references are written in red ink.

# Chapter 1: Introduction to Urban and Landscape Studies.

**Project aims**

This dissertation will examine the development of a largely neglected part of medieval York, specifically an area south west of the river Ouse (**MAP 1.**). Whilst I intend to concentrate upon the development of this area between the mid-9th century and the mid-16th century, it is necessary to also examine data from earlier periods of history to determine how they may have affected later patterns of settlement..

There are two main aims to this project; firstly to draw together as much data as possible so as to understand how this area developed, and secondly to produce a narrative, based upon the evidence gathered, which will explain the nature of medieval settlement in the area.

In order to achieve the first of these objectives, I will draw upon work that has already been undertaken in York by previous archaeologists, historians and antiquaries. Prior to the mid-twentieth century much of the archaeological work undertaken in the city was carried out by antiquarians, and although many produced excellent reports of their work, some records are a little vague. The report of The Royal Commission for Historic Monuments (England) (RCHM(E), produced in the late 1960's, summarised much of this work.

Since the early 1970's much of the archaeological investigation within the city has been undertaken by York Archaeological Trust (YAT). However recent changes in the way that archaeology is funded and managed, has led to work also being undertaken by smaller commercial units.

Access to the archaeological records produced by these organisations is not always as simple as it should be; YAT has for many years been producing *The Archaeology of York,* a multi volume series of archaeological reports intended to present an archaeological survey of York. These however are largely aimed at a professional audience and make difficult reading for the uninitiated. More publicly accessible material comes from the magazines produced by YAT for their members organisation and through more interpretive books produced in association with organisations such as English Heritage and the Historic Towns Trust.

Access to small interventions, such as watching briefs which are becoming the main method of urban archaeological intervention, are more difficult to obtain. These reports are known as grey literature, fortunately a project initiated by the University of York has provided a central archive in which these reports can be deposited. The Archaeology Data Service (ADS) (https://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk) has become the repository for much of this grey literature and has proved invaluable for finding information on the more recent archaeological activity in York.

Historical studies of York have a long history in themselves, the earliest dating from the 8th century with Alcuin's *Bishops, Kings and Saints of York* and Bede's *Ecclesiastic History of the English People.* The extensive survival of the records of both the city and the church has driven the study of the medieval city. These records are constantly being made more accessible by organisations such as the Borthwick Institute for Archives, The Surtees

Society, The York Archaeological and Historical Society (Records Section) and the Canterbury and York Society. These organisations have not only encouraged the transcription of these records but also their translation which has opened them up to interrogation by both academic and independent scholars for whom Latin is a closed book.

My final dataset is drawn from the extensive pictorial images of the city. These include plans, the earliest of which dates from the mid-16th century; engravings, particularly the panoramas of the eighteenth century which record the city prior to its redevelopment and industrialisation; and the paintings, drawings and photographs of the 19th and 20th centuries, which frequently record the last vestiges of the medieval town.

The second objective of this dissertation, as has already been noted, is to create a narrative which explains how the study area was developed and settled between the mid-9th and mid-16th centuries. I aim to do this both through the analysis of the data outlined above and through cartographic analysis, a process I shall summarise later in this chapter. From this I hope to present the reader with a plausible model of the medieval settlement of south west York, and hopefully raise some questions which lead to further research and debate about this largely neglected area of York.

**Defining the Study Area. (Map 1.)**

There are both natural and imposed boundaries which define the area under study. Within the body of this dissertation I will endeavour to describe these boundaries but here I wish to explain how they came about. Originally this project was centred upon the Benedictine Priory of St. Clement, the first nunnery to be founded in Yorkshire after the Norman Conquest (Dobson & Donaghey, 1984.1). The church served not only the inhabitants of the nunnery, but it was also the parochial church for the local inhabitants and had served as such for at least a century prior to the foundation of the nunnery. In order to understand how these two societies interacted I needed to define two basic things, the boundaries of the parish and the boundaries of the nunnery. Whilst lack of data, both historical and archaeological, meant the abandonment of this project it did provide the beginnings of the limits of my study area: Parish boundaries.

One of the major problems in the initial stages was that there were no records of the St. Clement parish boundary, although Harvey had attempted a reconstruction as part of his study of the church of York (Harvey 1965.382.fig.1) (**Map 2.1**). As part of the Edwardian reforms of the mid-16th century the parish of St. Clement became part of the parish of St. Mary, Bishophill Senior. On the advice of Dr. Sarah Rees Jones of the Centre for Medieval Studies, University of York I expanded my research area to the extents of this conjoined parish (**Map 2.2)**. Like Harvey I chose to use the boundaries of the parishes mapped out in the mid-19th century. The expansion of the study area meant that three specific zones of occupation now lay within my study area; an urban zone based within the walled city, a rural zone centred on the settlement of Middlethorpe and a suburban zone lying between the two.

On the advice of my academic supervisor, Dr. Aleksandra McClain further areas were added in order to fill in certain gaps within the study area. These particular areas lay within two much larger parishes, so in order to limit the size of the study area I used a mixture of both parish and natural boundaries, the former for the most northerly part of St. Mary, Bishophill

Junior, whilst an enhanced natural terrace forms the border around the Knavesmire. (**Map 2.3).**

**The Nature of the Data.**

Having outlined above the origins of the datasets for this dissertation I will now look at them in more detail. As I am reliant on archaeological data for much of this work it is appropriate that I begin this process by outlining the both the history of archaeological study in York, the methods by which the data was retrieved and the problems that this causes when using it for an exercise such as this.

Archaeology in York can be divided into three broad periods; The Antiquarian Period, The "Rescue" Period and the Post PPG16 Period. These periods represent not only differences in their approaches to gathering archaeological data but also in their attitudes to the purpose of archaeology and what to do with it. These three periods are not exclusive to York they sit within a much broader archaeological landscape and the influences of these periods of archaeological philosophy can be seen throughout the world.

*Antiquarian Archaeology.*

It is difficult to define when the Antiquarian period of archaeology began. It's origins perhaps lie in the courts of the Renaissance, whose rulers sought to present themselves as the inheritors of Ancient Rome and therefore employed artists, architects, poets, librarians and antiquaries to help them prove it.

By the 19th century antiquarian archaeology had become a political tool as various imperial powers sought to prove that their position in the world could be traced back to ancient civilisations, as Ottaway (1992.1) states "One could argue that when Britain ruled a quarter of the world archaeology became a cog in the wheels of empire, as the British sought to associate themselves with the great imperial civilisations of the past by digging them up." The same could be said of the French and Germans at the time. As a consequence of this the archaeology of urban settlement, seen as the driving force of civilisation, tended to take place in the near east, where urban settlements had been abandoned for centuries and were more easily accessible than the still occupied towns and cities with Classical origins that the antiquaries encountered at home.
This is not to say that English antiquaries were unable to investigate Roman cities in England; Thomas Wright worked at the Roman town of Wroxeter between 1859 and 1862, similarly Rev. Joyce excavated a Silchester between 1855 and 1878, work that was continued between 1890 and 1909 by the Society of Antiquaries (Ottaway 1992.9). These were however exceptions for the majority of cases local antiquaries or museum curators relied upon the honesty, frequently purchased, of developers and their workmen to turn in any interesting curios.

It is through this latter method of collection that the majority of data collected for my study area, at this time, was recovered. Despite the valiant work undertaken by the Royal Commission few sites can be accurately pinned down to specific locations and the majority

of these relate to Roman remains and the provenance of finds remains "found during …"[1]. When Tweddle, Moulden & Logan undertook their survey of evidence concerning Anglian York (Tweddle et al 1999), they found that much private antiquarian activity was concentrated on the recovery of decorative metalwork and coins (Tweddle et al 1999.221), whilst the Yorkshire Philosophical Society acquired not only coins but an extensive collection of cremation urns (Tweddle et al 1999.223). Lack of controlled archaeological excavation and recording has left us with a patchy record, difficult both to interrogate and interpret, yet these records remain a primary archaeological data source for many areas of York, particularly those lying within my study zone.

*"Rescue"*

Following the Second World War, the nature of archaeology changed both in thought and in practice. The extensive bombing of historic towns meant that a massive programme of redevelopment could be undertaken, and urban archaeology shifted gear. It moved away from the research led, multi seasonal investigation of "lost" towns to the recovery of material from "living" towns. As bomb sites were cleared and new buildings arose, small teams of amateurs led by museum curators and city archaeologists raced to recover as much archaeological data as possible, before it was lost to the developers. This was the beginning of the "Rescue" phase of British archaeology.
"Rescue" is a bit of a misnomer for this period of archaeological activity. In 1971, almost forty years after the first "rescue" excavations were carried out in Colchester (Ottaway 1992.10), a group of leading archaeologists formed a pressure group calling itself "Rescue". The aim of this group was to make both politicians and public aware of the threat to the archaeological remains of modern towns and cities (Ottaway 1992.11). By its nature "Rescue" archaeology was both time and resource poor, relying on small budgets and grants for finance, volunteers for labour and the goodwill of developers to allow access to the sites. It also required new techniques, single context planning and the use of the Harris Matrix, used in conjunction these meant that stratigraphic relationships could be accurately recorded and therefore, theoretically, a researcher with no knowledge of the excavation could virtually reconstruct the site and interpret the data.

Whilst preservation by record has proved useful and with our increased ability to create computer generated models which has enabled archaeologists to reconstruct these sites in ways not envisaged in the 1970's. It is the sheer amount of material generated by "Rescue" archaeology that has proven difficult to interpret, the records of many excavations have not been looked at since their records have been archived. Furthermore, as computers became more widely used much material is stored on now obsolete and in some cases inaccessible formats meaning that the site records, like the sites themselves, are now inaccessible. Despite these drawbacks it is from the published works generated from the excavations undertaken at during this period of archaeological development, that the majority of archaeological data feeding into this study is drawn.

[1] Obscure provenance is not unusual; whilst working for Coventry Museums Service I came across a fragment of medieval tile labelled "blown up into my garden by a bomb 1941"

*Post PPG16 archaeology.*

Planning Proposal Guideline 16, PPG16, was published in1990 and it had a major impact on the archaeology of modern towns and cities. For the first time in British planning law the archaeological record was seen as a cultural resource requiring careful management and clear research objectives. Developers were to allow archaeologists to make assessments of the damage likely to be caused by their work, to use this report to design and implement measures which would minimize that damage without compromising the safety of the new building and to allow archaeologists to examine those areas where this was not possible. On their part archaeologists would work alongside the developer and carry out their investigation within an agreed time frame at an agreed cost. Although if a significant archaeological discovery were made it was possible for the archaeological team to apply to extend the time frame agreed.

As Darvill states PPG16 ushered in a “shift from re-active rescue archaeology based on preservation by record to pro-active conservation archaeology based on informed decision making and the selection of management options from a menu that included preservation, protection and investigation” (Darvill 2019.285)

York was one of the first cities in the country to produce guidelines in how this new era of urban archaeology was to proceed. In 1991 the York Development and Archaeology Study (known throughout as the Arup Report) created a model of the depth of archaeological material throughout the central core of the city; identified sites likely to be developed; laid out mitigation strategies and how work should be funded. This report is the foundation of the current methods of archaeological investigation in the city.

A result of PPG16 and the Arup report has been that actual archaeological excavations have increasingly been undertaken as small-scale trial trenching or by watching brief. This has meant that the archaeological picture has become more fragmented, it is difficult to interpret sites through the observation of borehole cores or a series of metre square trenches. As a result, we can say that a site was probably occupied during a specific time period but how, by what and whom we cannot, with any accuracy, understand.

In 2012 a new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which finally put archaeology on a par with the other social, economic and environmental considerations relevant to planning and redevelopment (Darvill 2019.289). for York this meant a revision of section 4 of the Arup Report, this section was an assessment of the archaeological resource. For the first time, the York Historic Environment Characterisation Project, included assessments of the archaeological potential of areas outside the central conservation area of the city (MacRae 2013).

<u>Historical Sources</u>

There is a huge corpus of historical documentation associated with the city of York, ranging from taxation records, to court cases, property deeds, tenancy agreements, wills and probate records, and as with the archaeology it is necessary to sift through them to find both the documents relevant to the area and detail of the study being undertaken.

In a study of this type, which works on a wide canvas, it is necessary to first identify those which will help us to understand how the land was divided, used and where the boundaries lie. Only when this process is completed can we begin to create our narrative. The documents selected will allow me to suggest how the communities of my study area interacted with the landscape around them.

It is these historical sources which will provide much of the data for the more suburban and rural areas of my study zone as these areas have seen little archaeological intervention. This is not unusual; suburbs have received little archaeological attention as the opportunities for redevelopment are fewer.

As Palliser wrote "York has been unfortunate in the loss of its early [civic] archives for a city of such importance in the Middle Ages" (Palliser 1978a.81). This was opening sentence to his study of the Husgabel Roll of c1284, the earliest surviving document drawn up by the civic authorities of York. This is not to say that charters and records, relating to the city, prior to the late 13th century do not exist, they do but they were not drawn up by the civic authorities. These records are drawn up by central authorities. If we examine the records held by the church, we again find that prior to the mid-13th century there are no surviving Archbishops registers, the personal records of the daily administration of the head of the Province of York, there are however, in a mirror of the civic archive, records of land grants to religious houses, parish churches and individuals which pre date the registers.
Much of this material has been made available to scholars through the efforts of organisations such as the Surtees Society and the records section of the Yorkshire Archaeological Society. The transcription and translation of these documents whilst valuable to scholars such as myself also must be viewed with care, before we rely upon such work to aid us in achieving our objectives we must consider how skilled the transcriber was, the accuracy of the translation and the motivations of the editor.

Maps and Plans

There are four key plans which will be used in this study, firstly the large-scale plan produced for the Ordnance Survey by Captain Tucker in 1852. This is the base map used for the *Historic Towns Atlas.* Secondly, John Speed's plan of York produced in 1610 (**Plate 1.**), thirdly Samuel Parsons' *Plott of the Manor of Dringhouses* (**Plate 2.**), created in 1624 and finally John Lund Jnr.'s *Map of Micklegate Ward Stray* of 1772 (**Plate 3.**).

The earliest recognised plan of York dates to c1545 and was found in the records of the Exchequer (RCHM(E) 1972, v3.xxxiv). Although heavily damaged the plan is clearly of the city, but beyond a small section of central York there is little detail recorded on the plan. It is believed that this plan was commissioned by the city authorities and depicts the area designated to be subject to Rights of Sanctuary, which was to replace that formerly within St. Mary's Abbey (RCHM(E) 1972, v3.xxxiv). If this is the case it neatly illustrates the nature of the difficulty of using maps in order to interpret landscape, namely that plans and maps are commissioned for a specific reason and that so long as that purpose is achieved the accuracy both in scale and depiction is not important. Dean notes that Speed's map represents an ideal view of York, only important streets and structures are recorded (Dean 2012.17), none of the smaller thoroughfares which crisscross the city are depicted, nor are the buildings which crowd into the burgage plots behind the neat rows of uniform buildings

which face onto the neat, wide roads. This being taken into account Speed's plan is accurately measured, for the time of production, and does give a strong indication of the relationship of the principal buildings depicted and their neighbours and with careful manipulation can be used to plot the approximate position of some structures now lost to the current visual environment of the city.

Parsons plan (Plate 2) is primarily concerned with the ownership of land and represents the class of plan which develops into enclosure and tithe plans. Parsons' plan shows that while Dringhouses seems to retain the old strip fields of the medieval period, the process of enclosure has begun in Middlethorpe, thus representing a landscape in flux. It does however record details of field names, rights of way and watercourses which would once have defined the earlier landscape.

If Parson' plan represents a landscape that is changing as a result of field enclosure the Lund's (Plate 3) represents the stagnation of one. Commissioned by the Freemen of York, Lund produced plans of the Strays of York, the purpose of which was to assist the Freemen in preserving their grazing rights (Rights of Average)[2] over the open spaces which surrounded the city. The plans could be used as a visual record of the Freemen's rights in cases where attempts were made to enclose common lands.

Pictorial Images and Photographs.

In the 17th century York became the subject not only of planners but also artists. Early depictions come in the form of prospects, such as that featured on the title page of this work, unfortunately few of these depict the south western parts of York with which we are interested. As can be seen Haynes' prospect gives us a view across Knavesmire toward the City and depicts the windmills and fields found in our study area, a second prospect, that of E.B., gives us a view from the south east and shows some detail of the city and suburb within the study area. Both views however are subject to the motivations of the artists, E.B., has emphasised (and probably inflated) the size of the house belonging to the Duke of Buckingham, presumably in the hope of gaining his patronage (Plate.4).

On the whole few artists were attracted to the south western parts of York, possibly because of its lack of interesting monuments, its industrial character or the rapid redevelopment of the nineteenth century, as a result there were few images of this part of the city produced throughout the 19th century and early photographers found little to interest them.

Place name Evidence

Many of the documents mentioned above contain records of both street names and their parochial associations, but they can also prove problematical; firstly, there are two churches dedicated to St. Mary located on Bishophill. St. Mary, Bishophill Senior, the parochial church of much of this study area, and St. Mary, Bishophill Junior. In some documents these two

[2] There were two forms of "common" land in York on which the Freemen of the city could graze their livestock. "Whole Year Pasture" was provided on marginal land, like the Knavesmire and Hob Moor while half year pasturage or "Average" was available on the arable land and meadows, The "Average" lands were usually available from Michaelmas to Lady Day.

churches are referred to, respectively, as St. Mary the Elder and St. Mary the Younger. These names however largely post-date the medieval period. In medieval assessments they are generally referred to as St. Mary Veteris and St. Mary Bishop. A further problem is that not all the streets named in the medieval documents have been properly identified, Bishophill Senior for instance has been identified as “Besyngate” (Raine 1955.237 and Palliser 1978b.5) or as “Littlegate” (Palliser 1984.fig1). Finally, where records refer to the parish without the street name or other corroborating evidence we cannot be certain whether it concerns the inter or extra mural portion of the said parish.

Beyond the city walls it is even more difficult. Modern estate names, such as South Bank and Nunthorpe, have no historical equivalent. There are no points of reference to identify the whereabouts of the subject. There is no accepted boundary for the district known as “Clementhorpe”; it is generally accepted that it extends from the city walls to the city boundary and from the river to the Knavesmire. Parts of this area have been referred to as “Bishop’s Fields”, a term now limited to the area around the National Railway Museum, which in the medieval period covered almost the whole area surrounding the walled city south west of the river Ouse. Further complications arise when we look at Middlethorpe, which was known by at least three other names in medieval documents, and Bustardthorpe, which by the mid-fifteenth century had been absorbed by Middlethorpe, Dringhouses and York.

Using place name evidence is, then, less important to this study and can cause confusion, therefore I have largely tended to use the modern place and street names for the reader to easily locate themselves.

The lack of interest in the area by antiquaries and artists during the 19$^{th}$ and early 20$^{th}$ centuries led to a stagnation in the intellectual study of the area as a whole. It took the demolition of St. Mary, Bishophill Senior, and the excavations carried out both before and after this event, for interest in this area to be reignited.

In the next chapter I intend to outline the methodology that I will use in order to interpret this data.

## Chapter 2: Methodology: Defining a "town" and how to analyse it

In this chapter I intend to outline the methods by which I will interpret the data gathered from the source material outlined above. By necessity I will begin with an outline of how similar data has been treated in the past, after which I will outline how I will adopt these methods to achieve the aims of this dissertation.

Historical archaeology has its roots in historical research, many of the early antiquarians viewing it to prove the accuracy of the documents upon which their view of history was based. The socio-economic frameworks used by scholars to interpret historical documents have permeated through archaeological theory and have coloured our perceptions of the past.

This study concerns the occupation of a city and its hinterland, a landscape which displays various aspects which we might define as urban, suburban and rural settlement, yet despite this, to the modern eye it is a single distinct whole. Overall, most people will be able to tell you where in the city they live: the centre, the suburb or the outskirts. These terms are understandable to us, but when asked to define what a city is we become a little more confused; do they live in a city or a town? A town or a village?

This is a difficult concept; one which historians and archaeologists have been debating since the 19th century. It was at this time that the Public Record Office began a programme of publishing the records held within the National Archives, these documents were largely the legal charters, Royal Acts and tax assessments upon which British society was based. Similarly, as noted in chapter 1, civic archives were being made accessible through the work of local archaeological and antiquarian societies. Historians began to sift through these documents in order to come up with a definition for what a town was.

Two works, Charles Gross' 1897 work *A Biography of British Municipal History* and F.W. Maitland's *Township and Borough* of 1898, were the founding works in the British "Urbanist" movement (Palliser 2000.8). Both works emphasised the relationship between the legal rights of a settlement and its economic complexity. These two publications served as standard texts about historical urban settlement for many years. One of the fundamental aspects of this school was the study of was the relationship of constitutional history and the development of towns and boroughs, this study reached its zenith with the publication in 1936 of James Tait's *The English Medieval Borough,* it has been suggested that by "…the very thoroughness of his juridical research…[Tait] gave the impression that he had exhausted the subject of the medieval town, which consequently remained neglected for the following quarter of a century." (Holt and Rosser 1990.3).

The post-war period also saw a new debate on how urban settlements formed. Fuelled by the need to rebuild war damaged cities social scientists, historians, archaeologists, geographers and town planners sought out ideas on how to build new urban communities from the ruins of war. Whilst many of the archaeologists, historians and to some extent social scientists looked at the origins of towns in early civilisations in order to understand how nascent urban societies were created, some were struggling, not with the origin of

towns and cities, but with the very definition of what towns and cities were. The work of scholars such as Tait had concentrated on the necessity of legal charters and the presence of civic control in the form of mints, bureaucratic centres, town walls or other defensive structures to prove that a settlement was a town. This approach was appropriate for a very small number of settlements in a very narrow period of history; even in the period between 800 and 1200 on which it was focused there were settlements which were larger and economically stronger than the 'official' towns.

It is therefore important to understand what a town is, as our experience of city, town and village is different from that of the past. In her work, Reynolds defined the medieval town as *"...a permanent human settlement with two chief and essential attributes. The first is that a significant proportion (but not necessarily a majority) of its population lives off trade, industry, administration and other non-agricultural occupations. In order to distinguish itself from … a monastery...barracks… or mining village, one should add that inhabitants live off a variety of occupations...The second essential attribute of the town is that it forms a social unit more or less distinct from the surrounding countryside. This social distinctiveness probably derives partly from the greater size of its population...and partly from the difference of occupation"* (Reynolds 1977.ix-x).

This definition has largely been accepted by both historians and archaeologists as a good basis for identifying "town" type settlements. Although based on her studies of medieval towns it is a definition which can be applied across different time periods.

There have, of course, been additions to this basic outline, drawn not just from historical sources but features identified by researchers in other disciplines. it is to those identified by geographers and art historians that I will now turn my attention for it is through their work that the primary method by which I intend to use was developed.

While British scholars concentrated upon the legal and economic definitions in order to classify urban settlements, German scholars took a different more integrated method of studying settlement patterns. According to Whitehand (1981.2), this German school owed its origin to the work of the geographer O. Schluter. His work on German town plans and settlement patterns in Thuringia led to the publication of papers on the aims of human geography[3], and the place of human geography in geographical study[4]*.* These studies were, according to Whitehand (1981.2), written to oppose the idea that the methodology of human geography was a universal method to explore the nature of geographical relationships. Schluter believed that not only would geography lose its position in the sciences by adopting this method of analysis, but by its very nature it was philosophically unsound. Schluter instead developed the idea that the study of *Kulturlandschaft* or cultural landscape, the way in which man interacted with and developed the landscape - the settlement, land use and lines of communication - as being the primary role of human geography. While Schluter was making his case for the study of cultural landscapes, another scholar was working on ways to preserve the Old Town of Vienna. Hassinger's work in mapping the architectural history of Vienna identified *"... the wealth of architectural monuments of a famous city and the dangers to which they were exposed under modern metropolitan conditions"* (Whitehand 1981.3).

[3] Die Ziele der Geographie des Menchen. Munich 1906.
[4] Die Stellung der Geographie des Menschen in der Erdkundlichen Wissenschaft, Berlin 1919

Hassinger then produced one of the first conservation maps of a modern city. Between 1912 and 1916 Hassinger mapped and planned the different architectural styles of Vienna culminating in the publication of the *Kunsthitorischer Atlas von Vien* (1916) In his later study of Basel, Whitehand (1981.3) notes that Hassinger not only recorded the architectural details of the city, but also the building and land utilization. Schluter's ideas could be more generally applied in settlement studies, whilst Hassinger's work would have influence in both the specific study of urban morphology and in town planning theory. In 1933, the ideas of *Kulturgeographie* and urban morphology were brought to Britain by the German emigre and geographer M.R.G. Conzen.

Conzen applied the principals of *Kultergeographie* to the study of several English towns. Unhappy with the term "town map" Conzen preferred to use the term "town plan" which he defined as "any large-scale maps showing the essential detail of layout in recognisable and measurable for" (Conzen 1968.115). For his British studies this meant the Ordnance Survey (OS) 1:2500, 1:1250 and 1:500 plans alongside earlier large scale plans produced by them in the 19th century (one of the plans on which this study relies is the 1852 OS survey of York).

Conzen further identified that the term "town map" had other intellectual connotations; a town plan was merely a scaled representation of the physical layout of a defined urban area, but a map was part of the fabric of the city, like the buildings and landscape. A map no longer represented the layout of the town but was viewed as the town itself (Conzen 1968.116).

Conzen's surveys of small towns provided him with a comparative view of the aspects of the form of British towns (Whitehand 1981.10). Through these early studies, and that of Whitby, in 1958, he was able to identify three elements of the townscape which indicated how urban morphology could be studied;

1. **The town plan**: the streets and their interrelation with each other which forms the street system, the individual land parcels which form distinct plot or block patterns and, finally, the arrangement of buildings within these plots. It is the interaction between these elements that allow researchers to identify earlier patterns of occupation Conzen 1968.117).

2. **Building fabric and architecture**: this allows the researcher to identify blocks of development through time. Essentially it was the analysis of this aspect of the town which led Hassinger's research and led to the development of conservation led planning in modern town development.

3. **Land use**: this allows the researcher to identify areas of specialist concentration such as recreational, civic or industrial zoning.

It was Conzen's study of Alnwick[5] that was to have a profound effect on urban studies. In it he refined his ideas concerning the study of town plans, identifying four concepts which affected urban morphology. Conzen summarised these as follows; firstly topography, this not

[5] *Alnwick, Northumberland: a study in town plan analysis*. Institute of British Geographers Publication 27.1960.

only covers the physical landscape on which the town is built and includes factors such as the pattern of landownership and the existence of pre-existing developments. Town development can also be affected by its regional position, does it provide a unique set of services to the region? or is it in competition for resources with other similar settlements? Thirdly is there sufficient room for expansion beyond the urban core into which the town can be developed and finally there is urban redevelopment, how much urban space is there? How heavily is it developed? Are peripheral lands being reclaimed for urban development? (Conzen 1968. 120-122). Whitehand (1981.14-16) expands on this summary identifying them as:

1. **The morphological framework**; This concerns the relationship between two factors; firstly, the natural topography of the landscape and the limits and advantages it imposes on town development and secondly the effects that land ownership and previous development has upon the current landscape. In the burgage cycle we know that piecemeal redevelopment can create fossilised boundaries within the urban plan but in this case we must consider a longer period of time. for example what effect has the landscape of a Roman town had upon the development of a later historical period.

1.
2. **The morphological region**; This concerns the analysis of how the town both affects and is affected by its hinterland. What services does it supply to its less developed neighbours? What do its less urbanised neighbours provide? Why do they choose this urban centre over another?

3. **The Burgage Cycle:** This is the process of urban renewal. Fossilised into many town plans are the impressions of early boundaries of property ownership, “those long strips of properties so reminiscent of strips of cultivation laid out in the fields” (Carver 1987.54)[6]. These strips should more properly be called tenement strips as they are in fact a subdivision of a burgage plot. Tenement development was lineal, beginning close to the road and progressing backwards, infilling the plot. Tenements were not uniformly redeveloped and consequently the boundaries became fossilised within the fabric of the town.

4. **The Fringe Belt:** This area lies close to the urban core and is an area which remains either undeveloped or underdeveloped for a considerable period of time. This does not mean that it is uninhabited or that it is not exploited. In the medieval period this might comprise areas of light agriculture, market gardens, orchards, or home to industrial processes too noisome or which require more space than is available in the confines of the town. It was also attractive to religious and charitable organisations.

[6] During excavations at Gosford Street in Coventry it was found that not only were the tenement strips reminiscent of field systems they actually preserved the landscape of an early field; each property was two strips wide, and rather than plough out the strips the medieval developer had simply brought in material to level the site. Personal recollection of the author.

In effect Conzen's work on Alnwick introduced the ideas of "central place theory" (Whitehand 1981.22) to British scholars, modified versions of which continue to be used to interpret the distribution of settlement types to this day.

While Conzen was busy developing town plan analysis, two British historians adapted the ideas of *Kultergeographie* to their studies. W.G.Hoskins and M. Beresford would influence the development of the new approach to British landscape studies.

Hoskins published his work *The Making of the English Landscape* in 1955, arguing that the landscape was a palimpsest on which history had been written, and that through careful analysis it could reveal past environments, land use and settlement patterns. To do this, Hoskins advocated the use of field survey, map analysis and aerial photography in order to identify landscape features, he also predicted the use and value of palaeobotany and paleozoology to reconstruct past environments in order to not *"clothe the landscape with the wrong kind of trees, or allow in it plants and birds that are only the product of some recent changes"* (Hoskins 1977.19). Hoskins saw landscape studies as a discipline of careful observation through both field survey and desk-based analysis. Initially, he did not see that archaeological intervention could add much to the picture of past environments, but in a new introduction to the work for the second edition of his work Hoskins acknowledged that *"Archaeologists, too, have added enormously to our knowledge of the antiquity of the present landscape…'Rescue digs' have enormous disadvantages, as has anything done at speed, but at least they uncover a vast amount of evidence that might have remained buried forever or discovered only at long intervals and by accident."* (Hoskins 1977.11).

Beresford, like Hoskins, was initially interested in rural landscapes and advocated the use of both map analysis and aerial photography although his views on field survey were rather disparaging *"No organized school of "on-with-the-boots" field-workers (happily) exists"* (Beresford 1971.13). Beresford advocated the use of archive material, primarily documents, to create a hypothesis of settlement, to corroborate the historical record one should use maps and aerial photographs, and then only if necessary should one venture into the landscape itself to gather the physical evidence with which to test the hypothesis. It is ironic, therefore, that Beresford began the forty-year programme of excavation at Wharram Percy. Despite his interest in rural landscape studies, Beresford had greater influence in the rebirth of interest in urban development. As stated above, the publication of Tait's *English Medieval Borough* had caused a stagnation in the study of urban history, and in 1967 Beresford published *New Towns of the Middle Ages: Town Plantation in England, Wales and Gascony.* Having been influenced by his work with aerial photography and the development of town plan studies being adopted by geographers, Beresford began to apply his ideas of landscape study to the urban environment. Hypotheses of development and land use in the urban environment could be more easily generated from the greater volume of documentation created by urban centres, large scale maps, and the huge amount of archaeological material being created from the redevelopment and expansion of many towns and cities provided plenty of data with which to test them. It was Beresford's work at Winchester which was largely responsible for the rebirth of interest in urban development among archaeologists and historians. it was his influence which led to the setting up of "Rescue", the adoption by archaeologists of single context recording and the use of the Harris Matrix (both developed by archaeologists who were trained by Beresford at Winchester).

both Beresford and Hoskins trained as economic historians, for whom archaeology was simply a tool for corroborating history. At the time of their writing, archaeology was just emerging as an independent professional and academic discipline consequently it adopted the local interpretative framework. Many of these new professional archaeologists had trained under economic historians or under Beresford himself, and therefore it is not surprising that these ideas were widely adopted in Britain.

Perhaps one of the major effects of Conzen's work is that the definition of a town has expanded from that given by Reynolds (see above). Ottaway summarises the new definition "archaeologists and historians alike may consider labelling a settlement as a town if, when compared to others in its region, it had, first, a relatively large and dense population, and, second, a distinctive and diverse range of economic functions, which might include, but were not dominated by agriculture. In addition, we should expect evidence, including the appropriate amenities, for a distinctive role in administration, politics and religion (Ottaway 1992.3). This mirrors the ideas of *kulturgeographie* in that it asks us to identify zones of occupation, building types and land use when studying town plans.

It wasn't until 2000 that Keith Lilley, a historical geographer, applied Conzen's methodology to a major English medieval city. Lilley's used his work at Coventry to put forward a case for the use of plan analysis in understanding the development of large medieval urban settlements as Lilley himself states "…despite the growing acceptance of Conzen's approach since the 1960's, an explicit statement on the methodology of plan analysis has been absent, and so too has a demonstration of the historical validity of this technique." (Lilley 2000.9). Lilley's study of Coventry proved that the use of plan analysis, could give strong indications as to how similarly complex settlements developed but as yet no similar study has taken place.

This does not mean that Conzen's theories have been ignored by those researching British towns. Nigel Baker and Richard Holt (2004) have used an adapted version of town plan analysis to identify the various plan components of Gloucester and Worcester and their relationship to the development of both intra and extra mural parishes. Whilst burgage plot analysis has been used by Slater to examine the development of towns such as Hedon (1984), Stratford-upon-Avon (1981). These studies adapt Conzen's ideas to specific research questions, and it is this adaptability that makes his work so useful. When combined with new recording techniques such as GPS measurement and GIS modelling, researchers are now able to adapt Conzen's theories to investigate not just the development of the town itself but of the development of neighbourhoods and social adhesion within the urban community such as the work carried out by Dean in his study of a medieval neighbourhood in central York (Dean 2012a, unpublished thesis).

Dean chose to analyse his data using a geographical information system (GIS) allowing him to manipulate not only archaeological data, which allowed him to see relationships between archaeological contexts and features but also to tie in topographical data from historical plans and documents to build up a detailed image of the morphology of the area over time. Dean believes the use of GIS based analysis in conjunction with historical, archaeological and cartographic data could allow us to simple cause and effect interpretation of the past, it can "begin to help conjure past imagined and material cultures of the neighbourhood, for not

only is GIS a tool for integrating large volumes of detailed archaeological data from different time-periods, it also yields the intrinsic spatial quality of the medieval urban landscape, and even something of those who dwelt within it and played a role in shaping it." (Dean 2012b.27)

It is impractical to undertake a full Conzenian analysis of the area covered by this study. There are, however, some aspects of the framework that he developed for studying town plans which can be applied such as the use of a large-scale base plan on which to base my work. The initial decision, outlined in chapter 1, to use parochial boundaries as a basis for this study led to the identification of three Plan Zones. The table below and **Map 3** detail these Plan Zones and include the modern local place names alongside the names of the parishes that they were once part of.

| Plan Zone | Local and parochial areas |
|---|---|
| Zone 1: The Urban Core | Intramural area of St. Mary Veteris (Bishophill Senior) |
| Zone 2: Clementhorpe | The Scarcroft and Nunthorpe Estates (Bishophill Senior), former medieval parish of St. Clement and the Nunnery Lane Estate (St. Mary Bishop (Bishophill Junior) |
| Zone 3: Middlethorpe and Bustardthorpe | Middlethorpe (Bishophill Senior), Southbank, (Bishophill Junior) and Dringhouses (Holy Trinity. Micklegate) |

.

Of these plan zones I have only chosen to subdivide Zone 1: The Urban Core, into Plan Areas. This is because it is probably the most complex of all the Plan Zones thus requiring deeper analysis and because there are distinct areas of land use that can be observed on the 1852 Ordnance Survey Plan. These Plan Areas are detailed on **Map 4** and in the table below

| Zone 1 Units | Area covered and primary land use |
|---|---|
| Unit 1 | Skeldergate: River front and properties lying either side of the street.<br>Commercial |
| Unit 2 | Bishophill Senior: Properties on either side of the street and to the north of Victor Street.<br>Residential |
| Unit 3 | The Old Baile.<br>Monumental |

Readers familiar with the York Central Historic Core Conservation Area Appraisal (YCHCCAA)[7] will notice some similarities between the "character areas" of this report and my own. This is unsurprising as both works examine similar areas although from different directions **Maps 5.1 – 5.3** indicate the relationship between these "character areas" and my own Plan Zones, and **Map 6** does the same for my plan Units.

It seems appropriate at this point to summarise the origins and purposes of the YCHCCAA and how this relates to my project. Commissioned in 2013 on behalf of York City Council and English Heritage, YCHCCAA outlines the current approach to the conservation of the historic core of the city, and divides the central core of the city into 24 "character areas", each of which has its own statement summarising the current state of the natural and built environment, and the historical and archaeological importance of the area along statements on how these could be damaged or enhanced should development take place in the area. The YCHCCAA was only concerned with the York Central Conservation Area, (the walled city and the immediate hinterland) but it was soon realised that it was also vital to understand the needs of the suburban areas which make up the greater York area, and the project was extended to include them. The City of York Historic Environment Characterisation Project (YHECP)[8] ran in conjunction with the YCHCCAA and raised the character areas from 24 to 76, like their counterparts each of these character areas is the subject to a summary of its environmental and cultural importance and suggestions as to how developers can enhance, or mitigate, their impact upon them. These summaries have proved to be useful in my work as they not only reference archaeological data, allowing me to identify material relevant to my study, but also undertake landscape analysis which feeds into my own research.

These projects are only the latest in a series of planning reports that have helped guide the city council in their efforts to both modernise York while at the same time preserving its historic environment. Early reports, such as that produced by Lord Esher sought only to preserve the built environment of the city (Esher 1968) but in 1991 the architects Ove Arup in conjunction with York University produced the first report that looked at preserving the archaeological environment (Arup et al 1991).

I have also chosen not to carry out a GIS study similar to that undertaken by Dean. There are three reasons for this; firstly the constraints of this particular course of study both in time available and word length would make such a study nigh on impossible; secondly the size of the study area and the amount of data relating to it is beyond the range of this dissertation; and finally my own engagement with the technology is extremely limited and despite the best efforts of several of my colleagues at the University of York it has remained a closed book. I have therefore chosen to create plans using a platform available from York City Council[9] and they should be considered as pull out sheets similar to those produced in the recently published Historic Towns Atlas for York (2015).

[7] https://www.york.gov.uk/HCCAA
[8] https://www.york.gov.uk/YHECP
[9] https://cyc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=6e02c41a806e46879e7dc215f1275afb

## Chapter 3: Zone 1 - The Urban Core (**Map 4**)

Zone 1 is enclosed on two sides by the current circuit of York City Walls and by the River Ouse on a third. The fourth side is determined by the boundary of the medieval parish of St. Mary Veteris (Bishophill Senior), of which, this area forms the urban core. The Zone can be divided into three areas: Plan Area 1: Skeldergate, is centred upon the street of that name. This covers the former industrial areas of the waterfront. Plan Area 2: Bishophill Senior, is centred upon the street of that name and covers a more residential area extending from across a natural plateau overlooking Area 1. Plan Area 3: The Old Baile, covers the site of the former castle known as Baile Hill.

As part of the work undertaken for the Arup Report, the natural ground surface (**Plate 4)** of the city was modelled, revealing that this zone lies between two watercourses, one running in the vicinity of Bishopgate Street and one in the vicinity of Buckingham Street (Arup et al 1991, Fig 4.2), the latter is almost contiguous with the parish boundary which marks the northern limit of the plan zone. The Arup Report also shows that Area 1 is set between a steep slope and the river, whilst Areas 2 and 3 sit on the plateau above it. These form the natural boundaries of Zone 1.

The final part of this chapter will be devoted to the River Ouse itself. The river, which has had an important effect upon the nature of settlement in the whole study Area is discussed in this chapter as it is in this plan zone that those effects have been most significant. I have designated it Plan Area 4 even though it doesn't sit within the original scheme outlined in the previous chapter.

Having identified both the natural and manmade boundaries of this zone, I now intend to examine each plan area, beginning with a summary of Roman and Anglian settlement in order to identify what effect, if any, this may have had upon the nature of the medieval settlement.

**Roman Occupation. Map 7.**

**Plan Area 1: Skeldergate.**

Plan Area 1 fronts onto the river Ouse and it is here that we might expect to find evidence of the exploitation of the river as a transport artery replete with harbour facilities, warehousing and other industrial activity associated with an important transport hub.

There is some evidence for riverside management from the Roman period, as excavations carried out by York Archaeological Trust at 23-28 and 26-34 Skeldergate revealed that structural activity along the riverbank had taken place at the time, possibly to create some form of wharf (McComish 2015.31-32). Further north, and just beyond our study area, the site at 14 Skeldergate there was evidence of timber piling suggesting that some form of building had occupied the site in the Roman period (McComish 2015.34-5). Unfortunately, the dating sequence from these sites is unclear, so it is difficult to say when this work was undertaken, although Monaghan argues that this may have occurred in the early 3rd century (Monaghan 1997.1127).

More reliable evidence for the Roman occupation of this area was recovered by excavations at 58-59 Skeldergate, also known as Bishophill 1. Here archaeologists recovered evidence for the construction of a road in the 2nd Century (Carver et al, 1978.9 ) which apparently ran beside the river. Lack of a riverside defence meant that this road was subject to flooding and erosion. The road was renewed at least twice between the 2nd and 3rd centuries, with a further four renewals taking place before the road went out of use in the late 4th century (Carver et al 1978.13). This site also produced evidence of domestic occupation ranging in date from the mid-2nd to 4th centuries, the most spectacular of which was a timber-lined well. This was constructed in the late second or early third century and was being gradually backfilled during the 4th (Carver et al 1978.50).

The excavations at City Mills produced no evidence for Roman riverfront occupation and it may be that this part of the river lay beyond the boundary of the Roman settlement. However, a substantial timber was observed during a watching brief at The Bonding Warehouse, which given its depth, 5m below ground level, has been tentatively assigned as an indicator of Roman activity (McComish 2015.37).

**Plan Area 2: Bishophill Senior.**

The archaeological excavations in this area have largely been confined to sites lying on the northern side of Bishophill Senior. During his excavations on the site of the church of St. Mary Veteris (Bishophill Senior), Ramm uncovered evidence for the terracing of the steep sides of the natural bluff (Ramm 1976.36-7), which he dated to the late 2nd/early 3rd century. The terrace was occupied by a building sequence possibly extending to the 5th century. During his excavations at 37 Skeldergate, Carver also recovered evidence for a similarly dated building sequence and evidence for the terracing of the hillside, although unlike Ramm, he didn't find evidence for the terrace retention wall (Carver et al 1979.30-39).

South of the church site, York Archaeological Trust (YAT) carried out an excavation ahead of the redevelopment of a plot beside the Friends Burial Ground, evidence was found that this site had also been terraced. Ramm suggests that this may have been the termination of the terrace that he found as there was evidence for revetment in both the NE and SE areas of the excavation (Ramm 1976.36). There is also a 3rd to 5th-century building sequence (Monaghan 1997.1125). In 1990 YAT were able to excavate a site at the rear of Buckingham Street which, although heavily truncated by Victorian cellaring, produced demolition deposits and other evidence of a Roman building (McComish 2015.31).

**Plan Area 3: The Old Baile.**

Little evidence for Roman occupation has been recovered from this area. The evidence that has been recovered suggests that this area was a cemetery, as between 1882 and 1883, four tile lined burials were found SE of Falkland Street, near Baile Hill (RCHM(E) v1.107). Dating evidence suggests that this cemetery was in use in the early 2nd century.

**The Roman Landscape of Zone 1.**

How far the Roman town extended into our zone is unclear. Traditionally, it is suggested that the City Wall follows the line of the Roman boundary, but this may be untrue, particularly as the south eastern corner of the current wall follows the castle defences of the Old Baile.

As we have seen above, Ramm (1976.36) indicated that the evidence from the Friends Burial Ground suggested a termination of the terracing of Bishophill. If he is correct and this line is projected further then it meets the ditch which separated the Old Baile from the city, suggesting that this may form a boundary pre-dating the medieval period; furthermore if the line is projected toward the river, it is contiguous with a property boundary preserved within the landscape recorded by the 1852 large scale plan of York (Map.). This boundary marks a significant change in the pattern of property boundaries along Skeldergate.

A further argument for this line being the extent of the Roman town is the presence of the cemetery on the Old Baile site, as Roman law forbade the burial of corpses within the town boundary.

Finally, a boundary in this area would enclose the highest ground of the plateau, before it fell away toward the watercourse in the vicinity of Bishopgate street.

From the archaeological evidence presented above, it does not appear that this zone was incorporated into the Roman town until the mid-2nd century. Indeed, Ottaway has suggested that the watercourse in the vicinity of Buckingham Street may have formed a natural boundary for the early civilian settlement (Ottaway 1993, 73, fig 34.2). Expansion into the area seems to have been heralded by large public works, the building of a road along the river, the terracing of the hillside and the creation of a burial ground.

Despite this, however, the area does seem to have been on the periphery of the town. The road appears to have been unprotected by any form of riverside wall and shows evidence of regularly being eroded and overwhelmed by the river. It is not until the 3rd century that there is evidence for such protection being provided, by which time the road was in its fourth manifestation (Carver et al 1978.13). It is also at this time that buildings begin to be erected on the terraces.

The abandonment of this area appears to have begun in the late 4th century. The Skeldergate well was rapidly backfilled (Carver et al, 1978.25), and the seventh iteration of the road, the last and most poorly constructed in the sequence, seems to have gone out of use at a similar time (Carver et al 1978.13). While the evidence for the abandonment of the river front appears to have occurred at a relatively quick pace, on the terraces, Carver suggests that due to the large quantities of 3rd and 4th century pottery the buildings there may have been in use until the 5th century, and that there were indications that some of the walls remained standing well beyond this date (Carver et al 1978.39-40). Ramm also indicates that occupation of the church site may have continued into the 5th Century (Ramm 1976.45).

## Post-Roman Occupation

There is limited archaeological evidence for occupation in Zone 1 between the 5th and late 8th century, therefore it seems sensible to view the Zone as a whole. Although both Ramm and Carver suggest that the Roman buildings on the Bishophill terrace may still have been visible, they are unable to state with any certainty that they were habitable. Carver (1978, 40) suggests that the buildings at 37 Bishophill Senior may have been used as quarries for the religious complex further along the Bishophill ridge, centred around the present-day St. Mary Bishophill Junior and Holy Trinity churches in the late 8th century. Ramm, on the other hand, is even more tentative, suggesting that buildings identified as being erected during the fifth phase of Roman occupation at his site "may have been post-Roman*"* (Ramm 1976.45).

The only definite post-Roman buildings identified were found at 58-59 Skeldergate. These buildings lay closer to the modern riverfront and in a stratigraphically later phase than Roman road mentioned above (Bishop 1976b.14 ). This suggests that the presence of the road had no influence upon the construction of the building.

The whole zone would appear to be in what Conzen identifies as a "termination phase" of occupation: the area is becoming waste. The Roman riverfront had been abandoned, and successive periods of flooding and silting had moved the interface between land and river further east (Bishop 1976b.14). Evidence for this was recovered from 32-34 Skeldergate where archaeologists recovered "*a long expanse of black river silt stretching back and gradually up towards the line of the present street"* (Anonymous 1973a.21).

The apparent lack of evidence for the exploitation of the riverfront may be the due to the consequences of two factors, firstly the actual survival and identification of Anglian material in York, as can be seen in the summary of finds below, secondly and more importantly is the presence of a large trading centre or *wic* located on river Foss, just above its confluence with the river Ouse. Kemp (1996.3) describes the settlement as being "of specialised character...probably devoted to trade and industry, supplying the royal and ecclesiastical settlements [of York]". The presence of such a settlement may have negated the need for the exploitation of the southern bank of the river Ouse, hence the lack of evidence for Anglian occupation in Zone 1.

On the terraces, there would have still been visible remains of the Roman buildings ( Carver 1976b.12), but these were being quarried for their stone. All of the excavations mentioned above produced evidence of dark soils; it was in this that Carver found his three sherds of mid-Saxon pottery ( Carver 1976b.12), and it was in the upper limits this dark earth where Bishop located her earliest post-Roman buildings ( Bishop 1976b.14). This decaying landscape is where we find ourselves at the beginning of our primary study period. Ramm's excavations at St. Mary Veteris (Bishophill Senior) recovered evidence that the footings of the late-Saxon church were cut through a layer of rubble containing human bone suggesting that the site was being used as a burial ground prior to the 9th/10th century (Ramm 1976.45).

This lack of buildings dating from post Roman occupation is reflected in the sparsity of the artefacts, when Tweddle, Moulden and Logan published their summary of the evidence

pertaining to Anglian York, Zone 1 had produced 3 coins, 12 pottery sherds and 4 copper alloy pins (Tweddle et al, 1999. Items 64,74,75,77,98,169). Despite this analysis by Tweddle suggests that there was a concentration of activity with Zone 1., perhaps indicating that it may have been subject to more activity at this time than is generally recognized (Tweddle et al. 1999.210, fig.57).

Having summarised the evidence for occupation prior to the 9th century I will now turn my attention to the focus of this study, beginning with the occupation of the area in the Anglo-Scandinavian Period. Subsequent divisions of time, 11th - 13th and 14th - 16th reflect important changes which affect the growth of Zone 1. As with the discussion of the Roman occupation of this Zone I will consider each individual Plan Area separately before drawing a general overview of the nature of occupation in the Zone as a whole.

## Anglo-Scandinavian Occupation

### Plan Area 1: Skeldergate

From the late 8th/early 9th century, a concerted redevelopment of this riverside area appears to have taken place. A phase of building was observed during excavations at 58/59 Skeldergate which, although not precisely dated, provides a sequence running throughout the Anglo-Scandinavian period. Donaghey (Donaghey 1986.37- 48) identifies four separate structures built throughout the Anglo-Scandinavian period: the earliest overlies the Roman road suggesting that some limited encroachment on the riverfront is already occurring at this time. There also appears to be a clear property boundary, which crystallizes around the early 10th century, a similar period to those in Walmgate and Skeldergate (Hall 1986.52) and remains in use until the 18th century ( Bishop 1976b.14).

The earliest buildings from this excavation appear to show development along the street front, with later expansion into the rear of the property during the 10th/11th centuries (Hall 1994, 69). The later development of burgage plots is not uncommon at this period as demand for both residential and commercial space increases. Similar contemporary infilling of burgage plots can be seen in the evidence from Coppergate (Hall 1994.65, fig.41). It is, perhaps, at this period that we can first observe the burgage cycle, proposed by Conzen, in action.

The re-occupation of Plan Area 1 coincides with the decline and abandonment of the *wic* site located at 46-54 Fishergate, and the re-occupation of 16-22 Coppergate (Kemp 1996.83). If Kemp is right in his analysis, then this might further the argument that the abandonment of the Fishergate *wic* represents a reaction "*by the settlement's controlling authority to external change, bringing the inhabitants closer to the defended...area in a period of insecurity."* (Kemp 1996, 84). The 9th century was a tumultuous period for the city, political instability caused by dynastic infighting in the Northumbrian royal family (Rollason 1999.130-131 ) was compounded with increased pressure from Scandinavian raiding parties which culminated in the capture of York by the Viking Great Army in 866.
If this is the case then we might expect to see some evidence of waterfront structures built to service maritime trade, but as yet no evidence has been recovered in the Plan area which suggest that this is the case, indeed as we have seen above, the excavations at 28-34Skeldergate (YATGAZ 1997.89YORYM) found silts covering the riverfront up to the

current street alignment. This might suggest that if market activity was taking place here then it may have been in the form of a strand market as seen in Lincoln and London.

**Plan Area 2: Bishophill Senior.**

At the site of St. Mary Veteris (Bishophill Senior), Ramm identified the presence of an early medieval enclosure which he interpreted as a precinct wall for a cemetery (Ramm 1976. 45). During the demolition of the church several fragments of cross shafts were found, the earliest of which date to the late 9th/early 10th century (Lang, 1991, 88-95). Although he found little structural evidence for an early church, Ramm hypothesised that a structure may have been erected which re-used the two southern rooms of the Roman building as a foundation (Ramm 1976.46). In the 11th century a single-cell stone church was built against the NW wall of the enclosure, and dated by the presence of a fragment of cross shaft of 10th century date which had been used as part of the building's foundation matrix (RCHM(E) v3.30).

The neighbouring site at 37 Bishophill Senior produced "little evidence of occupation at this time save for a number of pits of indeterminate use" (Carver 1976.12). A similar lack of evidence is available from the Friends Burial Ground to the south. The limited excavations carried out on the southwestern side of Bishophill Senior have either been too shallow to reach Anglo-Scandinavian levels or have produced soils indicative of agricultural activity.

**Plan Area 3: The Old Baile.**

Excavations in this area have been limited. The Old Baile was subject to two seasons of archaeological investigation, but space was limited; the top of the motte was excavated down to 12/13th century levels, while the section through the ditch also failed to reach natural (both were stopped due to concerns over health and safety (Addyman pers. comm.). The excavations in the bailey were terminated due to the presence of 20th century air-raid shelters. Addyman was, however, able to show that the motte was constructed over an eleventh-century ground surface, evidenced by the presence of sherds of Stamford Ware (9 in total) and Torksey Ware (6 in total). (Addyman and Priestley 1977.124).

Antiquarian finds from the area have included two coin hoards, one of Edward the Confessor and the other of William I, two Northumbrian stycas, comb cases and decorated metalwork (Addyman & Priestley 1977.118). This evidence of activity in the Anglo-Scandinavian period indicates that the settlement along Bishophill was expanding into the area now contained within the City Walls ( Carver 1976b.12-13).

**<u>Overview of Anglo-Scandinavian Settlement in Zone 1</u>**

After the Roman abandonment and lack of early/mid-Saxon activity, it appears that the area began to undergo a period of renewal at some point around the 9th century. Property boundaries began to be established along Skeldergate (Hall 1986.52), and the possible mid-Saxon burial ground, on the site of St. Mary Veteris, becomes more formalised with the building of a church, the foundations of which make partial use of the former Roman building (Ramm 1976.45-46). Whether the area of the Old Baile was occupied or simply waste

ground is unclear. It is also unclear whether Plan Area 3 lay within the area of the Anglo Scandinavian settlement.
As outlined above the re-occupation of Plan Area 1.may have been driven by external political and social pressures. There is some evidence that a central authority may have planned this, in that there appears to be an established development of building, or burgage, plots and these are of similar size to those observed in Coppergate which had a street front of about 18 feet (Ottaway 1995.4).

## Occupation in the 11th - 14th centuries

### Plan Area 1: Skeldergate.

Excavations along the Ouse waterfront have shown that a process of reclaiming marginal land by extending burgage plots into the river continued throughout this period. At Albion Wharf archaeologists recovered evidence of a period of dumping followed by the construction of a limestone wall, tentatively dated to the 12th century, which ran parallel to the river (YATGAZ 1981.1). Similar process of dumping and evidence of a possible access road, or water lane, was observed during the excavations and watching briefs carried out at 26-34 Skeldergate (YATGAZ 1989.9; 1991.1). Whether this represents an organised effort to stabilize and exploit the riverfront is unclear, however, as Raine notes that it was customary for the landowners of Skeldergate to be responsible for their own stretch of riverbank, and they maintained their right to encroach on the river until the 14th century (Raine 1955, 239). Rees Jones (1987.76-7) notes that this method of land reclamation had become customary by 1288 and that similar processes were being utilised to reclaim marginal land in King's Lynn where, as at Skeldergate, the burgesses were lengthening their property by the enclosure of the river bank on the opposing side of the road to their street frontage. This right of encroachment was important to the citizens of Skeldergate not just because it provided them with more land, it meant that they access the deeper channels of the river, thereby allowing larger vessels, such as the cog-type ships, developed in northern Europe, with deeper draughts and greater cargo capacity, access to the city. Furthermore the new land could accommodate facilities such as warehouses, thus freeing up space in the principal burgage plot for other developments, such as workshops or accommodation to meet the increasing demand for housing as Rees Jones (1987.75) notes land use within the city centre had become more intensive as buildings extended towards the rear of plots at this time.

The excavations at City Mills provide us with some evidence of the expansion of the city along the riverbank at this time. During this excavation a wicker structure was discovered, which has been interpreted as a breakwater; this was later replaced by a post and wicker structure behind which timber buildings were erected (YATGAZ 1983.2). Dating evidence for the later construction is unclear, but it has been suggested that the "breakwater" might date to the 11th century.

Whilst timber-building seems to have been the norm in the 11th century, it appears that stone structures began to replace them in the mid-late 12th century. At 58/9 Skeldergate, a stone building facing onto the street was erected at this time (Bishop 1976c.17). Similarly, some evidence for a stone building facing the street was recovered from 26-34 Skeldergate (YATGAZ 1991.1). As these sites are on opposite sides of the road, it indicates that the

position of Skeldergate was becoming fixed at this period. It should also be noted that the building at 58/9 Skeldergate (Bishop 1976c.18) conformed to the earlier Anglo-Scandinavian property boundary, suggesting not only that the pre-conquest division of land had already become fossilised into the townscape, but that the nature of land ownership had also been carried through from that period, something that I will return to later in this dissertation.

**Plan Area 2: Bishophill Senior**

As has already noted, excavations in this area have largely been undertaken on the north eastern side of Bishophill Senior, but unfortunately due to modern intrusion, little evidence for the settlement of the area was retrieved. As a result, we are almost entirely reliant upon documentary sources to help us examine the settlement of this area. Further complications arise in this area as the street names have changed over time, for example the *Husgabel Roll,* a late 13th century document, records the main streets of Area 2 as *Littlegate, Lounlithgate,* and *Besingate:* respectively, these are now Bishophill Senior, Victor Street (and Carr Lane) and Lower Priory Street (Palliser. 1978a, 81-91 ).

Apart from the presence of the church of St. Mary Veteris (Bishophill Sr.), the earliest reference we have to this area is from a document copied into the *Magnum Registrum Album* of York Minster. This document outlines the rights claimed by the Archbishop in York and states that the Archbishop was entitled to every third penny in the Gildgarth (Peacock 1905.415), a piece of land generally accepted to be in this area. Raine places the Gildgarth in the angle formed by Skeldergate and the present Cromwell Road (Raine 1955, 236), whilst Rees Jones identifies it as the plot of land delineated by Bishophill Senior, Bishophill Junior, Lower Priory Street and Victor Street (Rees Jones 2013. map 11.) The nature of the Gildgarth is unclear, but it seems to have been an open space, possibly used for shire assemblies (Rees Jones 2013. 53).

The *Husgabel Roll,* ,records the tax paid on properties held in towns which had been built upon; in the York roll these plots of land are generally referred to as “tofts". The roll identifies 12 such tofts in Lower Priory Street (Besingate), 39 in Victor Street/Carr Lane (Lounlithgate), and 21 in Bishophill Senior (Littlegate) (Palliser 1978a, 90-91). This number of houses suggests that by the end of the 13th century there must have been some encroachment upon the Gildgarth, if this lies in the area identified by Rees Jones. (Rees Jones 2013. Map 11). If this is the case then it may confirm that by the late 13$^{th}$ century building is being extended into marginal zones due to population pressure, such as reclaimed land and churchyards, as suggested by Rees Jones (1987.74) and Andrews (1984. 184) respectively. Furthermore, if the Gildgarth was once used as an assembly area, then that function must have ceased by the end of the 13th century. A record in the *York Memorandum Book* reveals that in 1370, the city received 3s in rent from a garden in the Gildgarth (Sellars 1912, 25 ), which suggests that whilst development was occurring along the street fronts which surrounded the Gildgarth, the central area continued to be owned by the corporation and was divided into garden plots, similar to modern allotments. This hypothesis is supported by a later will in which William Brygg leaves “*a garden in les Gyldgarthes lying between the King’s street of Besyingate and the land belonging to Mayor and Commonalty of York "* (Raine 1955, 237).

As has already been stated the north eastern side of Bishophill Senior has seen the most archaeological investigation. However, when examined closely we can see that the results of this have been limited. At 37 Bishophill Senior this has been due to the limited area under investigation and post medieval development, whist the excavations at both the church of St. Mary and at the Friends Burial Ground were limited by the need to respect the social mores concerning the disturbance of human remains. As a result of this little data concerning the domestic occupation of this area was recovered..

Rees Jones identifies that almost all of Area 2 lying north of St. Mary's church formed part of the urban manor of the Basy family (Rees Jones 2013, map 15). The Basys appear to have benefitted from the persecution of York's Jewish community in the 1270s. Roger Basy, Mayor of York in 1290 and 1292, acquired the site of the Jewish synagogue (Rees Jones 2013, 123). According to the *Husgabel roll* he also had property on Micklegate which he rented from the Priory of St. Robert, Knaresborough (Palliser 1978a, 88), and four properties on Skeldergate (Palliser 1978a, 89). This latter group of properties may have formed the basis of his urban manor, and it is interesting to note that according to the *Husgabel Roll* the Basys didn't own or rent property on Bishophill Senior; therefore, this part of their estate must have been acquired after 1284.

The church site provides us with evidence of an increasing population. The single cell church of the 11th century began to expand: the 12th century saw a chancel added and an aisle built on the north side of the nave, and the churchyard was expanded eastwards, taking it to the edge of the Roman terrace (RCHM(E) v3, 30). In the 13th century a massive piece of civil engineering was undertaken, as the terrace was extended to its current limit in order to accommodate a new chancel, which effectively doubled the size of the church (RCHM(E) v3, 30). This expansion of the church may, as I have already said, reflect an expanding population, but it may also reflect the rise in the wealth of mercantile families in the area, particularly that of the Basy family.

**Plan Area 3: The Old Baile**

As I have detailed, this area was lightly occupied and possibly lay outside the city proper during the Anglo-Scandinavian period. This changed in the late eleventh century, when the site was cleared, and a castle was built on the site. This castle, one of two built in York under the instructions of William I, would dominate this area until the 19th century.

Little is known of the early castle, but its general layout can still be seen today. The site is roughly rectangular, with the southeast and southwest ramparts having been incorporated into the city walls. The line of the north western defences can still be traced — a depression in the wall embankment marks the position of the ditch, which can be traced in Newton Terrace and Kyme Street (RCHM(E) 1972.89)[10]. It is only on the north eastern side that all evidence for the defences of the castle have been lost. The castle motte stands in the eastern corner of this enclosure, on the edge of the glacial moraine.

[10] This can be seen quite clearly today as the buildings which sit above the ditch are the only ones in the streets to possess cellars and upon careful examination the buildings also display evidence of subsidence.

Due to the restrictions placed on the excavators, the earliest levels of occupation identified on the motte date to the late 12th/early 13th century, and even they are ambiguous. Addyman published two alternative interpretation drawings due to this uncertainty (Addyman & Priestley 1977.128, fig 5). Nevertheless, it appears that these features represent an occupation of the motte at this time. Whether this represents a refurbishment of the castle buildings during the various dynastic struggles of the 12th century (either the Anarchy of 1135-53 or the rebellions of the various sons of Henry II in 1173-1189) is unclear. At some point during this period the castle passed out of royal control and was transferred to that of the Archbishop of York, possibly during the incumbency of Archbishop Geoffrey Plantagenet, who was also Sheriff of Yorkshire 1194-8 and a half-brother to both Kings Richard and John (RCHM(E) v2, 87).

After these buildings had decayed, the motte appears to have been used as a dump for rubble. Addyman and Priestley (1977.131) identified some evidence for the sporadic occupation of the mound top after this suggesting that there may have been some occupation of the motte in the 13th century.

Unfortunately, due to the presence of later intrusions, the excavation of the bailey proved inconclusive. Further trial excavations carried out after the demolition of the Rolyatt Factory on the corner of Cromwell Road and Falkland Street failed to find any evidence of occupation levels associated with the castle (Oakey 1989. 4-6).

.

**Overview of 11th - 14th century occupation in Zone 1**

The Anglo-Scandinavian landscape of Zone 1 radically changed at the end of the 11th century, particularly with the imposition of a motte and bailey castle in its south eastern corner. This castle not only helped to control traffic on the River Ouse, the main approach to the city from the southeast, but also dominated an area of land which may have been used for public assembly, the Gildgarth.

The Castle made use of natural defences (**MAP 8)**: the motte was built on the edge of the glacial moraine, while the south eastern defences followed the edge of the ravine cut by the beck which ran down what is now Bishopgate Street. We can postulate that the north eastern defences ran along the edge of the escarpment of Bishophill itself, which the Arup report suggests is very steep at this point (Arup 1991. Fig 4.2), with the marshy ground at its base providing further defence. The north western defences may follow a pre-existing defensive or boundary ditch, which had been established in the Roman period. Shared boundary ditches are not uncommon in York; one such example being that between the City and the Abbey of St. Mary in Bootham, whilst the Franciscan Friary made use of the castle ditch to define part its boundary. Only the south western defences, fronting onto Prices Lane, needed to be entirely designed, unless they follow a pre-existing Roman defence, as is generally accepted.

In Plan Area 1., stone structures are beginning to replace wooden ones, but the property boundaries continue to conform to the underlying Anglo-Scandinavian pattern. In the late 11th/early 12th century there appears to be efforts made to re-enforce or protect parts of the riverbank, possibly as a result of the damming of the river Foss, something I intend to discuss later in this chapter. The infilling of burgage plots, expansion of the church, the

encroachment onto both the Gildgarth and into the river suggests that the population was growing at this time, likely going hand in hand with the granting of the city charter in the early 13th century.

## Settlement in the 14th -16th centuries

### Plan Area 1. Skeldergate

1306 is an important date for this area, as this was when the city was granted a murage tax for the specific purpose of building a wall along the Ouse beside Skeldergate (Maxwell 1898, 387). This represents the first corporate action taken to protect and maintain the southern bank of the river, rather than leaving it to individual burgage holders as had been the previous custom (Raine 1955.239), in order to prevent excessive erosion of the river's southern bank due to the construction of the walls surrounding the Franciscan Friary on the opposite bank. The Friary' s stone walls projected into the river and affected both the natural current and the tidal flows of the river, which over time would have shifted the deep water channels necessary for bringing ships into the city. The city fathers, sensing an opportunity for profit, seem to have set about a massive scheme of civil engineering, building not only the riverside wall but reclaiming land at the southern end of Skeldergate in order to build a defensible deep-water dock.

It had long been thought that the current riverfront between Albion Wharf and City Mills follows the line of the medieval riverside wall, and during excavations at the former Pawson's Warehouse, at the southern end of Skeldergate, evidence suggested that this was so (YATGAZ 1972.19 &1983.25). This site also provided evidence for the construction of the deep water dock. Prior to the construction of the river wall this area appears to have been open ground; no sign of early quays were located and successive black silty levels, identified as tidal deposits, extended for some distance, which led the archaeologists to conclude that the river's edge lay over 25 m behind the current line (Addyman 1975, 226).

The river wall itself was not investigated, but approximately 8m behind it a second parallel wall had been constructed, also in limestone. This wall was built on piles driven into the river warps[11]. A third limestone wall perpendicular to the river ran between these two walls. The space between these walls was filled with sand, which not only provided a revetment for the wall, but a level, stable surface for construction (Addyman 1975.225). This site lay next to the accepted position of the medieval common crane, and as such we must assume that its construction required a similar amount of engineering as that witnessed at Pawson's Warehouse. We do not have a description of the early common crane, but a description of its rebuilding in the 15th century reveals that the later complex consisted of a crane set upon a stone foundation, a hall with a glass window, a long chamber, and other buildings in the crane yard (Raine 1955, 241).

[11] Warp is the alluvial sediment deposited by a river, these can form distinct layers in the stratigraphy of sites where land is subject to flooding. In tidal rivers these can be semi solid layers of loam (the surface layer can harden in the air, trapping an a waterlogged layer of sediment between itself and the more solid warp that forms the river bed.

Whilst the riverside wall at Pawsons Warehouse was not investigated due to health and safety concerns, at 23-28 Skeldergate (Albion Wharf) an earlier attempt to protect the riverbank was identified (YATGAZ 1989.1). Firstly, as timber revetment dating to the 10th/11th centuries, this was followed by a period of dumping and build-up until a limestone wall was constructed in the 12th century. During the 14th century this wall was demolished and robbed possibly to provide material for the new river wall then under construction.

A new section of city wall was also constructed at this time, to the south of the Cranegarth. Beginning at the river with the construction of the "Crane Tower", (RCHM(E) 1972, vol.3.90) it proceeded south west toward the escarpment of Bishophill. The final termination of this wall is unclear, but by the 15th century it had been joined to the defences of the Old Baile. The last vestiges of this stretch of wall were removed in 1878 (RCHM(E) 1972, vol.3.90)

It is once again the site at 58/59 Skeldergate that provides the best evidence for domestic occupation. There was renewal of the street front properties, with stone buildings facing onto both Skeldergate and Carr Lane and timber buildings at the rear of the plot, one of which must have been quite substantial, as post holes identified as carrying the principal beams suggested a building of at least four bays. A lane running parallel to Carr Lane appears to have given access to the buildings at the rear of the plots (Bishop 1976c. 18). This exploitation of burgage plots is further evidenced by Raine, who recounts the development of a plot on Carr Lane: "*in 1280-3 a piece of land...is mentioned...lying between the churchyard of St. Mary… and… Skeldergate, bounded...by Kirk Lane* [now Carr Lane] *and...the land of Adam le Clerk. In 1311 the same property is described as a messuage* [a plot with a house]." By 1427/8, the same plot contained seven tenements, all with cellars (Raine 1955, 242).

**Plan Area 2: Bishophill Senior**

Once again, despite this area having been, archaeologically, one of the most investigated areas of the city, there is in fact a paucity of physical, or structural, evidence on which to hang material, such as the pottery sequences recovered from 37 Bishophill Senior. All we can say is that we know the sites were occupied, but by what or whom is unclear.

Documentary sources provide us with a framework to propose some theories as to how the area was occupied. We know, for instance, that the Basy family were highly influential in the area. Roger Basy, the Mayor mentioned above, founded a familial chantry chapel in St. Mary Veteris which resulted in a widening of the north aisle and the building of a chapel at its east end (RCHM(E) v3, 30). The chapel was rededicated in the early 15th century, which may have resulted in more refurbishment and the creation of a hermitage. We know about the latter, as Raine records that William Fysch and William de Ireby both left money to the hermit (Raine 1955, 235) in 1391 and 1393 respectively. According to the Poll Tax records William Fysch was resident in the parish of St Mary Veteris (Bishophill Senior) in 1391 (Fenwick 2005.156), whilst William de Ireby resided in the neighbouring parish of St John The Evangelist on Ouse Bridge End (Fenwick 2005.153). Both would have been neighbours of the Basy family and may have had some form of affinity with them.

**Plan Area 3: The Old Baile**

Addyman was unable to identify any long term occupation of the motte during the late Middle Ages He believed that at the end of the 13th century there may have been a wooden palisade around its perimeter, with timber buildings inside which may have survived into the 14th century (Addyman & Priestley 1977.131). Documentary evidence demonstrates that the Old Baile was much decayed in the early 14th century. Both Archbishop Greenfield and Archbishop Melton had disputes with the City about the state of the castle defences and who was responsible for their maintenance. Whether Melton was responsible for the replacement of the timber defences in stone is unclear, but the date of 1327 suggested by the Royal Commissioners (RCHM(E) v2, 87) is contemporary with the construction of the new defences around the deep water dock being built by the City below the castle. The dispute surrounding the responsibility for the repair of the castle walls continued into the 15th century, and only ended when Archbishop Bothe granted the Old Baile to the mayor and community of York (RCHM(E) v2, 87). The large number of arrowheads recovered during the excavation (Addyman & Priestley 177, 131), probably relate to the use of the Old Baile as a muster ground and archery butts for the citizenry of York (RCHM(E) v2, 87).

Once it was in their possession, the city incorporated the castle into the city wall, and it is presumably at this point that the ditch separating the city from the castle was filled in, and the two defences were joined. The Royal Commissioners noted that the facing of the wall differs considerably on either side of Tower 5, which sits on the north western (city) side of the ditch (RCHM(E) v2.92).

1n 1566, Tower 3 (“Biche Doughter Tower”) was taken down, as it had already become separated from the wall. This tower, which stood in the southern corner of the defences, may once have been the king’s gaol or “le Bydoutre”; its stones were used to repair Ouse Bridge (RCHM(E) v2, 91). Given the position of the tower, at the head of the narrow ravine carrying the Bishopgate beck and facing toward Bishopthorpe Road, and the fact that it may have been used as a prison, suggests that this tower may originally have been the gatehouse to the castle bailey, Unfortunately, it is likely that the evidence for this was removed in the seventeenth century, when the current artillery tower was constructed.

**Overview of 14th and 15th century occupation**

In this period, we see York at the height of its wealth. The civic authorities were involved in a massive corporate programme of building, including the construction of deep water port facilities and the stabilisation of the river banks, and the refurbishing and construction of new parts of the city wall, programmes which had major impacts on our study area. There was an increase in the backfilling of the burgage plots, indicating a growth in population. Reference to the poll tax returns reveals that the population in the area was mixed, ranging from merchants to labourers, but there were also people engaged in luxury trades, including a tapister, or tapestry maker, a tailor, and an apprentice lawyer (Fenwick 2005, 156). Furthermore, if we look at the amounts being paid, where they survive in the document, few are assessed at the bottom level of 4d, and in fact a quarter of the 47 surviving monetary assessments are for three shillings or more, suggesting that the urban core of our study area had, by the late Middle Ages, become an area of considerable affluence.

## Plan Area 4: The River Ouse

This study has so far concentrated on how settlement changed throughout the medieval period and whether it had been influenced by earlier periods of development, but it has not yet considered what was perhaps the main influence on settlement in this area, the River Ouse. Whilst the previous chapters have looked at buildings, field patterns, and road layouts, the main transportation highway of York has been largely ignored.

The river is arguably the cause of settlement in York; the promontory of land created by the confluence of the rivers Ouse and Foss is easily protected, and the tidal reach of the rivers made it accessible from the sea, allowing trade to flow. It is therefore unsurprising that it was chosen by the Romans as a place, initially, for military occupation and later civilian settlement.

That the river was vital to the citizens of York in the medieval period is clear as Tillotson states, “the city Jurors put the matter most succinctly at the end of the 14th century: the Ouse, they said, was a highway, and it was used by merchants coming up the Humber and thence to York and elsewhere in the County. It served for the great increase of the kingdom and especially of York, Yorkshire, and the other counties of the north parts” (VCH. 97).

The River Ouse is formed at the confluence of the rivers Ure and Swale, and in the medieval period was tidal up to this point. It presents the meandering aspect of a lowland river, meaning that the navigable channels migrate through the processes of active erosion; the banks on the outer edges of a meander are undercut while deposits of silt sand and gravel are laid along the inner bank. Depending on the flow of water and the amount of silt suspended within it, rather than heavy erosion of the banks, the riverbed itself can be scoured, thus creating bars and shoals (Lewin 1981, 43/4).

Whilst the above description outlines the process of erosion for a lowland river, it does not take into account the effects of a tidal regime. Tidal regimes tend to deposit finer material, due to the fact that heavier material is usually deposited by the river system further upstream; therefore, the material which reaches the estuary tends to be much finer. What the tidal regime does add, however, is a greater tendency for riverbed scour (Lewin 1981. 46-50). As stated above, scour results in the creation of bars and shoals which can change the course of deep water channels and provide hazards to navigation and potentially cutting inland ports, like York, from their trade networks.

Colin Briden has reconstructed a possible tidal pattern for York (Briden 1997). He calculated that the tide would enter the Humber as a wave travelling at 25kmph, and using calculations based on time, wavelength and distance, he suggests that high water at York would be 4hrs 45mins behind that of Hull. He also calculated that the mean high water spring tide (Spring tides are caused by the lunar cycle and occur just after the New and Full moons) would measure 3.4 m AOD at Ouse Bridge, and that the mean low water spring tide would measure approximately 1.9 m AOD, giving a tidal range of 1.5m. Finally, and most importantly, he calculated that the window of opportunity for bringing ships up to the city on the incoming tide, and their loading or unloading and subsequent dispatch on the outgoing tide, was probably 1.5 hours (Briden 1997, 166-167). It is worth noting that the above calculations are theoretical and rely on a river unencumbered by manmade obstacles. This

is of course impossible, as rivers provide many resources for the communities living along their banks. One of the earliest of these which may have been problematic for trying to model the movement of the river is the fishing industry.

During the medieval period the exploitation of riverine fish took two main forms, fish were either bred in ponds or trapped in rivers, both of which had some effect upon the natural processes of the river. The former method necessitated the construction of ponds, usually involving the damming or diversion of a natural watercourse in order to fill the ponds and provide them with a constant source of fresh, aerated water. This process can, however, deprive the commercial waterway of a large amount of water. The best example of this on the Ouse was the creation of the King's Fishpool, which effectively dammed off the water of the Foss. This had two effects upon the Ouse: 1) the incoming tide would be somewhat higher, as no water would be lost to the Foss, which was an advantage for the merchants based on the Ouse and a death knell for those based on the Foss, as ships were no longer able to pass up it. 2) on an outgoing tide, the deeper tide would create more scour on the Ouse, whilst more sediment would be laid in the Foss basin, thereby extending the promontory between the rivers and altering the navigable channels The "breakwater" observed during excavations at City Mills (YATGAZ 1983.2) mentioned above may have built in order to manage the change in tidal flow caused by the creation of the King's Fishpool.

To understand how important the flow of water was to the Ouse navigation, we may consider the event in the late 17th century when a sluice at the mouth of Dutch River collapsed and allowed water to flow up the river Don. According to antiquarian sources, this *"deprived York of two feet of water on the spring tides"* (Briden 1997, 169). This reduction of water would have commercial consequences, the depth of the water above the Don would be reduced, meaning that some ships with deeper keels would not be able to reach York, whilst those that did reach the city would have less time to load and unload cargoes.

The second method of commercial fish management involved the building of weirs and other structures in the river. Weirs not only cause a hazard to navigation in themselves, but depending on how they are built, they also tend to trap sediment and flotsam, creating artificial bars and shoals which can again change the navigable channel. The hazards that this causes are reflected in a reference in Magna Carta, which demanded all removal of fish weirs from rivers throughout England, except at the seashore (Carpenter 2015, 415).

The fishing industry was not the only impediment to navigation; the construction of mills deprived the river of water, diverting part of the river flow through leets to the millponds. Mill leets also necessitated the construction of partial dams which caused alterations in the river channels. It appears that by some point in the 14th century, the mayors of York were made responsible for ensuring that the Ouse navigation was clear of obstruction. A letter, preserved in the City House Books, reveals the extent of the Mayor's responsibilities. The letter, addressed to the Bishop of Durham, informs him of the Mayor's intention to inspect *"all gootes, ffishegarthes, milnes, milnedammes, lokkes, hebbing weres, piles, kidelles, hekkes, fflodeyates and all other impedimentes that bene newe arered, sett, fixd or elarged in any of the said rivers* [earlier in the text it mentioned that the Mayor is responsible for the rivers Ouse, Wharfe, Aire, Don, Nidd, Ure, Swale, Derwent and Humber] *within the tyme of King Edward the son of King Herry...and to charge and cause offenderes therayene to*

*castdowne, pulup and ammove all the said ffishgarthes and other premissez"* (Attreed 1991 v.1, 9).

One other major cause for concern, but not mentioned in the letter, was the construction of major pieces of infrastructure such as quays, staithes and bridge abutments, all of which could affect the flow of the river and the deposition of sediment. The Mayor of York did not have to worry about bridges none were built over the main Humber/Ouse navigation downstream of York. Staithes however were a different matter, as not only did they help to alter the course of the navigable channels, but they also might deprive York of trade; these are probably the "*other impedimentes*" mentioned in his letter.

**Effects on settlement**

There are a number of factors pertinent to the development of the river which may have had a direct bearing on settlement in the southwest of York, particularly in Zone 1.Firstly, the damming of the River Foss in the eleventh century effectively blocked the river to commercial transport. This would, probably, have caused a shift in the focus of commercial activity to the Ouse. While we cannot directly link this event to any part of the settlement of our area it may have been a contributing factor to the evidence riverbank encroachment identified at 23-28 Skeldergate (YATGAZ 1989.1).

The building of the stone wall around the Franciscan Friary in the late 13th century also had an immediate impact on our study area. Due to its solid nature, the Friary wall forced the river around it, creating a meander, as a result the erosion of the Skeldergate bank is increased. The wall is also too great an impediment to "*castdowne, pulup and ammove",* so an alternative solution had to be found. This resulted in the construction of the Skeldergate river wall and the new deep water wharf in the early 14th century, effectively canalising the river south of Ouse bridge.

## Chapter 4: Zone 2 - Clementhorpe, The Suburb. Map. 9

Clementhorpe is the name given to the section of the study area lying immediately outside the city walls in what could be considered the suburb of the city. Today it is dominated by nineteenth and twentieth-century housing and industrial development, which has created a plethora of new place names within it, few of which relate to its longer history. Old Nunthorpe, at the southern end of the zone, for example, relates to a post-medieval private estate. Whether this estate occupied land formerly owned by the medieval Priory of St. Clement is unclear. The more northerly Nunthorpe housing estate, named in honour of "Nunthorpe Court", a Victorian villa in whose gardens the estate was built. The Nunnery Lane estate is so called due to its proximity to the Bar Convent, a foundation of the seventeenth century, rather than the medieval nunnery of St Clement's. Nunnery Lane, which runs alongside the city walls, also gained its name from its proximity to this later foundation; in the medieval period it is believed that it was called Baggergate.

The name 'Clementhorpe' itself is confusing, as it not only applies to the neighbourhood, but also appears as a street name within the area. To differentiate between the two "(Str)" will be used in references to the road. Clementhorpe does not appear in the Domesday Survey. However, a near contemporary document detailing the rights and privileges of archbishop Thomas 1 (1070-1100), copied into the *Magnum Registrum Album* of York Minster, does mention *Clementesthorpe* (Peacock 1905.413), whilst an inquisition into the rights of the Archbishop taken in 1106 reveals that he is entitled to "... *all the tolls in Clementesthorpe from all ships that touch there...and below Clementesthorpe as far as the Archbishop's land stretches…"* (Leach 1891.196). From these two documents, we can show that a version of the place name "Clementhorpe" had been established by the eleventh century.

This place name is likely to have arisen after the establishment of a pre-Conquest church dedicated to St. Clement. The cult of St. Clement was popular from the ninth century and was particularly robust in areas of Scandinavian settlement. Indeed 75% of early dedications of churches to St. Clement lie within areas closely associated with the Scandinavian settlement of England (Dobson and Donaghey 1984.7). That the area should be named after a church is not unusual; Bishopthorpe, which lies three miles below York, on the river Ouse, was known as (St.) Andrewthorpe prior to the manor being bought by the Archbishop in the thirteenth century. The ruins of the old church of St. Andrew can still be seen on the banks of the river just below Bishopthorpe Palace.

The boundaries of Clementhorpe are difficult to define and it is quite possible that those which I am using do not conform exactly to the historical area. The eastern boundary is the most obvious, as it is the River Ouse. The northern boundary is taken as the current city walls. I have located the western boundary as Scarcroft Lane, as the historic property and field boundaries to the west of Scarcroft Lane align to Blossom Street (generally east/west, rather than the generally north/south alignments of those to the east of Scarcroft Lane). The southern boundary is the least well defined, and for ease of reference I have followed the southern boundary of the parish of St. Mary Bishophill Senior as recorded on the 1889 Ordnance Survey. Part of this boundary follows a bank and ditch which can be traced on the

plan of Micklegate Ward Stray produced by John Lund Jnr, (Plate 3)in 1772, and a small fragment of it can be seen in aerial photographs showing Millthorpe School. (**Plate 5a**).

Archaeologically, the area has received little attention. Historically, the majority of, work has taken place in areas close to the walled city, where there has been greater pressure to redevelop. However, the recent redevelopment of Terry's Chocolate Factory in the southernmost area of this zone has allowed archaeologists some opportunity to redress this. Much of the research agenda for this zone has been determined by antiquarian interest in the Roman period finds and the mediaeval priory.

**Evidence for the Roman Occupation of Clementhorpe (Map 10)**

If we examine the extreme southern end of the zone, around the former Terry's factory, it is possible to suggest that a small Roman settlement existed in this area. The Royal Commission Survey reported that eighteenth-century gravel extraction uncovered a mass of debris spread over an area "within a compass of 50 to 60 yards*"* (RCHM(E). V1.63b). This debris included metalwork, pottery and animal bone. Although accurate recording was not possible at the time, the RCHM(E) located this find at (NG600496); a further occupation site was identified to the north (NG60074998) in the 1930s (RCHM(E).v1.63b).

A number of burials have also been found in the vicinity. In 1813 two stone coffins were recovered from *"*a field between Middlethorpe and Old Nunthorpe*",* and a further two coffins were recovered from the same field in 1826 (RCHM(E).v1.108b). There are two further burials recorded by the Royal Commission under the entries for Dringhouses: *"(iii) Coffins, a further four, of stone, are recorded from Dringhouses...two in Bawtry Field."* (RCHM(E). V1.107b). The reference to these two coffins is interesting as the Commission gained its information from *York and the East Riding,* a book by J.J. Sheahan and T. Whellan published in 1855, and according to their research the coffins were found in 1812 (Sheahan & Whellan 1855.651). Bawtry Fields, or more properly Bawtry Pastures, can be found on Lund's plan of the Micklegate Strays (Plate 3), located east of Bishopthorpe Road. The southernmost of these pastures lay within the civil parish of Dringhouses. The proximity of the dates between the coffins found in the *"field between Middlethorpe…"* and those found in Bawtry Field suggest that they may be the same find. In 1839, the York Philosophical Society reported that a skull and a coin of Claudius Gothicus was found near Campleshon Road (YPSR (1838), 24).

Excavations carried out by YAT in 2005 on the former Terry's site revealed evidence of linear cuts, identified as ditches (Ottaway 2011. 270), which aligned to the road and may indicate field divisions (Ottaway 2011. 370-71). The pottery recovered from these features dated to the mid-2nd to early 3rd century.

Taken as a whole, the evidence appears to indicate a small Roman settlement in the area of Old Nunthorpe which has similarities to that of Dringhouses. The settlements are each approximately 2 miles from York and situated on a narrow ridge of high ground above areas liable to seasonal flooding. Each displayed evidence of ditches which respect a road or suspected road alignment, and each has produced funerary evidence, although Ottaway (Ottaway 2011. 363) suspects that those in Dringhouses are more ad hoc  than those in Old Nunthorpe (Ottaway 2011, 271).

While we can speculate that there is a Roman settlement in the southern part of this zone, the northern part is more complicated. For many years it has been known that a large Roman cemetery has existed along Blossom Street running south towards Dringhouses, although the eastern extent of this cemetery has remained elusive. However, excavations by Field Archaeology Specialists (FAS) in 2003 at Moss Street Depot found that the Roman ground surface sloped from Blossom Street and Nunnery Lane, and that this formed a natural limit to the cemetery (FAS 2003, 27). Several burials have been recorded along Bishopthorpe Road, in the east of this zone, which may be related to those in Zone 1, Area 2.

The major evidence for Roman occupation in this area comes from an excavation carried out by YAT in 1976/7 at a site south of Clementhorpe(S) . Evidence from this site shows that the ground slope was terraced at a similar time to that in Zone 1, probably at some point in the late 2nd/early 3rd centuries (Brinklow et al 1986, 73). The terrace was occupied by a high-status building (Brinklow et al 1986. 71-2).

The sites outlined above occupy the extreme edges of this zone and therefore it is difficult to use them to create a hypothesis about the occupation of the entire zone during the Roman period, particularly as the northern ones should be viewed as relating to the development of the Roman *colonia* rather than as a separate occupation zone. This means that the interpretation of the relationship between the Roman and medieval occupation, with which I am primarily concerned, is based on only limited data.

**Post-Roman and Anglian Settlement**

There is limited evidence for any settlement at this period within this zone. Only the site of the Roman house at Clementhorpe(Str) has produced any suggestion of occupation. During the excavation at this site, YAT recovered evidence of a building lying to the west of the apsidal room of the Roman house, consisting of two beam slots, four post holes and a rammed pebble floor. Heavily abraded pottery of the 2nd and 3rd centuries was recovered from the fills of the cut features and from the floor matrix. The structure appeared to lie below a substantial cobble foundation, tentatively dated to the 9th century (Brinklow et al 1986. 72-3). Once again, there is no evidence as to whether this building was domestic or industrial, nor how it may reflect the nature of occupation within this plan zone.

**The ninth to the twelfth centuries**

Again, archaeological evidence for the occupation of this zone is limited to the material recovered from the site of the Roman house in Clementhorpe(Str). The most substantial feature recovered from this period was the cobble foundation mentioned above. The structure ran E-W and was approximately 30m long and the width varied between 1.5 and 2m. There are possibly return foundations at either end, which suggests that the foundation was intended to support the southern wall of a substantial building. Unfortunately, no associated floor levels were observed, so the purpose of the building and the nature of its construction are unknown. However, three large limestone blocks were found resting on the south eastern corner of the foundation which may indicate that the building may have had some element of stone construction incorporated within it (Moulden & Tweddle 1986. 57-61).

Given that this foundation lies some distance from the river and on top of a Roman terrace, it has been suggested that it is all that remains of the pre-Conquest church of St. Clement, which gave the wider area its name (Moulden & Tweddle 1986. 61). The presence of a church in this area indicates that there would have been some form of settlement close by, but the position of this has not yet been identified.

The construction of The Old Baile in the 11th century effectively separated Clementhorpe from Bishophill. As noted in the previous chapter, because we do not know the extent of the Roman and Anglian settlement it is not clear whether The Old Baile was built within an area of the old city or beyond its boundary in a part of early Clementhorpe , but its construction does mean that the valley of the stream, now enclosed within the Bishopgate sewer, became a natural boundary between late 11th century Clementhorpe and the medieval town of York. As the documents mentioned above have shown, Clementhorpe fell within the jurisdiction of the Archbishop and twelfth-century charters show that the land was tenanted by families in return for military service. The charters relating to the Huddleston family provide us with the most information about Clementhorpe in the mid-12th century.

In a document dating to 1140-56 we learn that the warden of St Peter's Hospital (later re-dedicated to St. Leonard) grants *"to William, son of Quenilda, of land in Clementhorpe, given by Gilbert, son of Nigel…"* (Farrar 1914, entry 215). This document may relate to an earlier forfeiture of land by Gilbert, recorded as: *"Surrender by Gilbert, son of Nigel, to the church of St. Peter and Roger, Archbishop of York, his Lord, of his right in Clementhorpe, in land and men, except the demesne messuage, garden and meadow, which he had given to the nuns of St. Clement and except a bovate (in Cawood) of the fee of St. Peter, which surrender he made because he and his ancestors had usurped these tenements which belonged to the Board of St. Peter, for which he and they are absolved…*(Farrar 1914, entry 39). This second document suggests that although Gilbert had agreed to give land to St. Peter's (St. Leonard's) hospital he, or his father, had reneged on a deal, and in order to be absolved of his offence against the church, he returned all of his lands in Clementhorpe to his overlord the Archbishop. The second document also reveals that by the time Gilbert made his forfeiture he had given his principal dwelling place in Clementhorpe, a garden, and meadowland to the nunnery of St. Clement. This is important as the foundation document mentions that the nuns were already living in Clementhorpe when the priory was founded in c1130 (Farrar 1914 entry 357).

Richard de Huddleston, Gilbert's nephew, also held property in Clementhorpe, and from his charter granting the use of his dwelling house to his steward, we learn a little more about the area. The house and plot is described as *"being equal in width towards the land of Gamel Stute as to the water [presumably the river Ouse] for 2s yearly and, when the donor comes to York, by finding fire, candle, salt and straw; if there be war in the land Avenel shall deliver the house with its chamber to the donor to uphold and shall be quit of all service whilst the donor dwells in the town and shall dwell in other houses in the court and shall have access to the water through the house* (Farrar 1914, entry 216).

From this document we can suggest that Richard's property has access to the river and is substantial, as it has other dwelling houses within its boundary. The principal house has direct access to the river, whilst the lesser dwellings can access this resource presumably

via a pathway through the grounds of the principal dwelling. We can also determine that Richard had a neighbour, this is discussed further in chapter six .

One final document of similar date worth considering relates to a grant of land to Nostell Priory, founded in 1122. In it we find *"Hugh the Chaplain, son of Duugald, to the Canons of Nostell of two tofts in the street called Clementhorpe, late of Duuegald the donor's father, with all the buildings, rents, gardens and all other things within the confines of the land"* (Farrar 1914, entry 217). This is not only another substantial grant of land, but also the first mention of a street called Clementhorpe, and it also gives us perhaps the name of another person, Duugald, that may have owed service to the Archbishop.

**The twelfth to sixteenth centuries**

The Priory of St. Clement was founded at some point between 1125 and 1133 (Burton 1979, 6) by Archbishop Thurstan. It was the first post-Conquest nunnery to be founded in the north of England and the only one in Yorkshire to be founded by a cleric (Dobson & Donaghey 1984. 9). In his foundation charter Thurstan granted the priory two carucates of land from his shire in York, but we know this cannot all have been in Clementhorpe, as this would mean that the entire area had been granted to the nunnery and as the documents above show Gilbert de Huddleston, his nephew Richard, Gamel Stute and Nostell Priory all held lands within Clementhorpe after the Priory was founded.

The excavations at the Roman house in Clementhorpe revealed evidence that the priory church occupied the same site as the building identified as the pre-conquest church of St. Clement; indeed, some of the burials associated with the later foundation cut into the cobble foundation of the earlier church (Moulden & Tweddle 1986. 59). A surviving section of a limestone wall has been incorporated into the boundary wall at the rear of Colenso Street, and can be identified as part of the surviving buildings of the priory recorded on the 1852 Ordnance Survey plan of the area. A more visible section of the priory wall can be seen on the corner of Cherry Street and Clementhorpe(Str), this is likely to be part of the boundary wall shown on the 1852 OS. Excavations at numbers 4 (Allen 2017) and 6 Colenso (Dean 2004) Street have revealed several burials . If we take these factors into account we can surmise that, Cherry Street runs close to what was the western boundary of the Priory, whilst the northern boundary must have lay along Clementhorpe(Str). The eastern boundary is formed by the river, so only the southern boundary of the priory is unclear. Recent excavations at Clementhorpe Maltings revealed that further E-W orientated burials in this area (Loffman 2016). Finally, the presence of a well dedicated to St. Clement recorded on the 1852 OS suggests that the southern boundary may lie close to the St. Clement parish boundary reconstructed by Harvey (1963, 382) at the rear of Vine Street.
(**Map 11).**

While the above evidence helps to locate the precinct of the Priory, by using the 1852 OS alongside Lund's plan of Micklegate Ward Stray (Plate 3) we may be able to locate the wider "home" estate of the priory. (**Map 12**) On Lund's plan, the outfall of Clementhorpe Beck forms a field boundary which divides Nun Ings into two parts. This boundary proceeds through Bawtry Pastures, following the course of another drain now buried beneath Cameron Grove, to Bishopthorpe Road. The boundary line continues for a short distance before turning back toward the city, making an odd dog leg to enclose Pill Close Common

and Nun Mill Common. On reaching Scarcroft, the boundary returns toward the river, crossing Bishopthorpe Road once more. These boundaries can be easily traced on OS plans from 1850 to 1910 and seem to form a distinct estate. Within this "estate" we see that a windmill sat within the Nun Mill Common, and this mill may have been the successor to one of the original mills granted to the priory upon its foundation.

Returning to Lund's plan (Plate 3)we can see that the fields are labelled "common" and "not common"; the latter cluster along Nunnery Lane (Baggergate, in the medieval period) and Clementhorpe(Str). This suggests that these closes represent a different form of land use to their "common" neighbours. The right of common was important to the freemen of the city and Lund's surveys of the Strays of York was probably undertaken in order to investigate infringements on those rights. Rights of common existed in two forms: whole year pasture and "average" pasture. Whole year pasture in York's SW suburb was provided by the Knavesmire, whilst "average" (half-yearly pasturage) was exercised over the majority of the other fields in the area[12]. A close look at the "not common" closes suggests the form of a settlement, reminiscent of a medieval linear village, dominated at its eastern end by the site of the Priory. We can trace a "green" and a series of tofts or enclosures which respect the Nunnery Lane road alignment. Could this be the site of medieval Clementhorpe (**Map 13)**? This is something I will return to in a later chapter.

Ever since Drake, historians of the city have suggested that there was a substantial settlement in Clementhorpe, and we have already seen that there are several large land holdings in the area which contained more than one dwelling house or multiple tofts. There are multiple documents dated after the founding of the Priory which detail the granting of property or rents to religious institutions. Several wills dating to the late 14th century also mention properties in Clementhorpe (Raine 1955, 317) one of which bordered the "King's Ditch" or city moat. The Poll Tax Roll of 1381 records at least 39 people who were liable to pay the tax, but due to damage this list is incomplete (Fenwick 2005, 155-156) and excludes persons under 14, beggars (those unable to meet the 4d minimum payment) and clergy, so we are unable to calculate a minimum density for housing at this time, nor can we say how densely each house was occupied:

Clementhorpe seems to have had a mixed economy by the 14th century, we know from the documents outlining the rights of the Archbishops, outlined above, that there were staithes where ships could load and unload, and fisheries. The averaged (see footnote 4, chapter 2) fields were used for agriculture, and the Priory operated the mills. The Poll Tax of 1381 records show that Clementhorpe was home to at least four shipbuilders, two fullers and a fishmonger, all of whom may have worked outside the area, but would have needed access to the river or some other source of water to carry out their trades. It should be noted that Clementhorpe was a centre for shipbuilding in York until the twentieth century. Apart from the agricultural aspect of the Clementhorpe economy, everything else appears to be concentrated close to the city, indicating that this was the economic and social focus of the community. This is perhaps augmented by the presence of the Priory, whose precinct and home farm prevented expansion southwards along Bishopthorpe Road, and that of the whole year pasture of Scarcroft and the averaged lands of York Fields, both important parts of the lands of Micklegate Stray over which the freemen of the city exercised authority.

[12] For a fuller discussion of this see VCH pp 498-506.

There was a major change in the religious landscape of the area in the fifteenth century, when a chapel was erected close to the nun's windmill. It was built on the supposed site of the execution of Archbishop Scrope and was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary (Raine 1955.319). Scrope was executed in 1408, and we know that the chapel was built within twenty years of this event, as Raine (1955.319) cites the will of William Donyngton, who left 12d for the fabric of the chapel in 1427. The site of the chapel is now lost, but several documents refer to it. In his discussion concerning the chapel Raine refers to a list of chantry lands compiled in 1585, which mentions a piece of land on the road to Middlethorpe called "Scrope Chappell" and an extract from the will of Richard Roxby in which he bequeaths *"one little close called 'Scroope chappell' close, lying nere Clementhorpe, at the fote or skerte of the hill, whereupon standeth a wyndmyll called Nune Mill"* (Raine 1955.319). This is thought to lie north of the present Southlands Chapel (the site of the Nun Mill), and between Bishopthorpe Road and Nunmill Street. It is possible that this execution site was chosen as it is a point of high ground from which it would have been possible to see both York Minster, and Bishopthorpe Palace and therefore remind the Archbishop of what he had forfeited in committing treason.

## Chapter 5: Zone 3 - Middlethorpe, The Rural Hinterland

Middlethorpe marks the southern boundary of my study area, dictated by the fact that it forms the southernmost extent of the parish of St. Mary Veteris (Bishophill Senior). Apart from the twentieth-century housing estate on its western edge and the new A64 which cuts across the southern half of the township, much of the landscape mapped by Samuel Parsons (**Plate 2)** in 1624 can still be traced in the fields of Middlethorpe today (**Map 14**). The village projects the aspect of a planned estate village oddly dominated by two large houses: The earliest, Middlethorpe Manor, is believed to occupy the site of the capital messuage of Middlethorpe (RCHM(E) v3.121) sits at the eastern end of the village, while the early 18th century Middlethorpe Hall (Pevsner et al 1995.160) is situated at the western end.

The Parsons map gives us a picture of Middlethorpe in the early seventeenth century, but close examination suggests that it has been encroached upon by the neighbouring manor of Dringhouses. On the eastern side of the plan an odd parcel of land between "Yorke Common Field" and "Bustard Hall Garths" has been annexed to Dringhouses. This is mirrored in the 19th-century parish boundary of Holy Trinity Micklegate (**Map 2.3)**. whereas Lund's plan of the Micklegate Stray (Plate 3) clearly shows that the boundary between Middlethorpe and York is along the boundary of "York Field Common", along a right of way described by Parsons as "Bustard Lane". The western boundary of Middlethorpe is equally unclear. On Parsons' plan, the enclosures along Tadcaster Road are labelled "Streate Lands" and are part of the manor of Dringhouses, but close examination of the plan reveals that the northernmost of these enclosures is bounded by "Cherry Lane", a common lane giving access to the Knavesmire and, as can be seen on Parsons' map, this lane forms a partial boundary of Middlethorpe (**Map 15**). The southern boundary of Middlethorpe follows the course of a drain until it meets "Sim Balk Lane", the boundary between Middlethorpe and the neighbouring ville of Copmanthorpe. Given these parameters it would make sense to suggest that the "Streate Lands that lie between these two boundaries formerly were in former times part of Middlethorpe.

Little controlled archaeological excavation has taken place in Middlethorpe, and that which has was limited to watching briefs for foundations or utilities. Almost all our knowledge for the history of Middlethorpe lies within the historical records, which allow us to name the landholders of the medieval period and the size of their holdings, but little else. Nevertheless, we can make some educated guesses as to how the land was used, given the nature and purpose of the relevant documents. Domesday Book, for example, is primarily concerned with agricultural land, mills and other taxable resources, and in the Yorkshire folios, meadow, moor and in some cases woodlands are not usually recorded. The late 13th century inquest of John de Kirkby, however, appears to simply record all the land within a township regardless of its use.

Reference to documents for Middlethorpe is further complicated by the fact that it is known by multiple names, depending on the origins of the document itself. In various documents Middlethorpe is referred to as "Thorpe", "Thorpe Atun", Thorpe juxta Ebor" and in one case "Thorpe Acum"

**The Domesday Survey**

Domesday references tend to follow the same pattern: Place name, pre-conquest landholder, tenant's name, amount of land and rental fee, number of ploughs. This is followed by: current landholder, status of the land, taxable value at the time of King Edward, taxable value at the time of survey. The land is usually measured in "carucates" which are subdivided into "bovates". A bovate is the area of land capable of being ploughed by a single ox, a plough team consists of eight oxen. There are 8 bovates to the carucate, unfortunately there are two measurements for the carucate, 160 acres ore 180 acres depending on whether a two or three field system[13] is being used to cultivate the land, something which Domesday does not record.

There are several entries for Middlethorpe within the Domesday survey, because the township was divided among several landholders. The first entry relates to Robert Malet, Lord of the Honour of Eye. He is in possession of one carucate of land which is capable of supporting half a plough. The land is now waste and produces sufficient income to pay a tax of 3 shillings. Before the Conquest this land had been in the possession of Christ Church (Holy Trinity, Micklegate) and had produced a tax of 20 shillings (Yorkshire Domesday f231). The next entry for Middlethorpe concerns the land of Richard fitzErfast. He held 2 carucates of land enough to support 1.5 ploughs, like the land held by Robert Malet it was now waste, but it was still valued at 8 shillings. Unfortunately, in this case, the pre-conquest value is unrecorded, but we are told that this land, like that of his neighbour, formerly belonged to Christ's Church. (Yorkshire Domesday f327).

These two entries tell us that Middlethorpe was once an estate of Christ's Church, the Anglo-Saxon religious complex situated at the top of Micklegate in York, which was to be later re-founded as the Priory of the Holy Trinity. If Richard fitzErfast's property had devalued the same the same rate as that of his neighbour (around 85%) then it may have been worth as much as 53 shillings 4 pence prior to the conquest, giving a total value of 73 shillings 4d for the whole estate. One further detail contained within this document is that the land given to Robert Malet was formerly tenanted by an individual called Gamal, whereas no tenants are recorded for the land of Richard fitzErfast. This may indicate that there were differing methods of cultivation being undertaken within the earlier monastic estate, could Gamal be farming his land on a two field system (therefore only requiring the use of half a plough team) whilst the occupants of the other two thirds of the estate operated a three field system? .

**John de Kirkby's Inquest, c1284**

Kirkby's Inquest was undertaken at the behest of King Edward I, in order to enumerate the fees and duties by which the King's subjects held land from him. If the date is correct, it took place just after Edward had completed his conquest of Wales and its primary aim was

[13] According to the *Fleta,* a thirteenth century treatise on English Common Law, if fields are being cultivated in a three field system there are 180 acres to the carucate, 60 of which are fallow, 60 used for spring corn and 60 used for winter corn. If the land is farmed in a two field system there were 160 acres to the carucate, 80 fallow and 80 under the plough, only land under the plough was reckoned for tax purposes, ie 120 acres in the three field system or 80 in the two field system . (Seld.Soc.v72.241)

probably to work out how he was going to raise funds in order to pay off the debts incurred in this enterprise.

Kirkby tells us that there were three carucates of land in “Thorpe Malteby”, one of the many names for Middlethorpe. It states that the Abbot of Byland held 19 bovates from the Abbot of Selby, who, in turn, held them from the Fee of Mowbray, and also that Robert Bustard held 6 bovates from the Abbot of Whitby, who in turn holds them from the Fee of Mowbray. Robert Bustard also held the remaining land from Richard Malebys, who in turn held them from the Honour of Eye (Skaife 1867. 23).

The Inquest demonstrates that a considerable amount of land exchange had taken place since the Domesday survey. In the Honour of Eye, the Malet family continued to hold this land, that the holding was still intact as a land unit, and that it was tenanted by Richard Malebys and further sublet to Robert Bustard. The two carucates of land formerly held by Richard fitzErfast had passed to the Mowbray family, and they in turn had granted it to various religious foundations, and the parcel of land which had been granted to Whitby Abbey was sub-tenanted by Robert Bustard.

In his assessment of the Liberty of Byland, Kirkby returns to Middlethorpe and tells us that for his lands in “Thorpe Juxta Ebor” (another of the many names for Middlethorpe), the Abbot of Byland owed service to the Abbot of Selby who, in turn, owes the king the military service under the rule where twelve carucates make up a knight’s fee (Skaife 1867. 105). In practice this meant that if you held twelve carucates of land, you owed the king the annual service requirements of a knight, or the pro rata portion thereof. Since the Abbot of Byland only owed 18% of a knight, he almost certainly paid a cash equivalent.

**The land grant to Whitby Abbey**

The gift to Whitby abbey took place prior to 1175 (based on the death of Galfrid, Prior of Nostell, one of the witnesses to the charter (Atkinson 1878. 226, item 283, fn5) and it is clear that Roger de Mowbray gave his land to Whitby Abbey free of service[14] “*... I have given and granted to the church of Whitby...as a free and permanent endowment all the holdings which Reginald Poer held of me in Thorp...six bovates of land with the field belonging to them and* the rate of service would be met by Roger de Mowbray and not the abbey, essentially creating a small island of land over which the king has no claim[15]
This was a costly grant as Roger had previously let the some of the land to Robert, or Raynald Poer; “*I give to Raynald Poer two bovates of land in Thorp by York, which Osbert holds, and the service of Osbert himself and his heirs, free and quit of all service and custom*

[14] Service is owed to a landlord by his tenants. It was originally based on military service and has its basis in the feudal system. The King owns the whole country but has no standing army with which to protect it, so in return for providing him with soldiers he lets the land to his nobles. Like the King the nobles need men to protect their tenancies from their neighbours, so they let their lands to the knights and so on. At each level the cost of raising an army is defrayed. The knights summon their men at arms (the sub tenants of their land) and attend the nobles, the nobles take their knights and their men-at-arms and attend the king, the king has an army. While this works in theory the number of these sub-tenancies, or subinfeuds, made the system unworkable and a service in kind, usually cash or some valuable commercial item, was accepted in lieu.
[15] A process known as alienation; this was one of the factors which led to the dissolution of the monasteries in the 16th century.

*for the service of one pound of pepper per year*…" (Williams 2014, 92, item cclxxxi). In other words, in exchange for a pound of pepper Robert and his heirs do not have to provide military service or pay the equivalent. Robert/Reginald Poer was also the tenant of the other four bovates of the Whitby gift, "*...to Reginald Poer… the half carucate* [four bovates] *of land in thorp which the said Herbert held as a hereditary fee… entire, free and undisturbed, with all things belonging to the said land, and with all the free customs, and by service of a pair of scarlet stockings to be paid annually…"* (Williams 2014, 84, item cclviii). As can be seen, Roger de Mowbray has again waived the service fee, this time in favour of a pair of stockings made from scarlet, a rich and expensive cloth, possibly imported from the continent. Both the stockings and the pepper would have made excellent items for gift exchange and as such would probably have improved Roger's presence among his contemporaries.
Between them these documents show that Reginald Poer held 6 bovates of land, and received the service of a peasant named Osbert, from Roger de Mowbray. When the land was transferred to Whitby Abbey they retained all of Reginald's rights, including the service of Osbert and his family. Osbert is important as he is identified in the Whitby Cartulary both as Osbert of Thorpe and Osbert Bustard, and he eventually becomes the tenant of the whole land grant (Atkinson, 1879, 227, item 284) Unfortunately the document stating this is undated but it must have been fairly soon after the land was given to Whitby Abbey. This may account for the plethora of fields containing the name "Bustard" in the north eastern corner of Middlethorpe, discussed below, which may also help us locate the lands granted to Whitby Abbey.

**Middlethorpe in the fourteenth century**

The documents dealing with Middlethorpe at this time can once again be divided into tax returns and land transfers, with the latter tending to concern the land belonging to Whitby Abbey. On a national scale, we have the "*Feoda Militum in Wapentagio de Aynsty",* or "Knight's fees in the Wapentake of Ainsty". This document lays out the nature of military service owed by all land holders in the area and was created around 1300. There was also a Lay Subsidy assessment taken at the same time.

A rough translation of the knight's fees register reveals that in Thorp Atun (yet another of Middlethorpe's names), there were four carucates and two bovates of land, held under the rule of 15 carucates to the knight's fee, of which 19 bovates belonged to the Fee of Mowbray, 6 bovates to the Abbot of Whitby, and 9 bovates to the Honour of Eye. These lands were further subdivided: the Abbot of Byland 13 bovates (presumably the lands he tenanted from the Mowbray Fee via the Abbot of Selby (see above)), Elena de Sutton 2 bovates, Adam de Thorpe 5.5 bovates, Robert Bustard 4 bovates, the Prioress of St. Clement 3.5 bovates, John de Gray 6 bovates from the Honour of Eye and 2 bovates in the area of Tofte Flatt. The Lay Subsidy records that Elena de Sutton owed 8d, of which she had paid 4, Adam de Thorpe owed 20d, and that John de Grey owed 2s for the land he held from the Honour of Eye (Skaife 1867. 216-7).

If we compare this to the details in the Kirkby Inquest, we can see that by the 14th century, the number of subtenants in Middlethorpe had increased, and that some of the established landholders had reduced the size of their holdings. There had also been an increase in the number of religious houses tenanting Middlethorpe. Whitby Abbey retained its 6 bovates,

Byland Abbey had reduced its direct holdings from 19 to 13 bovates, and St. Clement's Priory had a holding of 3.5 bovates. Being religious bodies, all three were exempt from the Lay Subsidy taxation, thus reducing the taxable land in Middlethorpe from 34 bovates to 11.5. Only three lay people there were paying taxes: Elena Sutton, Adam Thorpe and John Grey. We know that John Grey rented 6 of the 9 bovates of the Honour of Eye, but as "tofteflatt" is not part of that, and as he is not taxed on it, it must be rented from one of the religious houses. Adam Thorpe is likely to be holding from the Mowbray fee, whilst Elena Sutton's parcel lies in the Honour of Eye.

**The Whitby Abbey holding** (**Map 16 &17**)

The record of knight's fees records that Robert Bustard was the tenant of 4 bovates of land (Skaife 1867. 217), which is confirmed in the inquisition post-mortem carried out on Robert's estate in 1301 ( Sharp & Stamp 1931, 43, item 70). The Whitby lands can be further traced through subsequent post-mortem inquests. Interestingly that of Robert's, son, John taken in 1323 reveals that the size of a bovate had, at some point, been reduced by about half to 7 acres, rather than the generally accepted measurement of 15 that most scholars continue to use today "*Middlethorpe, two parts of a messuage and of 4 bovates of land each containing 7 acres held jointly in form of the … of Whitby",* ( Sharp and Stamp 1910, 227-8, item 387). If we follow the trail of these inquisitions, we find that the holding passes out of the hands of the Bustard family by the early fifteenth century. The inquisition of Maud Bustard, the granddaughter of John, reveals that her share of the property passed to William Dayvell, her son ( Kirby 1995, 161-2, item 513)

On Parsons' map (Plate 2), There are two places bearing the name "Bustard", the first "Bustard Lane", which runs along the southern boundary of "Yorke Common Field" (Lund's plan (Plate 3)) and a second "Bustard Hall Garths", applies to large field south of "Thief Lane". The fields west of Bishopthorpe Road, although not named on Parsons' map, are known as "Bustard Fields". If this area is isolated and we exclude the water meadows, or ings, then we arrive at a plan area of 90.3 acres. We know that Whitby Abbey was granted 6 bovates of land, using the accepted calculation of 15 acres to the bovate, then we arrive at a grant of 90 acres. Allowing for error in measurement, the two are remarkably similar and therefore it is highly likely that this area of land is that which was granted to Whitby Abbey. In which case we have to ask an important question...

**Where is Bustardthorpe?** (**Map 18)**

So far as I have been able to ascertain Bustardthorpe is first mentioned in John de Kirkby's inquisition, this records a land parcel of 3 carucates held directly from the king by Geoffrey, Baron de Lutterell (2 carucates) and David le Lardiner (1 carucate) (Skaife 1867.23). This quite clearly demonstrates that "Bustardthorpe" cannot lie, even partially, in Middlethorpe as this lies in the fees of Mowbray and Eye . The same document also states that Robert Bustard is the tenant of all of David Lardiner's land. The "Knight's Fees" informs us that Robert Bustard held a carucate of land from David Lardiner, whilst one Richard Bustard held half a bovate of land from the Lutterell lordship (Skaife 1867. 216). I suggest that it lies north of Middlethorpe and south of the city of York, between the river Ouse and the Tadcaster Road.

A quick comparison John de Kirkby records that there are 3 carucates of land in Bustardthorpe but we can see that even if add all of the pasture and meadowland it does not compare with the area of the similar sized Middlethorpe, so how do we account for this discrepancy. The late 13th century saw reforms to both the knight's fee and the rules of serjeantry, King Edward 1. was keen to increase the number of knights available for service, (Powicke 1962.546) explains that it was his purpose to turn country gentlemen who could afford the trappings of knighthood into a competent cavalry reserve, responsible directly to him. In effect all persons with an income comparable to that of a knight were to be forced to accept this elevation of their status, a process known as *distraint.* One of the qualifications for knighthood was land, and we know from the *inquest post-mortem* of John, son of Robert Bustard (Sharp & Stamp 1910. 227-8, item 387) that the size of a carucate had been reduced by half prior to 1323.

This reduction in the size of the carucate may be connected with Edward's reform of knighthood. Closer examination of the *Feoda Militum in Wapentago de Aynsty* (c1300) reveals that Lord Luterell's service for his lands in Bustardthorpe is being assessed differently to that of his neighbours in Middlethorpe (Skaife 1867. 217-218) suggesting that this change in land measurement occurs is part of Edward's reforms. The area outlined on the map contains around 350 acres in total, this includes c12 acres of meadow and about 130 acres of pasture meaning that there is approximately 208 acres of arable land just shy of the 240 acres required of a two field system measured in the new 13th century small carucate system outlined above.

While my initial thought was that the entirety of Bustardthorpe lay to the east of the Knavesmire, however further map analysis indicated that South Bank, which marks the northern boundary of Bustardthorpe, extends further to the west, towards Holgate Beck. On the western side of the Knavesmire lies Little Hob Moor, a part of the parish of St. Mary Veteris (Bishophill Snr.), and a small enclosure to the east of the Tadcaster Road called Gallows Flatts. Both of these areas contain evidence of medieval ridge and furrow. There is also evince of ridge and furrow in the close between the railway and a water course called Chaloners Whinn, to the north of Little Hob Moor (Smith 2004.12). I have suggested that both of these areas may once have been parts of Bustardthope, and like the areas to the east of the Knavesmire these land areas were once part of the patrimony of the archbishops of York (Harvey 1965.382).
While this doubles the initial size I envisioned for Bustardthorpe, it is still likely that it was assessed under the new small carucate system rather than the old system applied to Middlethorpe. Furthermore, as both Lord Luterell and David le Lardiner are tenants in chief it suggests that Bustardthorpe was part of the King's demesne around York. The latter assumption conflicts with Harvey (1965. 377-393) who suggests that the entire area outlined was the property of the archbishop either directly or under the jurisdiction of the Dean and Chapter of York. How this land came into the hands of the king is unclear but it may have occurred in the early 13th century when King John confiscated the estates of his half-brother, Geoffrey, Archbishop of York, in 1207, following Geoffrey's refusal to support his tax (Poole 1955.445). Geoffrey de Luttrell (1158-1218) was a staunch supporter of King John (Backhouse 1989.16), whilst the Lardiner family were the hereditary serjeants of the King's Larder in York and therefore part of the greater royal household. It seems likely that the archbishops' estates were returned in 1215, upon the election of Walter de Gray, King

John's former chancellor, as Primate (Tindal Hart 1986.47). Having worked so closely together it is likely that some agreement was reached that allowed John's supporters to keep lands that had been awarded them out of the archbishops' territory.

Why is Bustardthorpe called Bustardthorpe? The earliest reference that I have found is in 1270/1 in the *inquisition post-mortem* of David le Lardiner where it states that he receives rent of 7s from Thomas Bustard for lands in Bustardthorpe (CIPM, v1, Hen 3, item 753). The Bustard family appear to be the most constant tenants in the area and therefore it seems that if the hypothesis laid out above is correct, it would appear to be their name that the various commissioners adopted to refer to this former piece of the archbishop's estate.

## Chapter 6: Landscape and Settlement.

So far in this dissertation I have summarised the archaeological data relating to the medieval settlement of the area south west of the river Ouse. Three areas plan zones have been identified and examined on an individual basis, in this chapter I aim to bring these separate studies together and examine how they interrelate.

Having treated each Plan Zone individually I should perhaps look at the wider implications of settlement in the area so that it is possible to see how it affected the entire study area and fits into the current thinking about the development of York as a whole, as with the earlier chapters I will examine the nature of earlier settlement in order to identify any effects this may have had upon the medieval landscape.

**Roman York: City and Hinterland.**

Roman military intervention into the York area is believed to have begun in around 69 AD and a fort was built between the rivers Ouse and Foss shortly after this  The site was probably chosen for a number of reasons, firstly it lies at the head of the tidal reach of the rivers Ouse and Foss, allowing access to seaborne supply, secondly it lies at a natural bridging point of these rivers making it a hub for both east/west and north/south land transport. York was in fact the only place, along the entire length of the river Ouse, in possession of a bridge crossing rather than a ferry, a situation unchanged until the 18th century.

The Roman Terracing

While the strategic position made York a natural choice for the military, the accessibility of the site began to attract civilian settlement. Brinklow (1984.23) suggests that settlement around the fort may have begun as early as AD 80, while the Royal Commissioners identified evidence for the settlement of the area at the top of Micklegate, on the southern bank of the Ouse, dating to the early 2nd century (RCHM(E) v1.xxxv). As has been shown in chapter 3, it does not appear that settlement based on the southern bank of the Ouse expanded into Zone 1 of my study area until the late 2nd century when work began on the terracing of the river escarpment. The terrace at Bishophill Senior seems to have been part of a wider scheme to bring more of the southern bank of the Ouse into use, evidence of terracing has come from a number of sites within the *Colonia*, beyond our study area. This has led to some speculation that this was undertaken as part of a major programme of civil engineering connected with York being granted *Colonia* status (Perrin 1981).

Evidence of terracing also occurs in Zone 2. The Roman House in Clementhorpe is set on an artificial terrace evidence for which was recovered from the excavations and dated to the late 2$^{nd}$ century, (Brinklow et al, 1986.68), further evidence of terracing in this area is perhaps evident in preserved property boundaries.

Roman Roads

If the construction of these terraces represents evidence of a major civil engineering programme then road building should be seen as another. So far only one section of road has been positively identified within my study area and that lies in Zone 1., close to the river.

Currently archaeologists have identified 11 roads which approach the city, these have been numbered sequentially and run anticlockwise around the fortress (**Map 19**). In 1981 a deep sewer excavation in Bishopthorpe Road (YATGAZ 1981.1026) recovered evidence of a cobbled surface over 2m below the current road level; this was identified as evidence for a possible Roman road (designated 12) leading to either Castleford or Doncaster (Brinklow et al 1986. 101). Credence is given to there being a road in this area by the presence of the possible Roman settlement site identified in the vicinity of the Terry's factory detailed in chapter 4.

If a road is located here, then it makes use of a ridge of high ground similar to that made by Road 10 (the modern Tadcaster Road). There is a possibility that road 12 runs slightly closer to the river than the modern Bishopthorpe Road. The housing estates constructed in the 19th century tend to preserve within them the boundaries of the fields on which they were built, these in turn, can align with earlier rights of way.

On the 1852 Ordnance Survey plan a footpath is recorded running along an alignment similar to the modern Cherry Street. Housing built in the early 20th century respects and maintains this right of way. This footpath follows the natural contours of Scarcroft ridge and unlike the modern Bishopthorpe Road does not require traffic to make a direct, steep, ascent to reach the ridge summit.

A second alignment can be traced further south running between Richardson Street and Reginald Grove, although this alignment has been encroached upon by more modern buildings when drawn out it passes along a contour, avoiding the climbs and twists of the modern road, At its northern end it can be projected to join up with Cherry Street alignment whilst at the southern end it passes through the possible settlement near to the Terry's factory.

Such fossilised routeways can be found elsewhere in York, the route of road 4 to Malton is partially preserved in the streets and alleys of The Groves, to the northeast of the city, similarly road 5 can be traced through the roads and alleys of Clifton. While major roads such as A1036,Tadcaster Road, A19, Bootham and A1079 Hull Road continue to follow alignments similar to their Roman counterparts, Roads 10, 7 and 2 respectively.

If the road layout in Zones 2 and 3 is vague then that in Zone 1 is speculative. Zone 1 does contain the only confirmed Roman road in my study area, and it is highly likely that it followed the river. As yet there is no evidence for a Roman road running through the vicinity of Bishophill Senior, although one must have serviced the buildings discovered by Ramm during his excavations at the church site, and Carver during the excavations at 37 Bishophill Senior. To date the nearest fragment of road discovered in this area lies to the north of Zone 1 at the corner of Bishophill Junior and Prospect Terrace (see Ottaway 1993.70, fig 33) , However if Road 8 is projected south it passes close by these two sites and joins the Cherry

Street alignment mentioned above, on its way to Zone 1 a number of other Roman sites align with it, including, a bathhouse complex in Toft Green, a possible house on the corner of Tanner Row and Barker Lane, and a house in Bishophill Junior. The Royal Commissioners argued that this road alignment may represent one of the axial roads of a Roman grid preserved, in a somewhat distorted fashion in the medieval road system (RCHM(E) v1.49), although Palliser believed this to be open to debate (Palliser 1984.103).

One final thought about the road alignments mentioned above is that the projection of Road 8 along Bishophill Senior meets the possible fossilised Road 12 beneath the motte of the Old Baile. It is here that Ramm suspected that there may have been a mileage origin point (Ramm 1984.45), similar to that found by Wenham during his excavations in Blossom Street (Wenham 1965) unfortunately as the excavations at Old Baile did not reach this archaeological level it is not possible to confirm this. However if such a point does exist beneath the motte it has implications for the limits of the Roman town in this area as that found by Whenham lay about 100m outside the *Colonia,* an origin point beneath the motte would place the southern extent of the *Colonia* somewhere in the vicinity of the north west defensive ditch of the Old Baile.

Extra-Mural Settlements

There are indications of a settlement close to the former Terry's (**Map 10**) factory, at the border between Zones 2 and 3 in this study. The evidence for this settlement, as has already been outlined, consists of organised land division, recovered by modern excavation, and some antiquarian discoveries.

In relation to the roman city, it lies at a similar position to Dringhouses, some two miles from the city centre along the Tadcaster Road. Both sites have yielded evidence for occupation from the mid-2nd century. Both have yielded evidence of organised land division, in the form of linear ditches aligned to a road (this is however speculative at the Terry's factory site as no road has yet been found). Each site has produced funerary evidence (Ottaway 2011.271 and 363) that is sufficiently distanced from that associated with the city of York to suggest that these are separate settlements rather than outlying villa complexes, and each has produced evidence of craft specialists; at Dringhouses there is evidence of metalworking whereas at Terry's factory antiquarians recovered not only metal work but large quantities of cattle bones (RCHME v1.63).

Recent excavations, ahead of the development of York University's East Campus, revealed a large settlement of similar date which displayed similar characteristics to both that of Dringhouses and Terry's Factory (Neal and Roskams 2013) suggesting that the Roman city of York was surrounded by a number of satellite settlements approximately 2 miles from its centre. It is possible that York is not alone in this as a settlement has been identified at Marton cum Grafton, some 2 miles southeast of the Roman town at Aldborough (Isurium Brigantum) and is currently under investigation by researchers at the University of York.

If we accept that the material from the area surrounding Terry's Factory may represent a small settlement then the case for there being a road in the area is further strengthened.

The decline of Roman York.

Roman York, probably, reached its zenith in the third century. It was capital to the province of *Britannia Inferior*, formalised by the emperor Caracalla following the provincial reforms envisioned by his father Septimius Severus, as I have shown above, this period of the late 2nd and early 3rd centuries is one that appears in the archaeological record to reflect a period of growth and expansion for the city. In Zone 1 of my study area there appears to be evidence of the abandonment of more the more peripheral areas of the Roman city, the well shaft discovered at 58/9 Skeldergate is backfilled (Bishop 1976a.7) and the road appears to have been abandoned (Bishop 1976b.14). At 37 Bishophill Senior, Carver suggests that following a programme of rebuilding in the late 3rd century, the building he identified was still, at least partially, standing into the 9th century but had been subject to a long programme of robbing (Carver 1976a.5), possibly begun fairly soon after abandonment as some contexts were sealed by dark earths (Carver 1976b.12). Ramm was equally uncertain about the abandonment of the building located beneath St. Mary Veteris (Bishophill Senior) suggesting that there was some evidence for the partial abandonment or subdivision of this building at some point in the late 4th/early 5th century (Ramm 1976.45).

This period of decay towards the end of the 4th century is witnessed across the city. Ottaway records that areas of the fort were being used as dumps, that the military bath house had been partially demolished, while the *principia* basilica showed evidence of being used as a metal workshop. Sites across the *colonia* also appear to show not only abandonment in the late 4th century but wholesale demolition particularly along the riverfront (Ottaway 1999.148-149).

In the hinterland of the Roman town there is little evidence for late Roman occupation, the Terry's Factory settlement has yielded no evidence. The settlement at Dringhouses seems to follow a similar pattern of decay to that of its larger neighbour with pottery sequences terminating in the late 4th century (Ottaway 2011). The Heslington East settlement also seems to be abandoned in the late 4th/early 5th century (Neal and Roskams 2013.15).

**Post-Roman York: City and Hinterland in the 5th-9th centuries.**

There is little documentary evidence among early texts concerning at the beginning of this period, Rollason (1999.118-9) identifies only two mentions of the city prior to the late 7th century, both of which were preserved in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* written in the early 8th century. The first of these was in a letter from Pope Gregory written in AD 601, in which he proposes to make York the centre of a metropolitan see. Rollason (1999.119) points out that it is unlikely that Gregory knew anything about York and that he only made the proposal because he knew that York had once been the capital of a Roman province. The second mention of York is that Edwin was baptised there in 627, suggesting that York does at this point have some ecclesiastic importance (Rollason 1999.119).
Cemetery evidence

There is slightly more archaeological evidence of early Anglian settlement in the York area, Early cemeteries have been identified surrounding the city. One, The Mount cemetery, is

centred along the Tadcaster Road (Roman road 10) sits on high ground, between the Roman city and Dringhouses. Occupying a similar position is the cemetery of Lamel Hill, between the city and the settlement at Heslington East, a third cemetery has been identified near Heworth along Roman road 3.

The cemetery at the Mount appears to either overlie or abut the earlier Roman cemetery (Tweddle 1999.170).Whether this represents a continuation of use by the local population or an appropriation of the site by a foreign elite seeking to legitimise their occupation of the area is unclear, although it would appear that the population using this cemetery had adopted the practice of cremating individuals and placing the remains inside urns which also contained items of significance either to the individual or to their surviving relatives.

The cemetery at Heworth has a similar date to that at The Mount. It lies some 200m north of a known Roman cemetery. In this case however there is seemingly no relationship between the two (Tweddle 1999.170).

Two excavations undertaken at Lamel Hill, an escarpment south east of the city. recovered evidence of funerary activity. The first in 1847/8 sectioned a mound in the grounds of The Retreat mental hospital. The mound contained a central cremation and the excavator dated its foundation to the Roman period. The excavator also established that a later inhumation cemetery was established on the site (Tweddle 1999.170). In 1983 an excavation at a neighbouring property recorded the presence of further inhumations, although no relationship between the two sites could be established (Tweddle 1999.172).

These cemeteries, away from the Roman town, suggest that the hinterland of York was still well populated and active, the presence of burial urns, iron knives, glass beads, copper alloy bowls and other metalwork, indicates that the populace were engaged in trade and industrial activities and that there must have been some network for this, whether the hub of the network lay within the old Roman town is, as yet unclear.

The fact that Edwin was baptised in York in the early 7th century suggests that there was at least some occupation of the Roman city at this time. It is generally accepted that the south eastern corner of the former Roman fort was the focus of an estate, possibly controlled by the King. Tweddle argues that the street plan of the fort is best preserved in this area (Tweddle 1999. 152) suggesting that these streets had a longer period of use and therefore became fossilised into the latter street pattern. The other accepted fact is that Edwin was baptised in a wooden building dedicated to St. Peter, which he later began to rebuild in stone (Sherley-Price 1968 .129) and that this church became York Minster. It is likely that Edwin would build his church close to his centre of administration, likewise Bishop Paulinus would want close access to the court in order to provide spiritual advice to the Queen and to persuade Edwin to convert.

Anglian York south of the river Ouse

If Edwin’s court was based in the Roman fort then, argued Palliser (1984. 101-108), the commercial centre of Anglian York lay on the bank of the river Ouse in the bounds of the former *colonia*. He believed that the whole of the south bank fell under the jurisdiction of the

bishops of York and that through their patronage a commercial settlement, possibly centred along the riverfront and administered from an estate at the top of Micklegate.

Excavations at Fishergate, close to the confluence of the rivers Ouse and Foss, uncovered evidence for a settlement, suggested the presence of a commercial trading settlement, or *wic,* similar to those found at London, Southampton and Dorestad (Kemp 1996.77). This suggests that Palliser is mistaken in his belief that the commercial centre lay in the former *Colonia.*

Palliser's argument for a settlement on the southern bank of the Ouse is not rendered redundant by the work at Fishergate. Alcuin recorded that Archbishop Aelberht (767-80) had ordered the building of a new church, dedicated to *Alma Sophia,* which he consecrated in 780. (Goodman 1982, line 1520). Although the location of this church is still debated. Willis, unable to find any evidence for this church being part of the minster complex, reported that he believed Aelberht's church was on a different site to that of the cathedral of Edwin and Paulinus (Willis, 1848.5). Willis amended his paper prior to publication adding that new information suggested that *Alma Sophia* was cognate with *Christ Church,* the name by which the Priory of Holy Trinity, Micklegate had been known before it's refounding in 1089 (Willis 1848.13, note d). More recently Morris (1986) has revisited this argument and concluded that Christ Church/Holy Trinity is likely to have been Aelberht's *Alma Sophia,* and that a close relationship existed between this church and that of its neighbours, St Mary Bishop (Bishophill Junior), St Martin and, the now lost, St Gregory. This relationship perhaps reflecting the ecclesiastic landscape of the pre-conquest cathedral of Christ Church in Canterbury (Morris 1986.84). If the *Alma Sophia* as described by Alcuin was built at the top of Micklegate, its construction may explain the purpose of the extensive robbing of building stone noted by Carver at 37 Bishophill Senior (Carver 1976b.12-13).

Palliser's argument that a commercial district may have existed in the *Colonia* cannot be dismissed simply because of the findings at Fishergate. A prestigious religious foundation such as that described by Alcuin would have required the presence of skilled artisans to both build and maintain it, this in turn would attract ancillary crafts to the settlement. Late 8th/early ninth century York then appears to be a polyfocal settlement with both royal and ecclesiastic patrons, while some roads conform to the Roman plan there are many deviations, surviving Roman structures are being cleared, either to make way for monumental buildings or as quarries for the same. Whether the Roman defences are maintained for their entire circuit is unclear, but it is possible that some form of ditch and bank may have superseded them, although on the southern bank of the Ouse we don't know how far these defences may have extended. On the riverfront evidence from 58/9 Skeldergate suggests that land reclamation was already taking place. The late 8th/early 9th century then sees a re-organisation of the town, only the serious engineering projects of its Roman predecessor appear to survive long enough to influence the Anglian settlement

Before leaving Christ Church/Holy Trinity I should note that as a community of canons it required the support of an extensive estate (Map 24), Domesday records that this included the villes of Bilborough, Moor Monkton, Knapton and, more importantly for us, Middlethorpe(Domesday 2003.868). All of these estates lie in the Wapentake of Ainsty, over which the city of York claimed jurisdiction "by ancient right" during many legal proceedings between the mid-13$^{th}$ and mid-15$^{th}$ centuries. If Ainsty Wapentake formed part of the Minster

parish of Christchurch/Holy Trinity, as this distribution of estates indicates, then this may have been the basis of the claim.

**Medieval York.**

Unlike earlier chapters, I have chosen not to separate discussion of medieval settlement into period specific subsections, this is because I wish to broaden the scope of this chapter and look at how my study area fits into the general picture of the development of York and to bring in discussion of its wider implications .

In an earlier chapter I mentioned that the Anglian *wic,* at Fishergate appears to have been in decline during the second quarter of the 9th century and that at the same period there was evidence from Skeldergate and Coppergate that the riverside in these areas was becoming used more intensely and that this was accompanied by the laying out of a new pattern of property boundaries and the creation of new streets, such as Coppergate itself. As yet it is unclear whether the decline of the *wic* and the reoccupation of peripheral land within the boundaries of the former Roman town are inter-related, but it seems likely.

This poses an interesting question: was the new pattern of streets and property boundaries laid out by an Anglian authority, aiming to mitigate the threat of Scandinavian raids, bringing the tradesman and merchants of the *wic* into a more easily controlled environment? Or as is currently thought does it represent a complete re-ordering of the city by a new Anglo-Scandinavian authority? Current archaeological evidence suggests that Coppergate was established by AD 930, while the dating of the property boundaries at Skeldergate is more tenuous (Hall 1994. 36) although Rees Jones suggests that it was established in the late 9th century (Rees Jones 1987.74). These dates suggest an Anglo-Scandinavian origin for laying out of these boundaries. Analysis of plot divisions by Ottaway (1995.3-13) suggested that land divisions in the former Roman fort were based upon the *furlong*, a measurement first mentioned in a charter of Aethelwulf of Wessex in c854. (OED online, “Furlong” 4.1) and it’s subdivision the *perch*[16]. Rees Jones identifies the divisions based on the perch as tenement blocks, rather than burgage plots of which, she argues, they are subdivisions (Rees Jones 2013.72). At 58/9 Skeldergate, one of the principal sources for information in our study area, Rees Jones identifies that two tenement blocks are represented. Taken together they occupy a street front of 50 ft, or 3 perches. According to the 13th century *Husgabel* roll these tenement blocks are owned as a single unit by the Stavely family as a single burgage plot for which they paid 2d in tax[17] (Rees Jones 2013.72).

This subdivision of the town plan can be seen in many medieval towns and is the basis of much of Conzen’s methods of town plan analysis, in particular that of the Burgage Cycle. The planned subdivision of urban land in England is largely ascribed to King Alfred of

[16] A furlong is a measure of length equating to 660 feet, a perch is a measure of length equating to 16 feet and 6 inches.

[17] Husgabel was a variable rated tax placed on burgage plots. It was assessed on the number of house gables within the plot faced onto the street. In York’s case this would appear to be 1d per gable, hence the Staverlys paid 2d one for each of their two gables. (Rees Jones 2013.72). The 1155 husgabel rate for Scarborough was “for each house whose gabel is turned toward the street 4d and for those whose sides are turned toward the street 6d (Ballard 1913.47)

Wessex, however there is some evidence that the nucleation of settlement in English England may have had its origins in the kingdom of Mercia, Nicholas Brooks has argued that charters from mid-8th century Mercia refer to military obligations associated with borough defence a full century before Alfred began to create his burgage system. (Brooks 1971.82). Excavations at Hereford would appear to confirm this however Biddle points out "it seems doubtful that a sub-rectangular pattern of streets reflects in essence anything other than an efficient approach to the division of land and the provision of easy communication" (1981.122)[18]. The survival of an early 10th century document *The Burghal Hidage,* is the basis for the assumption that Wessex was centre for the rebirth of town living. This document lists thirty three defended settlements, mostly within the boundaries of the Kingdom of Wessex, or its sphere of influence, and the taxable land associated with them and the service required of the inhabitants of both the town and the surrounding, associated, land (Stenton 1971.265). The Wessex *burhs* displayed, according to Biddle (1981. 129-133) a regular street plan, with a major road axis, supported by both parallel minor roads giving access to the rear of the properties facing onto them, and perpendicular to them giving rapid access to the defences and dividing the town into blocks which were given to "big men" within the community. These are subsequently subdivided into smaller parcels of land known as burgage plots.

Although this process appears to have begun in Wessex in the late 9th Century it is the same process that we see in 10th century York and so ably described by Rees Jones. Biddle further suggests that these larger divisions are about half a hectare in area (1981.133) this translates to 1.2 acres[19] or an area 660 ft by 79ft (1 furlong x 4.66 standard perches ). Ottaway, as we have already seen, suggests that the land divisions inside the former Roman fort at York are also based upon the furlong and it's subdivision, the perch, while in my study area Rees Jones has identified that the street frontage of the tenement block is approximately 1 perch and there are typically either two or three tenement blocks to the burgage plot (Rees Jones 2013.72-73).

The tenement blocks of Skeldergate run from the street front to the terrace, which separates Plan Area 1: Skeldergate from that of Plan Area 2: Bishophill. At no point does this distance meet the 660 feet necessary to equal the long side of an acre, therefore if we are to try and identify larger units of land holding within the city, we must look to other sources than simple land measurement. Rees Jones has identified a late medieval urban manor, as she terms it, in Plan Zone 1. This manor covers much of the northern quadrant of zone one and includes the properties owned by The Stavely family, was established by the Basy family in the late 13th century[20]. How the Basys came into the possession of this estate is not clear, but we do know that they were a prominent York family, Roger Basy was Mayor of the city in late 13th century[21]. As can be seen in (Map 20) the Basy holding contains much of the commercial heart of our study area (including 58/9 Skeldergate), all of the north eastern side of

[18] It should be pointed out that Biddle spent 10 years excavating sites in Winchester and at the time this article was written considered along with many that English urbanism originated in mid 9th century Wessex.
[19] An acre is a measurement of area equating to 660ft (1 furlong) x 66ft (4 perches).
[20] This would suggest that the Basy's acquired their manor sometime between c1284 (the approximate date of the Husgabel roll and c1300 when the Basy chantry chapel was created at St. Mary Veteris, Bishophill Senior.
[21] https://www.mansionhouseyork.com/lord-mayors-sheriffs/lord-mayors-through-time/

Bishophill Senior, including the church of St. Mary, which as we have seen was to house their chantry chapel. Through analysis of deeds and land transactions Rees Jones has identified at least 20 such estates in, or close to, the urban core of the city all of which are associated with parish churches. Biddle (1981.133) draws attention to this suggesting that many of these churches may have been founded as private chapels serving the landlord and tenants of these urban manors. If we apply this to York we can see that there does seem to be a correlation between the two, of the 17 possible pre conquest parish churches identified in York over two thirds can be associated with urban manors or ecclesiastic estates established by the 11th century. (Rees Jones 2013.xxviii, Map 15. Wilson & Mee 1998.10-13). Unfortunately, Rees Jones was not able to establish a relationship between the church of St. Mary Veteris (Bishophill Senior) and the estate owned by the Basys prior to the late 13th century.

When the Basy estate is plotted onto the 1852 OS map it occupies the whole of the northern quadrant of the urban part of the parish of St. Mary Veteris (Bishophill Snr.), closer examination of the plan reveals a regular pattern of land division running from Skeldergate to the terrace, which separates Plan Area 1: Skeldergate from Plan Area 2: Bishophill, of which four conform to Rees Jones assertion that tenement plots have a street frontage of about approximately three perches (**Map 21**), it is possible that a fifth tenement plot exists facing onto Carr Lane (**Map 22**). Unfortunately, the northernmost division has been disrupted by later land use, but it may represent two further burgage plots as it has a street front of some 108 feet. This pattern can be extended to the south to 53 Skeldergate, after which modern usage appears to either disrupt the pattern or it represents a later laying out of the area, possibly in the 14th century alongside the reclamation of land needed in order to build the new common crane. The plot can also be extended north of our study area and there also appears to be a clear relationship between the properties on the landward side of the street and those on the riverfront (**Map 23**) supporting Rees Jones proposal that the landowners of Skeldergate extended their properties by reclaiming land from the river in a similar fashion to the citizens of King's Lynn and Hull (Rees Jones 1987. 76-77).

The relationship between the Basy estate and the church of St. Mary Veteris (Bishophill Senior.) has already been mentioned. The Basy family and their successors, the Fairfax family, had a close relationship with the church, but had little control over it as the advowson[22] was not in their possession, by the 13th century this right was being shared by the Vavasour family, a local gentry family, and the Priory of Helagh Park, an Augustinian foundation of 1218 (Barnett 1997.81, table 2.7). The church itself was, by the time of the conquest, part of an extensive religious landscape and served a widely dispersed parish. It's position prior to this however seems to have been more peripheral. (**Map 24**) shows the position of the known pre-conquest churches, lying within the city walls, on the southern bank of the Ouse, as can be seen there is a cluster around the top of Micklegate forming the religious landscape, similar to that found in 8th/9th century Hexham, which Morris tentatively suggested might exist (Morris 1986.86) in this area. The position of St. Mary Veteris (Bishophill Snr.) clearly shows that it is not part of this complex. The Parish boundary of the church is also interesting, it cuts across the whole area in an almost straight line. The deviation toward its northern end accommodates the Basy Estate, suggesting that this estate

[22] The right of guardianship and patronage of the church, the owner of this right was able to nominate their own candidate when new priests were required.

probably existed when the parish was formed. The formation of parishes is complex, but it is necessary to summarise the process as it may have had an effect not just upon the urban landscape covered by this study but also upon both the suburban and rural ones.

Historically a parish was a relatively large area of land, similar in size to a modern diocese overseen by a Minster. Today we associate the term minster with churches such as the cathedral in York, or Westminster Abbey, but originally such churches formed the centre of a community of consecrated priests whose primary duty was to evangelise the population of their parish. As these minster parishes covered such large areas it was impractical for the priests to be itinerant so chapels and preaching places were established, usually by local landowners, at which a priest could be stationed.

Minsters were maintained by a system of tithes paid by the inhabitants of the parish. They also maintained a monopoly on certain rights such as baptism and burial, but as Jones (2002.48-49)argues this process was already under pressure and that by the late 8th century some tithes were already being paid to local churches rather than to the minsters. As this practice increased by the late 10th century many minsters were facing financial difficulties despite the passing of laws to prevent this. In effect the minster parishes were fragmenting into the parish system we understand today.

Two minsters have been identified at York, the first on the site of the current cathedral and the second at the top of Micklegate, centred upon Christ Church/Holy Trinity, the river Ouse presumably formed a border between their spheres of influence. South of the Ouse we can assume the parish of Christ Church/Holy Trinity was quite large, Harvey suggests that may once have comprised the entire prebend of Bichill and Knaresborough, dismembered in about AD1230 (Harvey 1965.378-379). There is no record of the full extent of this prebend, however we can perhaps still gain an idea of this from the Domesday Survey.

We already know from this source that Middlethorpe was once part of the estate of Christ Church, 2 carucates of which were originally awarded to Richard fitzErfast. This Richard also received 8 carucates of land in Bilborough, 9 carucates in Moor Monkton, 1 ¾ carucates in Hessay and 3 carucates in Knapton all of which had formerly belonged to Christ Church. More importantly he was also awarded the church, along with ½ a carucate of land and 3 tofts (**Map 25**). All of these properties were later returned to Christ Church, except Middlethorpe, when it was refounded, as Holy Trinity Priory, by Ralph Pagnell in 1089 (Solloway 1910.2). As can be seen these estates are spread across the area to the south and west of the city suggesting that the original bounds of the minster parish may have covered at least a quarter Ainsty Wapentake.

More locally to the city, Harvey suggests that the Archbishop's shire may also correlate with the estates of Christ Church (Harvey 1965.382) while Morris (1986.84) touches on the intermingling of the detached parishes the south bank churches, suggesting that they represent former estates belonging to Christ Church (**Map 26**), given that the majority of FitzErfast estates either coincide with these out-parishes or lie in close proximity to them this hypothesis may be correct. If we return to the boundary between the urban portion of St Mary Veteris (Bishophill Snr.) we might ask if this originally represented a boundary of the minster complex? The parish boundary coincides with the natural landscape, as it runs along the watercourse, now buried beneath Buckingham Street, which we discussed in chapter 3

with the development of Roman Bishophill. If this is the case could this mean that the boundaries of the Basy Urban Manor do not have their origins in the late 9th century but lie much earlier and perhaps represent the fossilised remains of a decayed Roman insula?

We must now consider one final question, when were these parish boundaries formed, I would argue that there is evidence that some of these boundaries were established by the late 10th century, this is based on the belief that the church of St. Clement was established at some point prior to the 11th century, by which time it had given its name to a geographical area in the suburb of York. Harvey indicated the boundary of the parish of St. Clement on his plan of the holdings of the Archbishop in the suburb of York (1965.382). Although there is no documented list of the boundaries of this parish there are indications in the fossilised field and property boundaries which suggest that his reconstruction of the majority of this parish is correct, as illustrated in (**Map 27**). This shows that the proposed parish of St. Clement cuts across that of St. Mary Veteris (Bishophill Senior.) suggesting that it is in fact a subdivision of the latter, just as that in turn was, possibly, carved out of the parish of Christ Church. Archaeologically we can suggest that there is evidence for the earlier foundation of the Bishophill church as burials reminiscent of late Saxon practice were recovered from the site (Ramm 1976.45) whereas the foundations believed to be those of the Clementhorpe church can be given a rough date somewhere in the Anglo Scandinavian period. The cult of St. Clement was popular in the 11th century, particularly among Scandinavians. Crawford (2008.155-158) suggests that the church may even have been founded by the archbishops in order to serve a Scandinavian community living in their patrimony and encourage traders to use this part of the river.

It is perhaps now time to discuss the monumental structures imposed onto the landscape of my study area, for this I intend to begin by looking at structures which are popularly associated with military functions, the city walls and the castle of the Old Baile. The city walls of York, south of the river, are generally believed to follow the line of the Roman defences, this however has only proven true in antiquarian excavations undertaken on the stretch opposite the railway station (RCHM(E) v1.49) because we do not know the extent of the Roman *colonia,* it is not clear whether the southern defences follow the earlier defences, therefore we cannot say for sure that the walls we see today really do reflect the their Roman counterparts. This brings into question the position of the Old Baile; was it built within the Roman town or without? It also raises a further question, If the Roman defences contained a smaller more compact settlement is this also reflected in later settlement?

Some parts of the Roman defences were sufficiently visible in the early medieval period to be mentioned in land grants (RCHM(E) v2.7) they do not appear to have been substantial enough to keep out the Viking army of the mid-9th century. Excavations in the north east corner of the fort suggest that earth banks were thrown up over the decayed Roman walls, topped with palisades and protected by deep, wide ditches to their outer face. These excavations also show that the later medieval walls were not built directly on top of their Roman predecessors, (Dean 2009.54). The first known murage was granted in 1251, and it seems likely that this is when the first stone walls began to be built (RCHM(E) v2.11). The stone walls were not completed in one single programme of construction, documents suggest that construction began on the northern side of the river first (Dean 2009.54),enclosing the area containing the administrative, ecclesiastic and commercial heartland between the rivers Ouse and Foss most threatened by the barbarous Scots, work

then seems to have moved to the southern side of the Ouse. This programme of work probably began following the granting of a murage, for 5 years, issued in 1267 and was completed by 1315, based on the survival of the earliest custody roll for the city wall (RCHM(E) v2.11-12). The custody rolls lay out the responsibilities of each parish with regard to maintenance and manning of the walls. The custody roll for 1315 reveals that the length of wall between the Old Baile and the Ouse was the responsibility of the parishes of St Mary Veteris (Bishophill Senior) and St. Clement, while the area between the Old Baile and Micklegate Bar fell to The Priory of Holy Trinity and the parishes of St. Mary Bishop (Bishophill Junior.), St. Martin and St. Gregory. No provision was made by the city for the defence of the Old Baile, and the entry relating to it appears to be a later addition (RCHM(E) v2.12-13). A later custody roll, 1380, reveals that St. Clement's has been relieved of its responsibility for the wall between the river and the Old Baile, and has been replaced by St. Mary Bishop (Bishophill Junior.). As a result of this St. Michael, Spurriergate has been given responsibility for the wall between the Old Baile and the Sadler Tower. (RCHM(E) v2.17). From this document we also find that William de Ireby has been made Custodian of the chains across the river Ouse and that the Key holder of Hyngbrigg Postern (at the end of Skeldergate) has yet to be appointed (RCHM(E) v2.18), furthermore it tells us that the responsibility for the Old Baile remains with the Archbishop. What is also clear from this document is that all those parts of the walls that the citizenry feel responsible for have been rebuilt in stone, the Walmgate section of the walls was undertaken from 1345 (although it appears they had to be extended in this area in the 15th century due to the shrinking of the King's Fishpool (RCHM(E) v2.140). That city walls took so long to build, or at least to refurbish in stone is not unusual; Coventry took nearly two hundred years to complete its circuit of stone walls, Newcastle took a similar amount of time to York while the circuit at Lincoln was not completed, suggesting that the earlier ditch, bank and palisade constructions were deemed sufficient for defence and that the refurbishment in stone was both a political and an economic statement.

The Old Baile was, as can be seen from the documents above, considered by the citizenry as separate to the defensive circuit for which they accepted responsibility. As one of two castles built to dominate control the river Ouse and the citizens of York, the Old Baile occupies a natural promontory of high ground. In chapter 3 I suggested that this site was deliberately chosen for its natural defence, an argument better expressed by Dean (2009.66) *It appears to have exploited a strong natural position with the steep slope to the Ouse on its north-east side and a natural valley, now followed by Bishopgate Street, on its southern side, perhaps making the only need for fortification on the side facing the town.* Despite the excavations of the 1960's little is really known of the internal layout of the castle, nor do we know when the castle was given to the archbishops, although the most likely period is between 1194-98, when Archbishop Geoffrey Plantagenet combined his episcopal role with that of sheriff of Yorkshire (Dean 2009.66), or following Walter de Gray's elevation to Archbishop in 1215 (King John wanting a friendly magnate overseeing the city). What we do know is that the city saw the Old Baile as separate and beyond its jurisdiction hence the continued disputes throughout the 14th and early 15th centuries.

This separation may be a result of the position of the castle, especially if it originally lay outside the early city defences, and the aspect it showed toward the town. If we look at York Castle, on the other side of the river, we see that its main focus is towards the river Ouse, the bailey is almost shielded from the city by the motte and having been built on an artificial

island created by the damming of the river Foss it has almost as if the castle has turned its back on the city. The Old Baile however is a victim of geography. The motte is built at the point of the promontory, taking the most advantage of the natural defences this provides. The bailey is forced to occupy an open aspect toward the town, unfortunately we do not know the position of its gatehouse, as this would determine its visual aspect. Was the gateway in the north west defensive circuit as the Royal Commissioners thought (RCHM(E) v2.89)? suggesting a protective role toward the citizenry, or was it located in the position now occupied by Tower 3, the "Bitch Daughter Tower", occupying the south west corner of the bailey facing down river and away from the city, a mirror to its sister?

Without further archaeological investigation we will not be able to understand the relationship of this castle to the town, but on the question of where the gatehouse stood I prefer the latter hypothesis. It makes sense that the two castles would as much as possible mirror each other, after all they are there to send a message of strength and control over the most important transport highway of the city. Another argument for the gatehouse being situated at the south west corner is the name of the tower. Known today as the "Bitch Daughter Tower", this is believed to be a corruption of an earlier name "le bydoutre" (Dean 2009.56), this tower was taken down in 1566, as it had *shronken from the Citie wall* (Raine 1955.25), in order to repair Ouse Bridge as its removal would not weaken the defence of the city. This suggests that the tower had been bypassed through infilling and therefore had been rendered obsolete, a not uncommon practice for redundant gateways. Furthermore there is evidence that the tower had been used as a prison[23], again gatehouses were frequently used as prisons as there were often the most secure structures in the defensive circuit, all of the main gatehouses of York have served as prisons at some point in their history. It is unlikely however if this can be proved as the entire area was remodelled in the 17th century in order to accommodate a new gun tower, the current "Bitch Daughter Tower".

So far much of this discussion has been limited to aspects of settlement which have mainly affected Plan Zone 1. There are two main reasons for this, firstly it is the area from which the majority of the data has been sourced, secondly it is the most studied of my plan zones and therefore the most easily accessible, but in discussing monumental structures I am able to move into the suburbs.

Suburbs reflect the fortunes of their towns (Schofield & Vince 2003.66), they can house the trades banned from the city, due to their noise or pollutants and they become home to hospitals for the socially isolated, such as lepers. Suburbs grew outside all four of the main entrances to York creating ribbon developments along the routes north towards Scotland, east towards Hull and south towards London, but beyond the lesser gates, the posterns, there was less development, only Layerthorpe postern with its access towards the rich sheep pastures of the North Yorkshire Moors and Clementhorpe Postern, or *Hyngbrigg* as it was known (Raine 1955.22) show any sign of suburban development. In the case of Clementhorpe even this statement may be premature.

Clementhorpe, as we have seen in chapter 4, appears to have been a fully functioning settlement by the late 11th century. Crawford's argument suggests that the church of St.

[23] https://www.yorkwalls.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Bitchdaughter-Tower-History-CR.pdf accessed 29/03/20.

Clement was founded by an archbishop, in order to create a trading settlement independent of the city. The unnamed document of c1080 (Peacock 1905.412-412) and the later Inquisition of 1106 confirm that *All toll in Clementsthorpe from all ships which touch there shall be the Archbishop' s and below Clementsthorpe as far as the Archbishop's land stretches, and the whole custom of fish..* (Dobson and Donaghey 1984.8) certainly seem to suggest that some form of trading community existed in the area, but the nature of that community is unclear. Other than agriculture, which we must assume is taking place, the primary income of this settlement appears to be derived from maritime industries and therefore we would expect the settlement to be focussed on the river. Given the proximity to York it has to be assumed that there was a road linking the two, possibly a former Roman road. In 1068, this land connection appears to be severed with the construction of the Old Baile in the north western corner of the settlement (Rees Jones 2013.48). It is probably in this period that a secondary road, via Skeldergate assumes importance.

In the late 10th to the early 12th century Clementhorpe appears to be a dormitory settlement for gentry who owe service to the Archbishop, We have seen in, chapter 4, that the Huddleston family held property in the area, including two principal houses, the one given to the nuns of Clementhorpe by Gilbert de Huddleston (Farrar 1914, entry 39) and the one leased to Avenel the Steward by Richard de Huddleston (Farrar 1914, entry 216). We know that Gilbert owed service to the Archbishop because his charter describes the Archbishop as "*...his lord, of his right in Clementhorpe, in land and men…",* we can assume that Richard, Gilbert's nephew, also owed service to the archbishop as he retains his right to occupy the principal dwelling if he is fulfilling his duties of service. We can further suggest that Richard held an area of land equal at least to a burgage plot because in his charter he states that if he is in residence Avenel *"...shall dwell in other houses in the court…",* finally we can suggest that Richard had access to the river as Avenel, whenever Richard is in residence, *"...shall have access to the water through the house…"* . We can also assume that Richard's plot is fairly rectangular as it is *"...equal in width toward the land of Gamel Stute as to the water…" In* other words, the aspect it presents to the river is the same length as the aspect that it presents to an unspecified road, furthermore, because only one neighbour is mentioned it suggests that Richard is in possession of a terminal plot (**Map 28)**.

The accurate dating of the Huddleston charters is debatable but they all date to the mid to late 12th century so identifying the position of Richard's land on the ground is difficult, however if we assume that Richard's charter is later than that of his uncle, this suggests that his land lies between York and the Priory of St. Clement. Using the evidence that Avenel needs to access the river via the capital messuage of the property it must have an east-west orientation, suggesting that it runs from Cherry Hill towards the river. Due to extensive redevelopment in the 19th century it is difficult to reconstruct this earlier landscape, but some boundaries may have been fossilised within the landscape recorded on Lund's Plan (Plate 3) and on the 1852 OS map (**Map 29**). Lund's plan divides the area into two fields, his division runs approximately E-W and can be picked up as a consistent boundary on the OS map. A longitudinal boundary, running approximately N-S may represent the collapsed Roman terrace which ran through the area, while the other divisions may represent either the division of the area into burgage plots or their subdivisions. The group around Clementhorpe brewery present an aspect to the riverfront of 150 feet or the equivalent of three burgage plots. This of course does not yet allow me to identify Richard's property, but if we examine the field division more closely we find that the northern field presents an aspect to the river of

approximately 280 feet as does the southern field. Both fields also have a western boundary which measures approximately 213 feet. These measurements fit those described in Richard's charter, in that the aspect facing the river and that facing the road match those of Gamel Stute. This suggests that both Richard Huddleston and Gamel Stute are both holders, not of burgages, but of urban manors, furthermore if we look at the proposed site of the Priory precinct, gardens and service areas it occupies a similar sized block of land presumably the urban manor of Gilbert de Huddleston. These manors share similar attributes to that held by the Basy family mentioned earlier, they each contain about 2 ⅓ acres of land, and they each contain properties or land set on the former Roman terraces and on the lower lying riverfront, this could suggest that these urban manors were created at a similar time, which raise the question, as they appear to be of a standard size and contain similar patterns of development and land use, have they been laid out by a single authority and apportioned to gentry families who owe that authority service?

The mid-12th century was a time of change for Clementhorpe, Gilbert de Huddleston gave up his manor in Clementhorpe and it probably became part of the two carucates of land granted to the Priory of St. Clement on its foundation by Archbishop Thurstan. The Priory is thought to have been awarded the church of St. Clement by the Archbishop (Crawford 2008.155-58) but we don't know its relationship to Gilbert's manor; it is however unlikely that Gilbert had the advowson as that would have been mentioned in his surrender document. What we can suggest is that Gilbert's house, given to the nuns (Farrar 1914 item 39), must have been in the proximity of the church and that it possibly formed part of the later conventual buildings.

The positioning of the priory may have had a detrimental effect on the further growth of Clementhorpe, as a suburb, it blocks the area available for growth along the river and would also appear to limit development along Bishopthorpe Road, if I am correct in my conjectural plans of the priory estate. The only direction for expansion would appear to be along Baggergate, now Nunnery Lane, which runs between Bishopthorpe Road and Blossom Street (part of the road to London). The eastern edge of the road ran along the city moat preventing development, the western edge however bordered fields and may have been used for development. When created in the 18th century, Lund's Plan of the Strays of York was used to illustrate the pasture rights of the Freemen of York (Plate 3). In chapter 4, I argued that the closes marked "Not Common" were remnants of earlier occupation. Apart from the fields which I have suggested represent the fossils of urban manors, there are a number of "Not Common" closes along Baggergate. The group to the north west lies immediately behind Blossom Street and should probably be considered as part of that suburb, however there is a single field to the south west also designated "Not Common" which may indicate the limit of suburban development in Clementhorpe.

At the beginning of this discussion on suburbs I partially summarised the attributes of suburbs listed by Schofield and Vince (2003.66), I concentrated upon the industries likely to be found there, exiled due to their noise and pollution, but as these gentlemen point out mills should also be included among the industrial complexes of the suburb, and Clementhorpe possesses at least one of these. Situated to the south of Clementhorpe settlement is a ridge of high ground, known locally as Scarcroft Hill. Speed's map (Plate 1) shows that this ridge was surmounted by a number of windmills, one of which lies next to Bishopthorpe Road. By 1440, the tithe of this mill was in the possession of the Priory of St. Clement, a road leading

to the Nun's Mill is mentioned in the bridge master's rolls at this date (Raine 1955.309), by 1524 the Priory appears to have the tithe of a second mill somewhere east of St. James Chapel on the Mount.

Both of these mills would have been wind powered, but there is a possibility that a watermill may also have existed in Clementhorpe. An examination of the 1852 OS map shows that Clementhorpe Beck has a remarkably straight course and that it turns a virtual right angle, before entering the Ouse via an outfall perpendicular to the river. This could, of course represent, a recutting or canalisation of the beck in order to create a more efficient drain for the meadowland on either side of it. Speed's map (Plate 6) shows that the stream followed a similar course and that it makes the same right-angled turns, furthermore Speed shows that it is crossed by a bridge, beside which is a row of buildings. The only other streams shown on Speed's map are the millstreams and their associated mills on the opposite side of the river. Earlier in this dissertation I suggested that Speed was interested in presenting an image of the ordered town, neat rows of houses and ordered streets, but on closer examination we can see a river full of ships and that the market crosses are clearly marked, Speed is also showing us the economic basis for the wealth of the city, given this, the depiction of these buildings beside a stream in Clementhorpe must indicate that they have economic importance and given their location I would suggest that these buildings represent a watermill, unfortunately I have found no documentary evidence to support this argument.

As I have already indicated Schofield and Vince identify the suburb as being home to outcasts, and while Clementhorpe does not have a hospital, it does possess a nunnery. Clementhorpe was the first post-conquest nunnery to be established in Yorkshire, it was founded by Archbishop Thurstan at some time between 1125 and 1133 (Dobson & Donaghey 1984.9). The 12th century was a period of religious expansion and the desire to enter the contemplative life of a religious community was expressed by both sexes, this was problematic to the church as monastic foundations up until this point had largely been for men only. There were few urban nunneries, most were set up in suburbs or isolated rural settings (Gilchrist 1994. 64-65), so the position of Clementhorpe Priory is not unique, Gilchrist cites not just English examples like Norwich, Canterbury and Cambridge but gives European examples as well, Roskilde in Denmark and Lund in Sweden. This distancing of nunneries away from the centre of religious life, the cathedrals, great monastic churches and Universities, could be seen as an attempt by the established church to distance itself from the idea of the female religious. Many nunnery churches served as parish churches also, such as Godstow, Goring, Clerkenwell (Gilchrist 1994.94) and Clementhorpe this placed them at the heart of their communities and brought with its endowments and patronage. It is possible that by the mid-15th century Clementhorpe had even become part of the pilgrim movement. Following the execution of Archbishop Scrope in 1405 a local cult was created, and sites associated with Scrope's life, or more importantly his death, became important. Scrope was tried at his Palace in Bishopthorpe and executed on his way to the city. Raine tells us that shortly afterwards a chapel, dedicated to St. Mary, was erected on or close to the execution site. Rees Jones ( 2007) has identified that many of the Bishophill churches have connections to either the Scrope family or to the archbishop himself.

## Chapter 7: Summary.

The aim of this dissertation was to present a coherent narrative concerning the nature of the medieval settlement of south west York drawn from both archaeological and historical evidence, something which I think has largely been achieved, however there is still much work to be done and in this chapter I intend to identify some of the aspects of this which I think require further investigation. In order to do this effectively I will address each Plan Zone individually.

Plan Zone 1: The Urban Core.

In this zone a number of questions need to be addressed if we are to understand the nature of its medieval development:

1. Does the current circuit of city walls follow that of the Earlier Roman defences?

   I have suggested that this, although this is a widely accepted premise is not the case, and that Roman defences are in fact represented by the location of the north western defences of the Old Baile. This leads into the next question.

2. Was the Old Baile built beyond the boundaries of the early medieval town?

   If we accept that the Roman defences lie to the north east of the Old Baile and that those same defences mark the extent of the early medieval city, then in all likelihood the castle does lie outside the boundaries of the early medieval town. The castle is built in one of the most naturally defensible positions the area has to offer. (Map….).

   Archaeological evidence has proved that it overlies a Roman cemetery, and we know from Roman law that these had to lie outside the boundary of the settlement. Evidence for post Roman use of the site, as we saw in chapter 3, is limited and suggests that use of the site was marginal at best. Unfortunately, due to later developments and safety concerns excavations in the vicinity of the castle have been of limited value when it comes to investigating its origins.

3. How big was the “Cranegarth”?

   Throughout this dissertation I have suggested that the cranegarth was a specific piece of civil and economic engineering. York has been an important inland port throughout much of its history. I have shown that up until the 14th century the owners of riverside property were able to extend these properties into the river in order to exploit the opportunities presented by the river for trade. Following the construction of the cranegarth this expansion appears to cease or at least form a coherent river frontage unchanged until the building of Queens Staith.

   The cranegarth is located below the Old Baile and excavations at Pawson’s Warehouse have, as outlined in Chapter 3, shown that a considerable effort was put into the reclamation of the land necessary to construct the cranegarth complex

(Plan…). Little remains of this complex that can be seen today, the riverside wall and possibly the lower courses of the Crane Tower may still exist beneath the surface of the river Ouse, but as this is kept at an artificially high depth it is unlikely that we will be able to confirm this.

The description of the rebuilding of the cranegarth (Raine 1955.241) suggests a large complex of buildings may have existed. However if we look to other inland ports we can see that these facilities were quite extensive (The ports of Belgium, Holland and Germany have been recorded by artists since the mid-14th century and provide a large corpus of visual imagery upon which I make this suggestion), however the only images that we have for York are from the 18th century by which time many modifications had been made to the area.

Three do, however, clearly illustrate the complex at this late period and it may be possible to infer from them certain aspects of the medieval cranegarth. The first is the *Panorama of York from the South East.* (Plate 7.) this shows the Crane Tower and Skeldergate Postern. Between the two is a section of wall above which can be seen the roof of a building which is built parallel to it. This building is presumably divided into at least three parts (there are three visible chimney stacks). To the right of the circular Crane Tower, can be seen the crane itself and a large building, running parallel to the river. This building has at least four chimney stacks and two projecting gables which may indicate additional cranage allowing goods to be directly transferred from the moored ships into the building.

The second image is that made by Samuel Buck (Plate 8). This view taken from the Old Baile records a walled complex lying beneath the castle motte, from the relative positions of features such as St Mary Veteris (Bishophill Senior) and Lounlithgate, this complex can only be the warehouses associated with the cranegarth. Bucks drawing was undertaken c1720 about two years after E.B. published his panorama so we have two contemporary which illustrate the buildings in the area of the cranegarth at the beginning of the 18th century.

A third illustration (Plate 9) taken in the mid-18th century, again by Samuel Buck along with his brother Nathaniel, and from a similar viewpoint of that by E.B., shows that the Crane Tower has been removed and that Pawson's warehouse, with its Dutch Gables, has been erected next to the crane house, which on the earlier Buck engraving was an empty space.

How far this complex extends along Skeldergate is unclear but there is a suggestion in the earlier engraving by Samuel Buck, (Plate 8) that a complex of buildings extends from the Old Baile to the river front. These buildings represent an earlier boundary, against which their predecessors had been erected. These buildings can be traced on the 1852 OS plan as can be seen on Map 30 This may represent the original extent of the medieval cranegarth and its ancillary buildings. To the north of all these structures Buck records a wall this follows a land boundary still extant on the 1852 OS plan, this may represent the extent of the authority of the Staple, whether this was a specific liberty within the city is as yet unclear.

## Plan Zone 2: The Suburb.

The questions arising from this zone have largely been created not just through our lack of knowledge of the area in general but from our lack of understanding of medieval suburbs in general. Both archaeologists and historians have been happy to accept that medieval suburbs are home to noisome trades, and marginalised members of medieval society. Yet from the few studies undertaken suburbs show evidence of planning and organisation.

At Coventry Alcock has identified that Queen Isabella, the wife of Edward II, granted an area of land from the Royal Estate for the foundation of a new suburb. As Alcock points out this development, sometime around 1348, was a little behind the times (Alcock 2008.247). Although accepting Alcock's argument that Queen Isabella's grant was intended to create a new suburb, Demidowicz argued that the proposed plan was incorrect (Demidowicz 2012.106-115). Using a combination of plan analysis and documentary data Demidowicz was able to show that rather than the neatly laid out plots, suggested by Alcock, the suburb had been laid out to maximise the amount of space available for development. Both Alcock and Demidowicz agree that this suburb was meant for urbanised development, rather than the agricultural use to which it was later put, and that it failed due to the intervention of the Black Death.

In their studies of Gloucester and Worcester Baker and Holt were primarily concerned with the role of the church had on the development of these medieval towns (Baker and Holt 2004). Using a modification of Conzen's town plan analysis and historical data they were able to identify the size, foundation date and landholders of the suburbs of these two towns but beyond a list of tax assessments, rentals paid and craft derived surnames they came to little conclusion of how the suburb and the town interacted.

What then do we know of the Clementhorpe suburb of York? The simple answer to this question is very little. As we saw in chapter 4, based upon its name we can speculate that it was founded prior to the Norman Conquest. It is not mentioned in the Domesday book, but a near contemporary document (cited above Ch.4) places it in the possession of the Archbishop who appears to have divided parts of it among some of his retainers. In the 12$^{th}$ century it became home to a Benedictine Priory of nuns. Several documents refer to properties in the area and I have shown that there is some evidence of fossilised tenement boundaries recorded on the 1852 OS plan. Other than this little is known about the size of the settlement or even the extent of its associated lands.

In this dissertation I have suggested that the settlement of Clementhorpe may be identified using the plan of Micklegate Strays. Close to the city are several closes identified as being unavailable for common usage. One of these coincides with the area of the nunnery, others can be tied to my proposed sites for the urban manors of Richard Huddleston and Gamel Stute, these can both be located on the 1852 OS plan of York and, as already stated, they display some attributes suggesting fossilised tenement boundaries. This suggests that the other enclosures marked "not common" on Lund's plan may once have been the location of former domestic development. As to the limits of Clementhorpe, I have suggested that this is marked by a bank that is still partially visible in the grounds of Millthorpe School.

I would further suggest that the presence of the Nunnery, or rather the proximity of its "home farm" had a detrimental effect upon the development of the area. Lack of available land for both domestic and commercial exploitation meant that the population of the suburb was kept close to the urban centre and therefore the ribbon development that is visible outside the other entrances to the city is unable to develop here, furthermore the principal means of transport in this area is the river. The road to Bishopthorpe, even though it leads to an archbishop's palace, is not likely to have been a major transport link.

It is possible that the road became more important in the 15th century as a pilgrimage route for those wishing to follow the in the final footsteps of the proto saint and former archbishop Richard Scrope: Scrope would have followed this road from Bishopthorpe Palace, where he was tried for treason, to his place of execution, somewhere close to the Nun's windmill (now the site of Southlands Methodist Church). Shortly after his execution a chapel was set up close to the site (Raine 1955.319), it is also in this area that he is believed to have performed a miracle and his body was possibly prepared for burial at the nunnery[24]. Rees Jones (2007) identified that there was considerable interest in the cult associated with Richard Scrope and the elite inhabitants of the Bishophill and Micklegate areas of York, and that the Bolton Hours prayer book contained many images of saints associated with the intramural churches and social organisations of the area. However, St. Clement's was not mentioned in her summary of the images which appear in the book (Rees Jones 2007.223-224). Amongst the saints depicted in the Bolton Hours are SS Catherine, Bridgit and Sitha each of whom had either an altar or an image in the church. The book also contains an image of St. Clement, the patronal saint of the nunnery; St. William, whose day was celebrated as the foundation day of the nunnery and whose image stood alongside that of the Virgin Mary (Raine 1955.318).

In this dissertation I have tried to identify the suburb of Clementhorpe in terms of area and land use, but questions as to its size and position remain. The poll Tax records show that there was a concentration of shipwrights living in the parish but, as yet, no evidence for this trade is apparent, nor is there evidence for all the ancillary trades which would have serviced this industry such as sailmakers, roperies and smithies, it may be that these industries were carried out in house but then we should expect to find some evidence of a large industrial complex similar to the Victorian one recorded in the area on the 1852 OS plan.

## Zone 3: The Rural Hinterland.

As with Zone 2, the immediate rural hinterland of medieval towns has lacked scholastic interest. In York, and other medieval towns it has been the work left to local history groups and individuals to investigate the history and development of the settlements lying in this zone. York is fortunate in having many such local history groups based in its modern boundaries, but studies are limited both by the interests of their members and the skill sets available to them. Such studies are also limited by geography, few groups wishing to carry

[24] This brief summation is derived from a number secondary accounts of Scrope's execution for those who wish to read more two near contemporary martyrologies exist; *Martyrium Ricardi Archiepiscopi,*written by Clement Maidstone, and transcribed by J. Raine in *Historians of the Church of York and its Archbibishops, v2.306-311 (Rolls Series, 71: London 1879-94)* and *Loci e Libro Veritatum e Libro Veritatum* by Thomas Gascoigne (edited by J.E.T. Rogers) Oxford 1881.225-229.

out studies which might impinge on the interests of their neighbours, thus a wide area study such as this is difficult to undertake within such a framework (the area covered by this dissertation lies within the spheres of influence of at least seven local groups).

Despite this at least one study concerning the rural morphology of York has been undertaken. Huntington, like Middlethorpe, lies some two miles from the centre of York and would today be considered a commuter village, although it is somewhat larger, Domesday records that it consisted of nine carucates of land as opposed to Middlethorpe's three. Curtis (2014, unpublished dissertation) studied the development of this settlement using both map analysis, documents and lidar data. She was able to demonstrate that field systems in Huntington developed in different ways dependant both on soil conditions and land ownership. She also concluded that settlements like Huntington provided vital resources for the city in the form of both food and pasturage. Huntington's proximity to York not only provided it with a ready market but that "Without York…Huntington would have been a self-contained unit with little need for change" (Curtis 2014.41).

Middlethorpe was, I would argue, more dependent upon the city than Huntington, although it fulfilled a similar roll. Examination of land records for Middlethorpe show that both tenants in Chief and their subtenants had interests inside the walls of York or it's suburb. Unlike Huntington, Middlethorpe had no mill so it was reliant external third-party millers to process both its surplus and domestic grain, it shared its whole year pasturage (Knavesmire) with neighbouring settlements, Dringhouses, Bustardthorpe, Clementhorpe and the Freemen of the City. It is even unclear in the documents as to its relationship to some of these settlements, it seems clear that The Stray Lands were once part of Middlethorpe rather than Dringhouses, yet by the time Parsons came to draw his plan of this latter settlement it appears that Middlethorpe had become part of it.

I have attempted to trace the development of Middlethorpe through the medieval period. This has proved easier for that portion of the settlement which fell to Roger de Mowbray than it did for the Honour of Eye. It also meant that I entered into the long running debate as to the location of Bustardthorpe, and I hope that I have managed to show that no part of that settlement lay within the boundaries of Middlethorpe despite the plethora of "Bustard" place names. It does still leave the question as to the true location of this settlement.

## Final Thoughts.

The purpose of this dissertation was to provide a narrative detailing the development of a large area of south western York, whilst I think I have achieved most of what I set out to do I realise that there are several questions that remain unanswered, and I have identified some of them in this chapter. If we are to truly understand how this area of the city evolved there are some fundamental questions that need to be addressed by researchers which I will now identify.

- What was the extent of the *Colonia*? I have said that the Roman town helped to shape the settlement pattern of the medieval period, but without knowing the extent of this important part of the Roman Town we cannot fully understand that of the later

periods. If we were to find the boundary of this early settlement, we might be able to answer several further questions:

- Did the merchants from the Anglian *Wic* relocate to the Skeldergate area? Was this within the old Roman defences? Were these the walls breached by the Viking Army?
- If any of the above were answered it would lead to an answer to another vexing question – was the Old Baile built within or without the Anglo-Scandinavian town?
- Before we leave the questions concerning Zone 1, we still need to ask whether the cranegarth was built as a deep-water port facility? If so, what was its extent, and furthermore did it serve as the headquarters of the Staple and if so, was this a distinct liberty within the city?
- Both zones 2 and 3 throw up questions concerning the nature of the suburbs and immediate hinterlands of medieval towns, were they simply dormitories for those unable to live within the city just as todays dormitory towns do? Or were they distinct areas of their own? Were the villages like Middlethorpe and Huntingdon simply larders for the town?
- Finally. Where was Bustardthorpe?

I can offer no definitive answer to these questions or solutions as to how they can be answered. We could look to archaeological excavation to provide some answers but given the current accepted ideas of preservation rather than intervention it is unlikely that unless a programme of research archaeology were to take place it is unlikely that these questions could be addressed at present. Non-invasive techniques could be used in the less developed areas of the study area, these alongside GIS may answer some of the questions arising from zones 2 and 3, but again specific research agendas would be required. Turning to historical analysis we again need to create research agendas that we can use to interrogate the historical data that might enable us to answer these questions.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**Royal Commission for Historic Monuments (England) (RCHM(E)):**
City of York, *Volume 1: Eboracum.* RCHM(E) 1962.
City of York, *Volume 2: The Defences.* RCHM(E), 1972
City of York*, Volume 3: South West.* RCHM(E), 1972.

**Victoria County History of the Counties of England (VCH):**
**Tillot, P.M.** 1961. *A History of the County of York, City of York.* Oxford University Press .

*The Yorkshire Domesday: Introduction and Translation,* Alecto Historical Editions, London 1992.

**The Yorkshire Philosophical Society Annual Reports. (YSPR)**

**Addyman, P.V.** 1975, *Excavations in York 1972-1973, first interim report.,* in The Antiquaries Journal, vol. 54, pt. 2, pp. 201-231.

**Addyman, P.V.** 1976a. *Excavations in York 1973-1974, second interim report.* Council for British Archaeology/York Archaeological Trust.
**Addyman, P.V.** (Gen. ed). 1976b -. *The Archaeology of York 14 volumes and supplementary series.* (York Archaeological Trust/Council for British Archaeology)

**Addyman, P.V.**,(ed). 2015. *British Historic Town Atlas, Volume 5. York.* Historic Towns Trust/York Archaeological Trust.

**Addyman, P.V. and Black, V.E.** (Eds). 1984. *Archaeological papers from York presented to M.W. Barley.* YAT, York.

**Addyman, P.V. & Priestley, J.** 1977. *Baile Hill, York: A report on the Institute's excavations.,* in Archaeological Journal, 1977, vol.134, pp 115-156.

**Alcock, N.W.** 2008. *Queen Isabella's new suburb in Coventry in 1348,* in Midland History, v 33:2 240-248.

**Andrews, G.** 1984. *Archaeology in York: an assessment.,* in **Addyman & Black** 1984, pp.173-187.

**Anonymous.** 1973a *The first nine months; a summary of excavations in 1972.,*in Interim: Bulletin of the York Archaeological Trust. Vol. 1, No. 1.

**Anonymous.** 1973b *Sites review March – June.,* in Interim: Bulletin of the York Archaeological Trust. Vol. 1, No. 2.

**Anonymous,** 1973c *Sites Review June – September.,* in Interim: Bulletin of the York Archaeological Trust. Vol. 1, No.3.

**Anonymous.** 1974a *Sites Review September 1973 – January 1974.,* in Interim: Bulletin of The York Archaeological Trust. Vol. 1, No. 4.

**Anonymous.** 1974b *Sites Review January – March.,* in Interim: Bulletin of the York Archaeological Trust. Vol. 2, No. 1.

**Anonymous.** 1974c. *Bishophill.* in Interim: Bulletin of the York Archaeological Trust. Vol. 2, No. 2.

**Anonymous.** 1974d. *Site Review June – September.,* in Interim: Bulletin of the York Archaeological Trust. Vol. 2, No. 3.

**Anonymous.** 1976a. *Site Review March – June.,* in Interim: Bulletin of the York Archaeological Trust. Vol. 4, No, 2.

**Anonymous.** 1976b, *Site Review, June – September.,* in Interim: Bulletin of the York Archaeological Trust. Vol. 4, No. 3.

**Arup, O., University of York, & Thorpe, B.** 1991. *York Development & Archaeology Study.* English Heritage/York Archaeological Trust.

**Atkinson, J.C.** ed. 1879. *Cartularium Abbathiae de Whiteby ordinis S.Benedicti fundatae MLXXVIII.* Surtees Society, vol.69.

**Atkinson, J.C.** ed. 1881. *Cartularium Abbathiae de Whiteby ordinis S.Benedicti fundatae MLXXVIII.* Surtees Society, vol.72.

**Attreed, L.C.** 1991. *The York House Books 1461-1490.* Two Volumes, Allan Sutton, Stroud.

**Backhouse, J.** 1989. *The Luttrell Psalter.* British Library

**Ballard, A,** ed. 1913. *British Borough Charters 1042-1216.*

**Beresford, M.W.** 1967. *New towns of the Middle Ages: town plantation in England, Wales and Gascony.* Lutterworth Press, London.

**Beresford, M.W.** 1971 *History on the Ground: six studies in maps and landscapes.* Revised edition, Methuen: London

**Biddle, M.** 1981. *Towns.,* in **Wilson** 1981, pp.91-150.

**Bishop, S.** 1976a. *Skeldergate: Roman Riverside and Buildings.*, in **Addyman** 1976a, p.7.

**Bishop, S.** 1976b. *Skeldergate: Anglian and Anglo-Scandinavian Buildings.*, in **Addyman** 1976a, p.14.

**Bishop, S.** 1976c. *Skeldergate: The Medieval Sequence.*, in **Addyman** 1976a, pp.17-19.

**Briden, C.** 1997. *York as a Tidal Port.,* in Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, vol.69, pp.165-171.

**Brinklow, D.A.** 1984. *Roman Settlement around the Legionary Fortress.,* in **Addyman & Black.** 1984, pp.22-27.

**Brinklow, D.** 1986, *Main Roads serving Roman York.,* in **Brinklow, D et al** 1986, pp.84-101.

**Brinklow, D., Hall, R.A., Magilton, J.R. and Donaghey, S.** 1986. *Coney Street, Aldwark and Clementhorpe, Minor Sites and Roman Roads.,* in **Addyman** 1976b Vol 6 Roman Extra-mural Settlement and Roads, Fasc. 1.

**Burton, J.E.** *Yorkshire Nunneries in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries.* Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, York.

**Butler, L.A.S and Morris, R.K.** (eds). 1986. *The Anglo-Saxon Church: Papers on history, architecture and archaeology in honour of Dr. H.M. Taylor.* CBA, London.

**Carpenter, D.** 2015. *Magna Carta.* Penguin Classics, London.

**Carver, M.O.H.** 1976a. *Bishophill: The Roman sequence.,* in **Addyman** 1976a, pp.2-5.

**Carver, M.O.H.** 1976b. *Bishophill: destruction of Roman Buildings and Anglo-Scandinavian occupation.,* in **Addyman** 1976a, pp12-13.

**Carver, M.O.H.** 1976c. *Bishophill: the Medieval sequences.,* in **Addyman** 1976a, pp15-17.

**Carver, M.O.H., Donaghey, S. & Sumpter, A.B.** 1978, *Riverside Structures and a Well in Skeldergate and Buildings in Bishophill.,* in **Addyman** 1976b, vol 4 *The Colonia*, fas 1.

**Carver, M.O.H. & Sumpter, A.B.** 1978. *Buildings in Bishophill.,* in **Carver, M.O.H. et al** 1978, pp. 29-40.

**Carver, M.O.H.** 1987. *Underneath English Towns: Interpreting Urban Archaeology.* Batsford, London.

**Cavill, P.** 2018, *A new dictionary of English field-names.* English Place-name Society, Nottingham.

**Clarke, A.** *Albion Wharf – All Muck and Magic?,* in Interim: Archaeology in York. Vol 14, No. 1

**Clemoes, P and Hughes, K.** (ed). 1971. *Studies in Primary Sources presented to Dorothy Whitelock.* Cambridge University Press.

**Conzen, M.R.G.** 1968. *The use of town plans in Urban History.,* in **Dyos** 1968, pp113-130.

**Crawford, B.E.** 2008. *The churches dedicated to St. Clement in medieval England: a hagio-geography of the seafarer's saint in eleventh century north Europe.* Axioma, St. Petersburg, Russia, (2008).

**Darvill, T.** 2019. *Archaeology in the PPG16 era: Investigations in England 1990 – 2010.* Oxbow, Oxford.

**Davison, A.** 1987. *Terry Avenue – Tales of the River Bank.,* in Interim: Archaeology in York. Vol. 11, No. 4.

**Dean, G.** 2009 (reprint). *Medieval York.* The History Press, Stroud.

**Dean, G.** 2012b. *GIS, Archaeology and neighbourhood assemblages in medieval York,* in Post Classical Archaeologies, v2 7-29.

**Deneke, D. and Shaw, G.** (eds). 1988.*Urban Historical Geography: recent progress in Britain and Germany.* CUP, Cambridge & New York

**Dobson, R.B. & Donaghey, S.** 1984. *The History of Clementhorpe Nunnery.,* in **Addyman** 1976b, Vol.2 *Historical sources for York Archaeology after AD1100, Fas.1.*

**Donaghey, S.** 1977. *Get thee to Clementhorpe* in Interim: Bulletin of the York Archaeological Trust. Vol. 5, No. 1.

**Donaghey, S.** 1986. *58-59 Skeldergate.,*in **Moulden & Tweddle** 1986, pp.37-48.

**Demidowicz, G.** 2012. *From Queen Street to Little Park, Coventry: The failure of the medieval suburb in Cheylesmore Park and its transformation into the Little Park,* in Midland History, v37:1 106-115

**Drake, F.** *Eboracum: or the history and antiquities of the City of York, with a new introduction by K.J. Allison.*

**Dyos, H.J.** 1968. *The study of urban history: the proceedings of an international round-table conference of the Urban History Group at Gilbert Murray Hall, University of Leicester on 23-26th September 1966.* Edward Arnold, London.

**Esher, Viscount.** 1968. *York: A Study in Conservation; Report to the Minister of Housing and Local Government, and York City Council.* HMSO, London.

**Evans, D.** 1996. *Skeldergate and Roman Terraces in The Colonia.,* in Interim: Archaeology in York. Vol. 21, No.3.

**Farrar, W.** 1914. *Early Yorkshire Charters, Vol.1.* Ballantyne, Hanson & Co. Edinburgh

**Fenwick,** 2005. *The Poll Taxes of 1377,1379 and 1381, part 3 Wiltshire - Yorkshire,* in Records of Social and Economic History NS37

**Gilchrist, R.** 1994. *Gender and Material Culture: The Archaeology of Religious Women.* Routledge, Abingdon.

**Godman, P.** (ed).1982. *Alcuin: The Bishops, Kings and Saints of York.* Clarendon Press, Oxford.

**Goldberg, P.J.P.** (ed). 2007. *Richard Scrope: Archbishop, Rebel, Martyr.* Shaun Tyas, Donnington.

**Hall, R.** 1986. *Discussion.,* in **Moulden & Tweddle** 1986, pp 48-52.

**Hall, R.** 1994. *The English Heritage book of Viking Age York.* Batsford/English Heritage, London.

**Harvey, J.H.** 1965. *Bishophill and the Church of York,* in Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, v43, 377-93.

**Holt, R and Baker, N.** 2004.*Urban growth and the Medieval Church: Gloucester and Worcester.* Ashgate, Aldershot.

**Holt, R and Rosser, G.** 1990. *The Medieval Town: a reader in English urban history 1200 - 1540.* Longman, London.

**Hoskins, W.G.** 1977. *The making of the English Landscape.* Revised edition, Hodder and Stoughton, London (1977).

**Hyde, R.** 1994. *A Prospect of Britain: The town panoramas of Samuel and Nathaniel Buck.* Pavilion Books: London.

**Jones, A.** 2002. *A Thousand Years of the English Parish: Medieval Patterns and Modern Interpretations.* Cassell, London.

**Kemp, R.** 1996. *Anglian Settlement at 46-54 Fishergate.,* in **Addyman** 1976b, Vol. 7 *Anglian York,* fas.1.

**Kirby, J.L.** ed. 1995. Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem Vol.20. *Henry V, 1-5.* PRO/HMSO, London.

**Lang, J.,** 1991, Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture in England:
Volume 3: York and Eastern Yorkshire.

**Leach, A.F.** *Visitations and Memorials of Southwell Minster: Camden Society New Series Vol.48.* Camden Society.

**Lewin, J.** (ed). 1981. *British Rivers.* George Allen and Unwin: London.

**Lilley, K.D.** 2000. *Mapping the medieval city: plan analysis and urban history.,* in Urban History: v.27, issue. 1, pp. 5 – 30.

**MacRae, C.** 2013. *City of York Historic Characterisation Project - 2013, Character area statements.* City of York Council/English Heritage.
https://www.york.gov.uk/info/20214/conservation_and_archaeology/1297/york_historic_environment_characterisation_project

*Character area 19: Queen's Staith and Skeldergate*
*Character area 20: Bishophill*
*Character area 24: The Mount*
*Character area 29: Hob Moor*
*Character area 69: Fulford and Nun/Middlethorpe Ings*
*Character area 70: Terry's Factory*
*Character area 71: Clementhorpe and Bishopthorpe Road*
*Character area 72: Scarcroft Terraces and South Bank*
*Character area 73: Nunnery Lane*
*Character area 74: York Racecourse and the Knavesmire*

**Maxwell Lyte, H.C.** ed. 1898. Calendar of Patent Rolls, vol.4. *Edward I, 1301 – 1307.* PRO/HMSO, London.

**Monaghan, J.** 1997. *Roman Pottery from York.,* in **Addyman** 1976b, Vol. 16 The Pottery. Fas. 8.

**Morris, R.** 1986. *Alcuin, York and the alma sophia,* in **Butler, L.A.S and Morris, R.K** 80-89.

**Moulden, J. and Tweddle, D.** 1986. *Anglo-Scandinavian settlement South-west of the Ouse.,* in **Addyman** 1976b, Vol.8 *Anglo-Scandinavian York,* Fas.1.

**Neal, C., and Roskams, S.** 2013. *The past beneath our feet: the communities of Heslington East.* University of York.

**Oakey, N.** 1989. *The Case of the Disappearing Castle.,* in Interim: Archaeology in York. Vol. 14, No. 1.

**Ottaway, P.** 1992. *Archaeology in British Towns: from the Emperor Claudius to the Black Death.* Routledge, London.

**Ottaway, P.** 1993. *English Heritage book of Roman York.* Batsford/English Heritage.

**Ottaway, P.** 1995. *Measuring up the City.,* in Interim: Archaeology in York. Vol. 20, No. 4.

**Ottaway, P.** 1999. *Roman York.,* in **Tweddle et al.** 1999, 141-150.

**Ottaway, P.** 2011. *Archaeology in the Environs of Roman York: Excavations 1976 – 2005.,* in **Addyman** 1976b, Vol. 6, Roman Extra-mural Settlement and Roads. Fas.2.

**Palliser, D.M.** 1978a. *York's earliest administrative record: The Husgabel Roll of c.1284,* in The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, v50, 81-91.

**Palliser, D.M.** 1978b. *The Medieval Street-names of York,* in York Historian, v2. 2-16.

**Palliser, D.M.** 1984 *York's West Bank: Medieval suburb or Urban Nucleus,* in **Addyman, P.V. and Black, V.E** 1984, **pp** 101-108.

**Palliser, D.M.** (ed). 2000. *The Cambridge urban history of Britain, Volume 1, 600 - 1540.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

**Palliser, D.M.** 2005. *Towns and local communities in medieval and early modern England.* Ashgate, Burlington VT.

**Palliser, D.M.** 2014. *Medieval York 600 - 1540.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.

**Perrin, J.R.** 1981, *Roman Pottery from the Colonia; Skeldergate and Bishophill.,* in **Addyman** 1976b, Vol. 16 The Pottery, Fas. 2.

**Peacock, M.A.** 1905, *An English Document of about 1080.,* in The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal.

**Pevsner, N., Neave, D., Neave, S. and Hutchinson, J.** 1995. *Yorkshire: York and the East Riding.* Penguin,London.

**Piroyansky, D.** 2007. *'Martyrio pulchro finitus': Archbishop Scrope's Martyrdom and the creation of a cult,* in **Goldberg, P.J.P.** 2007 100-112

**Poole, A.L.** 1955. *Domesday to Magna Carta 1087-1216.* Oxford University Press. 2nd edition.

**Powicke, M.** 1962. *The Thirteenth Century 1216-1307.* Oxford University Press. 2nd edition.

**Raine, A.** 1955. *Medieval York: a topographical survey based on original sources.* John Murray, London.

**Ramm, H.G.** 1976. *The church of St. Mary, Bishophill Senior, York: Excavations, 1964,* in The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal, v48, 35-68.

**Ramm, H.G.** 1984. *The Duel Cross Milestone and Roman Roads west of York,* in **Addyman, P.V. & Black, V.E.** 1984, Archaeological Papers from York presented to M.W.Barley. 43-46.

**Rees Jones, S.** 2007. *Richard Scrope, the Bolton Hours and the Church of St. Martin in Micklegate: Reconstructing a Holy Neighbourhood in Later Medieval York,* in **Goldberg, P.J.P** 2007 214-236.

**Rees Jones, S.** 2013. *York: the making of a city 1068 - 1350.* Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York.

**Reynolds, S.** 1977. *An introduction to the history of English Medieval Towns.* Clarendon Press: Oxford

**Richardson, H.G.** and **Sayles, G.O.** eds. 1953. *Fleta: volume 2; Prologue and books I and II.* Selden Society Vol. 72.

**Rollason, D.** 1999. *Historical Evidence for Anglian York.,* in **Tweddle et al** 1999.

**Schofield, J. and Vince, A.** 2003. *Medieval Towns: the archaeology of British towns in their European setting.* Continuum, London.

**Sellars, M.** 1912. *York Memorandum Book: lettered A/Y in the Guildhall Muniment Room, 1379 -1493.* Surtees Society vol.120.

**Sharp, J.E.E.S.** and **Stamp, A.E.** eds. 1910. Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem vol.6. *Edward II, 10-20.* PRO/HMSO, London.

**Sharp, J.E.E.S.** and **Stamp, A.E.** eds. 1913. Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem vol.4. *Edward I, 29-35.* PRO/HMSO, London.

**Sheahan, J.J. and Whellan, T.** 1855. *York and the East Riding.*

**Sherley-Price, L.** (Tr. & ed), **and Latham, R.E.** (ed). 1968. *Bede: A History of the English Church and People.* Penguin Classics.

**Skaife, R.H.** ed. 1867. *The survey of the county of York, taken by John de Kirkby, commonly called Kirkby's Inquest: also, Inquisitions of knight's fees, the Nomina villarum for Yorkshire and an appendix of illustrative documents.* Surtees Society vol.49,

**Slater. T.R.** 1981. *The analysis of burgages in medieval towns: three case studies from the West Midlands,* in West Midlands Archaeology, v 23:53-66.

**Slater. T.** 1988. *English Medieval Town Planning,* in **Deneke, D. and Shaw, G.** 93-105.

**Smith, E.** 2004. *Hob Moor: Historic stray and local nature reserve.* William Sessions, York.

**Solloway, J.** 1910. *The Alien Benedictines of York: Being a complete history of Holy Trinity Priory, York.* Richard Jackson, Leeds.

**Stenton, F.M.** 1971. *Anglo-Saxon England.* 3rd edition. Oxford University Press.

**Tindal Hart, A.** 1986. *Ebor: The Archbishops of York.* Sessions, York.

**Tweddle, D., Moulden, J. and Logan, E.** 1999. *Anglian York a survey of the evidence.,* in **Addyman** 1976b, Vol. 7 *Anglian York,* fas.2.

**Wenham, L.P.** 1965. *Blossom Street excavations, York 1953-1955,* in Yorkshire Archaeological Journal v41, 524-53.

**Whitehand, J.W.R.** (ed). 1981. *The Urban Landscape: historical development and management: Papers by M.R.G.Conzen.* Academic Press, London & New York.

**Williams, B.** 2014, *The Whitby Abbot's Book: being the cartulary of the medieval Abbey of St. Peter and St. Hilda.* Friends of Whitby Abbey.

**Willis, R,** 1848. *The Architectural history of York Cathedral,* Archaeological Institute. Reproduced in *The Architectural history of some English Cathedrals, pt. 1, No. 3* 1972

**Wilson, B. and Mee, F.** 1988. *The Medieval Parish Churches of York.,* in **Addyman** 1976b. Supplementary Series, Vol. 1, The Pictorial Evidence, Fas. 1.

**Wilson, D.M.** (ed). 1981. *The Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England.* Cambridge University Press.

## Theses

The following theses are unpublished or have been made electronically available through the University of York.

**Curtis, D.A.** 2014.*Rural Morphology in the hinterland of York.* MA Thesis in Medieval Archaeology, Dept. Archaeology, University of York.

**Dean, G.** 2012. *Urban Neighbourhoods: Social and Spatial Development in York, c.600-1600.* Doctoral Thesis, Dept. of Archaeology, University of York.

**Rees Jones, S.** 1987. *Property Tenure and Rents: Some aspects of the topography and economy of Medieval York.* Doctoral Thesis, University of York

**Suarez Wilber, R.** 2015. *The Urban Congregation: Mapping developing medieval communities through the parish boundaries of Norwich and York.* MA Thesis in Medieval Archaeology, Dept. of Archaeology, University of York.

**Grey Literature.**

Unless otherwise stated this material was accessed through the Archaeological Data Service http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/

**Allen, S.J.** *4 Colenso Street, York, Watching Brief Report. YAT Report Number 2017/36* (courtesy of YAT)

**Dawes.** *The Human Bones, Clementhorpe 1976-7/3.* (Draft report courtesy of YAT)

**Dean, G.** *Report on an Archaeological Watching Brief, 6 Colenso Street, York. YAT Report Number 2004/4.* (Courtesy of YAT)

**Evans, D.T.** *76 Bishopthorpe Road.* York Archaeological Trust Unpublished Report Series

**FAS, Excavation and Evaluation Section.** *Moss Street Depot, Moss Street, York: Archaeological Evaluation Report.* (2003)

**Loffman, G.** *Archaeological Investigations at Clementhorpe Maltings, Watching Brief Report.* YAT Report Number 2016/35 (Courtesy of YAT)

**McComish, J.M.** *Excavations by York Archaeological Trust within the walled area to the south-west of the river Ouse: Web Based Report. YAT Report Number 2015/48.* (2015).

**WYAS: Archaeological Services.** *Bonding Warehouse, Skeldergate, York: Archaeological Desk-based Assessment and Building Assessment on behalf of City Life Yorkshire Limited. Report No. 1647.* (2007).

**York Archaeological Trust: York Archive Gazetteer. (YATGAZ).**

***Reports downloaded from*** www.yorkarchaelogy.co.uk

*Excavations at 32-Skeldergate, York, 1990.*

*Excavations at 47-51 Skeldergate, york,1996.*

*Tatting Ware: A shining example of Frankish pottery from excavations at Bishophill, Skeldergate, York, 1976.*

.

.