‘The House of Every One’: the Consumption of Material Culture in Castles during the English Civil War

Volume 1: Discussion and Bibliography

Rachel M. C. Askew

Thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Archaeology
University of Sheffield

September 2013

‘The house of every one is to him as his castle and fortress, as well for his defence against injury and violence as for his repose’

Edward Coke, 1604.

Abstract

Castles studies are currently polarised between proponents of the castle as defensive stronghold and those who view it as elite status symbol. However, these debates largely ignore the participation of castles in the English Civil War. This thesis addresses these problems through the development of an alternative, biographical approach which is applied to drinking and dining assemblages from three castles: Eccleshall, Staffordshire and Sandal and Pontefract, West Yorkshire.

Rather than interpret the castle from the viewpoint of its elite owner, a biographical approach utilises excavated material culture to investigate how the castle was inhabited on a daily basis by its non-elite occupants. It highlights the possibility that a castle is not identified on the basis of its appearance, but the way in which it is experienced by those who inhabit it. This is demonstrated by case studies of three buildings utilised as castles during the Civil War: a bishop's palace, a ruined motte and bailey and a strong fortress.

The selected assemblages demonstrate the important role played by food, drink and their containers during the Civil War. As well as being integral to a garrison's ability to stave off starvation, these assemblages were vital in the maintenance of group cohesion and identity. This is most clearly seen through the adoption of outmoded vessels and other material culture at all the castles studied. Analysis of these suggest the occupation of castles during this period, far from being an act of desperation, was instead part of a conscious effort by their defenders to legitimise and sustain their identity through references to the past. This demonstrates that, far from being divorced from the medieval period, the occupation of castles during this period was instead the continuation of a much longer history lasting from their initial construction until the present day.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without a doctoral award from the AHRC and the assistance of a large number of people. The staff at Wakefield Museum Service and the Potteries Museum, Stoke-on-Trent dealt with frequent visits and endless questions with patience and efficiency. Particular thanks go to Pam Judkins, Deb Klemperer and Sam Richardson for allowing me access to their archives during an extremely busy period. Dr. Chris Cumberpatch and Dr. Jane Richardson were extremely generous in answering my queries regarding Pontefract and provided unpublished material relating to their analysis of pottery and faunal remains from the castle. Peter Brears furthered my knowledge of the excavations at Sandal whilst Katey Goodwin permitted the reproduction of her graphs relating to the distribution of glass at Eccleshall (fig.6.11) and John Hudson answered my queries regarding 17th-century pottery manufacture. Stephanie Ratkai, Dr. Richard Thomas and Pete Boland all provided additional information regarding the excavations at Dudley and Susan Harrison answered my queries concerning Beeston and supplied the distribution plan of artefacts from Helmsley (fig 1.2). I would also like to thank the staff of the British Library for their assistance and Prof. Oliver Creighton, who provided the details of Crowmarsh Castle. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Anne Irving, without whose patience and extensive knowledge of post-medieval ceramics this thesis could not have been completed.

The world of Civil War archaeology is a small one, and I am particularly grateful to Dr. Lila Rakoczy, Dr. John Mabbitt, Brian Kerr and Peter Harrington for sharing their experience and information regarding particular aspects of their research. At the University of Sheffield, my fellow PhD researchers have provided endless support and fruitful debate, particular thanks to Alex Cassels, Claire Finn, Charlotte Howsam, Freya Massey, Alyx Mattison, Dr. Gareth Perry and Veronica Velasquez. Dr. Amy Hufton was also invaluable in providing necessary support as were my family, particularly my parents.

Dr. Hugh Willmott supervised this thesis with great skill and patience and also shared invaluable knowledge regarding post-medieval glass. It was examined by Prof. Dawn Hadley and Prof. Oliver Creighton, for whose insight and comments the author is extremely grateful. Finally, thanks to David for his love, support and computer wizardry. I could not have done it without you.

Abbreviations used within the text

AO= Athenae Oxonienses

CJ= Journal of the House of Commons

CWT= Civil War Tracts (Minster Library, York)

HMC=Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts

HMSO= Her Majesty's Stationery Office

HC= House of Commons

MPRG= Medieval Pottery Research Group

PRO= Public Records Office

RCHME= Royal Commission on Historical Monuments England

SP= Collection of State papers

SRO= Scottish Record Office

STC= Item included within Pollard and Redgrave's *Short-Title Catalogue*

TT=Thomason Tract preserved at the British Library

Wing= Item included within *Wing's Short-Title Catalogue (1641-1700)*

Table of Contents

1 Introduction: a new approach to castles

'Almost any question one may raise about castles has already been raised and answered' (Brown 1969, 134)

Few buildings provoke an emotional response like the English castle. From their depiction on the Bayeux tapestry to their prominence in the "Rose and Castle" motifs on 19th-century canal barges, they have long been a potent and adaptable symbol. This flexibility in meaning has meant they have become obscured by modern definitions and relating emotions, resulting in a scholarly conflict between champions of a castle's military function and supporters of its symbolic status. Proponents of the latter often cite the low incidence of siege warfare in England and Wales during the later medieval period, suggesting that at castles such as Raglan, modified during the late 15th century, 'the 'military' view... is in retreat, but has yet to be finally killed off' as such castles were only 'lightly fortified to protect against the endemic 'casual violence'... rather than a formal, full-scale siege' (Johnson 2002, 84, 96). However, between 1642 and 1649 buildings used to support this argument, including Raglan, Tattershall and Wingfield Manor to name but a few, were all invested with the 'formal, full-scale siege' they were supposedly ill-equipped for. This 17th-century contradiction, caused by the English Civil War, is often ignored or dismissed as an example of the primitive nature of the conflict, but in fact highlights the way in which castles were multi-faceted institutions encapsulating ideas of both status *and* defence.

As a result, a new, biographical approach to castles is essential to move beyond the motivation surrounding the castle's construction and instead focus on the castle as a phenomenon which varied across time, space and the individuals who experienced it. This concept, adopted from material culture theory, utilises objects consumed at castle sites to demonstrate how a static architecture influenced, and in turn was influenced by, the social discourse of its inhabitants. By studying the artefacts associated with eating and drinking retrieved from Civil War siege sites it is possible to demonstrate the importance the castle played in both the military and social interactions of the 17th century.

1.1 Thesis Aims

This thesis has two primary aims. First, it suggests a biographical approach to castles which moves beyond the dichotomies of status or defence to appreciate how the experience of the castle is multifaceted and dependent on temporal, spatial and social contexts. Second, it addresses the neglect of the post-medieval castle as a social, as opposed to military, entity through a study of activities which occurred here during the English Civil War. These aims are fulfilled through the examination of Civil War assemblages from three castles: Eccleshall in Staffordshire, and Sandal and Pontefract in Yorkshire (see fig. 1.1). The holistic analysis of material culture associated with the consumption of food and drink within these castles demonstrates the complexity of social interactions during this period and the reliance placed upon communal consumption in the creation and maintenance of a group identity. Finally, it highlights the importance tradition played within the Civil War, particularly amongst Royalist garrisons, and how this is demonstrated through the use and discard of artefacts at all three sites.

1.2 Thesis structure

Although the three case studies provide the main focus of this thesis, these need to be placed within a theoretical framework which establishes the biographical approach to castles and situate the use of material culture at these sites within contemporary social discourse. The present chapter outlines the current approaches to castle studies and discusses why these are insufficient to fully comprehend the castle's complexity. It proposes and outlines an alternative biographical approach that utilises material culture to appreciate the changing interpretations of the castle through time, space and social context. Although only one aspect of a complete biography, the use of the castle during the 17th century highlights the need for such an approach (chapter 2) and provides many suitable case studies to test this methodology, including the three presented here.

As a castle biography is reliant on the consumption of material culture, the following chapter (chapter 3) discusses the application of material culture theory to castle biographies before highlighting the active role played by food, drink and associated artefacts during the mid-17th century and the Civil War in particular. However, most of the Civil War assemblages retrieved from castle sites were deposited not by the

besieged but by those responsible for the slighting of castles in the aftermath of the conflict. As a result, the destruction of material culture during the conflict is considered (chapter 4), particularly in reference to the three case studies. The unique motivations for destruction at all three castles demonstrates the need for a site-specific approach when analysing both the occupation and abandonment of fortified sites during this period.

As the analysis of social discourse requires a holistic approach to material culture, the methodology employed avoids traditional approaches to facilitate the examination of an entire assemblage as opposed to a particular material type (chapter 5). Emphasising evidence of use over evidence of origin, the methodology identifies non-residual vessels, and facilitates a comparison of all material types within and between features. This is then employed at three siege sites, Eccleshall (chapter 6), Sandal (chapter 7) and Pontefract (chapter 8) to examine social discourse at each castle during the conflict. Although there are significant differences between these sites, the considerable amount of archaic material culture at all castles demonstrates the need for continuity and tradition within garrisons, a phenomenon discussed in chapter 9. Finally, the conclusion (chapter 10) summarises the thesis findings and suggests ways in which the approach could be further employed to promote the concept of castle biographies.

1.3 The Role of Castles

The heated debate over the role of the castle, epitomised by recent articles in *Medieval Archaeology* (Platt 2007; Creighton and Liddiard 2008), focuses on whether castles were predominantly defensive or were instead symbols of lordly power and status. Designated “the Battle for Bodiam” after the castle of the same name in East Sussex, emphasis is placed on the construction of architecture and the surrounding landscape to highlight elements which support either side of the argument. Although the deadlock between these two viewpoints continues, recent scholars have highlighted the need for alternative approaches which transcend the current stalemate to appreciate the castle as a complex institution with multiple meanings and interpretations (Creighton 2008, 88). However, before the need for an alternative methodology is discussed, it is first necessary to understand the current approaches used and the two factions in the Battle

for Bodiam; the positivists, who support a martial interpretation of castles and the relativists, who prefer to see the castle as an elite status symbol.

1.3.1 Not just a pretty picture: the positivist approach

The earliest studies of the castle (e.g. Clark 1884; Armitage 1912; Braun 1948; Allen Brown 1954) agreed unequivocally with the Oxford English Dictionary (second edition) definition of the castle as 'a large building or set of buildings fortified for defence against an enemy; a fortress, stronghold'. As a result, initial studies confirmed the castle as an essentially feudal and military institution, an interpretation which influences a large number of castellologists to the present day (Thompson 1994, 444, examples include Warner 1971; Reid 1973; Wilkinson 1973; Platt 1982 2007; Cathcart King 1988). Positivists suggest that, during a period of endemic warfare, castles were built as an alternative to the raising and maintenance of large armies which were more expensive and lacked the chivalric and feudal symbolism of the castle (Brauer and van Tuyll 2008, 70-72). Castles are also viewed as part of an evolution from hillforts towards modern warfare, with architecture such as gun ports at Bodiam showing their adaptation to the latest technology (Jones 1999, 166). Even when accepting the decreased martial presence of castles during the later medieval period, some scholars see their residential role as largely subsidiary to their defensive function (e.g. O'Neil 1960; Warner 1971; Bottomley 1979; Pettifer 1995), whilst others emphasise their continued martial symbolism (e.g. Turner 1986; Allen Brown 1989). As a result, a military function is deemed to be the key dividing line between castles and fortified manor houses, albeit a distinction that becomes increasingly blurred over time (Kightly 1979, 142).

The positivist interpretation of castles suggests that, as essentially military structures, these buildings accordingly possess a specific architecture which can be differentiated from ecclesiastical and other secular buildings, and by which they can be described and classified (e.g. Clark 1884; Armitage 1912; Toy 1963). As they have such an obvious role, castles are often described rather than interpreted, aided in part by the wider neglect of castles by historians who fail to provide a context in which to interpret them (Allen Brown 1989, 1). As a result other works, including D.J.C. King's *Castellarium Anglicanum* (1983), exclude from their analysis all buildings which do not meet strict

military criteria, thus 'the term does not extend to fortified towns or fortified monasteries' (King 1983, xv; see also Clark 1884; Allen Brown 1954). The emphasis on architectural form and ground plans has had a heavy influence on subsequent interpretations, with much of the criticism surrounding this approach focussed on these two areas.

1.3.2 Playing at soldiers: the revisionist approach

From the 1960s onwards the primacy of defence in the interpretation of castles came under increasing attack from both historians (e.g. Coulson 1979; 1994) and archaeologists (e.g. Stocker 1993), as a result of which it was claimed that 'the social purposes of fortresses almost always comprehended and transcended their military functions' (Coulson 1979, 74). In other words, whilst a castle might look like a fortress its symbolism was intended to impress and deter elite visitors rather than act as a meaningful defence (see also Fradley 2006). Although there are still proponents who see the true castle as being both a house and a fortress, with later castles being seen as fake or 'show' castles due to their emphasis on comfort over defence (e.g. Gilchrist 1999, 238), increasingly the architecture used to define the evolution of castle design is deemed to have a largely symbolic basis, as demonstrated at Orford (Heslop 1991). In addition, castellologists have widened their study of castles to understand the use of space within these structures (e.g. Richardson 2003; Fradley 2006) and their setting within the wider landscape (e.g. Creighton 2002).

Proponents of the revisionist stance emphasise the context in which the castle was built, thus later medieval castles were predominantly symbolic as improved siegecraft made their defensive role defunct (Coulson 1979, 82). Analysis of licences to crenellate, originally used to establish a chronology for buildings, showed that these were used by the elite to emphasise their status as opposed to strengthen their walls, with monasteries, town houses and even a garden wall being granted licences alongside castles (Coulson 1994, 90-94). The castellation of a building is thus seen as an ornamentation and status symbol as opposed to a deliberate attempt at fortification, the very word 'castle' being imported into the English language to reflect a dominant social group as opposed to a specific set of architecture (Wheatley 2001, 32). Thus it is predominantly prestige that governed the construction and crenellation of Raglan (Coulson 1979, 80), despite this

building withstanding Parliamentarian attack for four years during the Civil War (Gaunt 1987, 186-8). Although it is acknowledged in some instances that violence may have influenced the choice of design (e.g. Fradley 2006, 175), it is often argued that martial architecture does not necessarily constitute defensible architecture.

1.3.3 The Battle for Bodiam

The debate between those who propose a defensive role for castles and those who support their inception as symbols of status has been named the 'Battle for Bodiam' after Bodiam Castle in East Sussex, as it was debate surrounding this castle that caused marked division between castellologists (e.g. Coulson 1992; Liddiard 2005; Platt 2007). Although its picturesque setting had been noted for many years, it was seen as the archetypal medieval castle by positivists who drew attention to its 'strong corners and flanking towers firing over a wide moat' (Warner 1971, 233). However, a detailed critique of the military interpretation suggested that the poor positioning of gun and arrow loops, the absence of flanking towers and lack of defences protecting the moat's dam demonstrated that the castle was meant for chivalric display as opposed to serious defence. This was supported by studies of the landscape which indicated that the landscape and moat were designed for aesthetics as opposed to defence (Taylor *et al.* 1990; Everson 1996; Liddiard 2005, 7-10).

Although this interpretation has been vigorously challenged by those supporting its defensive merits (e.g. Platt 2007), the use of Bodiam as the *cause celèbre* of revisionists (e.g. Stocker 1993, 418) is misleading. Despite strong opposition (e.g. Turner 1986), Bodiam had already been described in the past as a fortified manor house (Braun 1948, 106), a palace-castle as opposed to a castle-palace (Clark 1884, 4) and an old soldier's dream house (Hohler 1966). As such, any critique of Bodiam's defensive capabilities, however comprehensive, cannot be applied unequivocally to other castles of the period; whilst its aesthetics make it an obvious target for argument and counter-argument, they also mean it may not be typical of the majority of castles (Coulson 2003, 8). Despite this, the alternative view of castles offered by revisionists is extremely attractive, suggesting as it does that castles are not predominately military (Coulson 1994, 86). However, such a critique fails to take into account the castle's subsequent use, as even though a building may be defensively viable within modern interpretations, this does

not mean that it could not, given the right circumstances, be used as a defensive structure (see below, 2.5). Consequently, emphasis on revisionism in castles may have shifted the argument too much onto aspects of status, obscuring some of the subtleties of castles that were a key part of their interpretation in the past.

1.4 Revising the revisionist approach

The entrenched stance between positivists and revisionists has created a strong tendency by both sides to take extreme stances on the role of castles and there is still intense debate (e.g. Platt 2007) despite recent work taking a more balanced view (e.g. Creighton 2002; Creighton and Liddiard 2008). However, just as the methods and approaches used by positivists were analysed by revisionists, it is now appropriate to analyse current approaches to castles to suggest why these are insufficient to fully appreciate the complexity of castles and the way in which they were viewed. These reasons broadly fall into four areas: the selection of castles for analysis, the characterisation of defensive or indefensible features, static interpretations of the role of the castle and the emphasis on elite interpretations.

1.4.1 Castle selection

Although some castellologists are explicit about the motivations behind their chosen corpus of sites (Johnson 2002, 15), all too often studies focus on castles that have been selected on the basis of their preservation or situation. Although there are exceptions, such as the early 14th-century Keep at Knaresborough (Dixon 1990), it is no coincidence that the majority of castles used in modern debates tend to be English Heritage properties located in the south of the country and with a high degree of preservation (see for example the analysis of Orford Castle, Heslop 1991). Thus selected sites, such as Kenilworth (Johnson 2002, 136-160), Bodiam (Coulson 1992; Johnson 2002, 19-30) and Cooling (Johnson 2002, xiii-xix), may be exceptions to castle architecture rather than the norm. This is a hazardous approach, as whilst warfare may not have been of primary concern for some castles, this does not negate a defensive function for others. Even though it is highly likely that warfare was never the sole reason for building a castle this does not mean it was not of primary concern in some instances. Therefore, the determination of the role of the castle on the basis of a few examples is extremely risky.

1.4.2 Characterisation of defence

As noted at Raglan castle (see above, introduction), the motivation behind the construction of a castle is often deemed to determine its subsequent use; therefore, a castle built in a period or area of little conflict is likely to be of symbolic, rather than defensive, value (Coulson 1979, 90). Similarly architectural features at Bodiam can be described as being non-defensive and 'impossible to use effectively' and thus constructed as a private joke of the elite (Johnson 2002, 29). However, whilst castellologists may view a building as indefensible, potential defenders or attackers may not have interpreted it in the same way. For example, whether Bodiam was indefensible in practice matters little, 'what *was* important was whether Sir Edward or his potential attackers *saw* the castle as sufficiently defensible' (Turner 1986, 277). It is no coincidence that the same gunports at Bodiam have been interpreted both as defensive (Platt 2007) and indefensible (Coulson 1992; Johnson 2002, 29) dependent on the observer, as the characterisation of features is one of the key arguments by positivists and revisionists; if a castle can be defended, it was built for this purpose, if it cannot be defended, then its primary purpose must have been as a status symbol.

Analyses can also be based around flawed judgements. For example, the main audience chamber at Knaresborough is deemed to be 'very simple' to focus the visitors' attention on the lord (Dixon 1990, 127). However, what may appear a plain room to modern scholars is highly unlikely to have been so in the past as portable material culture such as furniture and tapestries could easily transform a plain room into a magnificent one (Woolgar 1999, 73). Similarly, whilst spatial analyses of buildings may demonstrate how people might have moved around them and suggest a hierarchy of experience (e.g. Richardson 2003), by itself it cannot do more than suggest how the elite *intended* a building and wider landscape to be used rather than how it was used in reality.

Whilst it would be misleading to deny that there were strong stylistic and iconographic traditions behind the construction of castles, the negation of their defensive role is to the detriment of castle studies as a whole. Revisionists often use the inability of castles to withstand sieges as evidence for their stance (e.g. Creighton and Liddiard 2008, 162), yet this is clearly challenged by the events of the English Civil War (see below, 2.3). Therefore, to say a castle was not intended to be defensive because it could not

withstand a sustained siege is misunderstanding the motivations behind their creation, as castles were designed to be a deterrent rather than a long-term fortress (Coulson 2003, 121). Many buildings never had to face heavy bombardment (Kightly 1979, 182-3) and, in addition, the construction of earthworks could quickly strengthen a stronghold's defence and be just as successful against cannon as masonry, leading to many sieges becoming prolonged and tedious (Gaunt 1991, 18; Hutton and Reeves 1998, 203; Humphrys 2007, 80-1).

The interpretation of castles on the basis of architecture also assumes that this was the dominant factor in determining their definition and use to the detriment of alternative evidence. Castles were intended to be theatrical backdrops (Dixon 1990, 127), yet the actors themselves may have played very different roles within the castle and viewed it in a very different light to that intended by its builders. Whilst these undoubtedly played a key role, the emphasis on architecture and location in the landscape detracts from other evidence that demonstrates the meaning of castles is far subtler than can be seen through these two approaches alone. Indeed, during the medieval period, 'castrum', literally 'camp' in Latin, could refer to castles, monasteries, Roman marching camps, town houses, city walls, warships and artillery forts (Liddiard 2005, 40; Coulson 2003, 29-30). Therefore, by attempting to separate the 'real' from the 'fake' castle, we completely misunderstand how these buildings were interpreted in the past.

As landscape scholars themselves point out, there is great difficulty in ascertaining when a landscape was fabricated and whether this was in conjunction with the development of the castle (Creighton 2002, 83). However, there has been a tendency to describe a landscape as deliberately designed when the finished product suggests a desire to display wealth and status as opposed to a conscious attempt to display a castle in a particular way (Liddiard and Williamson 2008, 533). For example, the "Gun Garden" at Bodiam is suggested as a viewing platform to survey the magnificence of the castle (Taylor *et al.* 1990, 157), yet there is limited archaeological evidence for this and its asymmetrical placement with respect to the castle suggests its view may have been less deliberate than has previously been assumed (Hurst 1962-3, 334-5; Platt 2007, 89; Liddiard and Williamson 2008, 524).

Ultimately the determinism of features is symptomatic of a wider weakness of current studies, which suggest that the way in which a castle is conceived is the same as the way in which it was universally interpreted by everyone throughout time and space, irrespective of social factors such as age, gender and social status. This stance, in which the motivations of the builder determine all subsequent interpretations, is particularly restrictive when interpreting the role of castles in the past.

1.4.3 The Static Role of Castles

Although there can be little doubt that castles were built with symbolism in mind, the emphasis by castellologists on the motivations of the elite in the construction of their castles means that only one interpretation of the castle is achieved, that of a very small elite minority at one particular point in time. However, to suggest that the interpretation of castles is static and is unaffected by time and space is misleading. Bodiam castle may have been built in one phase (Coulson 1992, 54), but this does not necessitate a single phase of use, or even that the way in which it was conceived by Sir Edward Dallingridge was how it was perceived in the following centuries or by his contemporaries from a different social background. As O' Keeffe (2001, 76) notes, 'the 'meaning' of the architecture can and does change.' In addition, current approaches rely on the surviving architecture and landscape being an accurate representation of the past. Thus at Bodiam although 'much of the interior… and an uncertain but considerable amount of masonry, have disappeared' (Coulson 1992, 67), it is still supposedly possible to reconstruct the perceptions of those who experienced the castle at the point of its inception from the remaining masonry, particularly the towers and outer walls.

Whilst it may be true that licences to crenellate increased in times of peace rather than war (Coulson 1994, 111), they deflect from the study of how castles were subsequently experienced. As can be seen during the English Civil War (see 2.5), a castle originally conceived as a symbol of status can be deemed an effective fortress given the appropriate social context. To focus on the castle at the moment of its inception is to create a static interpretation of architecture which does not allow for different interpretations over time; however, it is highly unlikely that a castle keep constructed in the 13th century is interpreted in the same way by the 15th century. For example, studies of the outer bailey at Kuuisto Castle, Finland have shown that it was originally used as a

rose garden before increased warfare and a worsening climate led to its probable destruction in the 16th century (Uotila 2004). As a result, a contextualised approach is required in which the interpretation of castles is allowed to alter over time. Although this is briefly mentioned by Johnson (1999a, 72) in his interpretation of Wressle Castle in Yorkshire, the argument then returns to a debate on the motivations of its creators as opposed to a discussion about the changing interpretation of buildings over time.

1.4.4 Elite interpretations

Landscape approaches often seek to move towards the inclusion of people within the landscape, but they all too often focus on a *particular* type of person, namely the elite constructor of the castle. However, a study of the constructor's intentions is not enough to fully appreciate how castles participated in social discourse as it is highly doubtful that the elite interpretation of a castle, if indeed a single elite interpretation existed, was accepted or understood by the majority of people. It is notable that Johnson's visitor to Bodiam is a knight, whose motivations and interpretations are apparently easily understood (Johnson 2002, 30), as opposed to the 'everyday' experiences of the non-elite occupants who formed the majority of those who experienced castles, particularly during an era when itinerant households meant the nobility were absent from their estates for long periods of time (Woolgar 1999). As such, the castle was only occasionally witness to elite lifestyles, instead being occupied more usually by diverse non-elite communities. Therefore, there is a problem in trying to reconcile 'chronologically differentiated synaesthetic experiences', as one critic terms it (Fleming 2006, 273). In other words, people removed in time or by social conditions such as age, class or gender will view and interpret the landscape differently. That is not to say that landscape studies are redundant, but by themselves they cannot offer a complete understanding of how the castle was interpreted and experienced in the past. As a result, new approaches are needed which not only complement landscape studies but also recognise social, spatial and temporal differences in the interpretation of buildings and their settings. Just as there is a damaging paradox in some medieval studies between medieval ecclesiastical culture for the elite and secular culture for the lower orders (Heslop 1991, 36), so too there is an equally damaging paradox in castles between noble architecture and peasant experience.

The failure to produce a complex interpretation of castles is part of a wider problem with phenomenological interpretations of the landscape. The experiences that shape the human mind are complex and multifaceted so it is impossible to convey a single conception of a particular landscape by those who experience it because, just as landscapes are contested in the present, so they were in the past (Bender 2002; Brück 2005, 61). Therefore, whilst landscape and architectural studies elucidate how castles were central places, economic centres and 'badges of wealth or status' (Creighton 2002, 223), they often fail to engage with the majority of people who experienced castles.

1.4.5 The need for a new approach

Although the differences between revisionist and positivist approaches have yet to be truly reconciled (e.g. Platt 2007), castellologists are increasingly moving towards a more diffuse meaning of castles in which the dichotomy of status or defence is deemed to be false (e.g. Coulson 2003; Liddiard 2005; Creighton 2008; Creighton and Liddiard 2008). As Austin (1984, 69) states, 'can we genuinely understand the meaning of the castle today without knowing how the contemporary mind viewed it?' In his critique of Bodiam, Coulson (1992, 96) notes that the contemporary meaning of the word castle was complex and not necessarily the same as ours. This fits into a wider criticism of phenomenology as even though archaeologists may see a relationship between architecture and perceiver as significant, this may not have been recognised or deemed significant by those in the past (Brück 2005, 51). Therefore, there is a need to move beyond the military context of castles to examine the social discourse conducted within their walls. This has been initialised for other forms of monumental buildings, such as monasteries (e.g. Gilchrist 1997), but castles, despite limited functional analyses (e.g. Richardson 2003), lag some way behind.

One commentator on castles in the post-medieval world examines 'the value of castles to communities in their substantial phases of 'non-castle' usage' (Speight 2008, 385). However, this implies that there is a separate 'castle' usage which, as has been argued, is by no means certain. Rather than separate the medieval from the post-medieval, the functional from the romantic, we must instead consider the application of modern meanings and categories to castles when their interpretation in the past is so clearly at variance with our own. As noted above, the medieval understanding of *castra* took

many different forms, despite only a handful of these being recognisable as castles under current definitions (see 1.4.2). It is our own fixed ideas of the castle which have given rise to the arguments of defence against status, an argument which would have been alien and nonsensical to those who inhabited castles in the past. Therefore, instead of distinguishing between "castles" and "non-castles" each structure should be studied according to the temporal and spatial context in which it had a role.

Just as the buildings that could be defined as castles in the past were many, so the people who viewed them came from a wealth of different backgrounds and experiences. As such, it is imperative to move beyond the single contemporary mind of many current interpretations and instead begin to differentiate and reconstruct a plethora of complementary and conflicting contemporary viewpoints (Austin 1984, 69). Landscape and architectural approaches can only contribute so much without descending into a simplistic debate between status and defence. Although the landscape may be the most important source of information about the relationship between a castle and its surroundings (Creighton 2002, 9), in order to understand the relationship between a castle and its inhabitants a much broader approach is necessary. Some castles, such as Launceston, were occupied for over 900 years (Saunders 2006, 455) and it is highly unlikely that the way in which they were viewed remained static throughout this period. Therefore, an approach is needed which facilitates an adaptable interpretation of the castle which can change through time, space and social context.

1.5 Beyond the Castle Gate: the biography of castles

Recent studies have demonstrated how the castle was a flexible concept in the medieval period, encapsulating many shifting and complex ideologies including civic, ecclesiastical and imperial identities and even being synonymous with female virginity and chastity (Wheatley 2001; 2004; Landewé 2010). Studies of castles in the post-medieval period demonstrate that castles have particular relevance in terms of national, military and local identities depending on the context in which they are viewed; 'they are never neutral' (Speight 2008, 388). As how a castle was used defined its purpose rather than its architecture (Coulson 2003, 48), examining the idea of the castle offers a new approach in which castles are defined not by their walls and landscape, but instead by their social significance (O' Keeffe 2001; Wheatley 2004).

In order to appreciate the complexity of the castle, it is first necessary to develop a new approach that facilitates a flexible, multi-faceted interpretation. One such method is the application of object biographies, which suggests that objects can have different meanings throughout their life cycle dependent on the context in which they are used (Koptyoff 1986; Gosden and Marshall 1999). Far from being sterile (Austin 1984, 72), artefacts are instead active, possessing multi-layered meanings which change and develop depending on temporal and spatial contexts and the people with whom they interact (e.g. Moreland 1999; Holtorf 2002; Miller 2002). Through treating castles as active, rather than passive, institutions they are allowed to develop their own significance rather than having modern interpretations imposed upon them. Such an approach does not interpret buildings solely on the basis of present-day landscape or architecture but instead explores how contemporaries view and experience them. As a result, it is possible for a building to be viewed variously as a mansion, fortified manor and castle without any architectural change and solely depending on who experiences it and when.

The biography of castles, defined as 'a history of events and relationships that it has participated in' (Rakoczy 2007, 4), has previously been explored by scholars such as Matthew Johnson (2002). However, a biography is far more complex than an analysis of buildings or landscapes and encompasses more than a description of events. It includes the way in which contemporaries of all social backgrounds viewed the castle and the way it participated in particular social discourses. As such the development of a castle's biography is extremely complex, but the result is a far richer understanding of how these buildings were viewed in the past.

1.6 Excavating biographies and material culture

Although castles are starting to be seen as multi-faceted institutions, the approaches used have often seen them in terms of how they were intended to be viewed, as opposed to how they were actually used. The constructors of a castle may have intended it as an education for the ordinary person (Coulson 1979, 76), but is this how it was in fact perceived? As a result, studying the biography of castles requires a holistic methodology in which landscape and architectural studies must be combined with other approaches including documentary research and archaeological excavation.

Just as the application of object biographies has much to offer castellology, so the study of material culture retrieved from archaeological excavations offers a new approach to castle studies in which the distribution of artefacts around a site can suggest how castles were involved in social discourse. Whilst the need to integrate material culture from castles with their interpretation has been recognised (Creighton and Liddiard 2008, 166), there have been very few studies demonstrating how this might be achieved. One rare example comes from the castle of Middelburg-in-Flanders, Belgium (de Clercq *et al.* 2007) where excavations of garderobe deposits relating to sieges of the Spanish-Dutch war in the late 16th to early 17th centuries demonstrated that consumption patterns amongst different social groups were maintained despite disruption to supply routes.

Such an approach is governed by the artefacts that people used and disposed of on a daily basis. Rather than elite architecture, these objects consist of the lowest material categories, including wood and pottery, which would be used by the lower orders of society. This facilitates insights into how non-elite groups viewed the castle, something notoriously difficult under current approaches (Liddiard 2005, 147). Furthermore, as material culture changes more rapidly than the buildings in which it was consumed, it is possible to see how the social discourse at a site changed whilst the architecture remained static. For example, at Sandal, the distribution of medieval pottery could be used to show a change in site use over time and with appropriate research techniques it is possible to obtain a meaningful interpretation of the ways in which castles participated in social discourse in the past (Moorhouse 1983a, 169-173). However, to apply this approach more widely it is necessary to develop research strategies that utilise existing excavation records as well as proposing possible new sites for future excavation.

The approach of large-scale excavation is an expensive one (Austin 1984), but is vital if we are to fully appreciate the significance these monuments had in past societies. A recent study of excavations of castle sites since 1956 (Creighton 2008) shows that these are by no means restricted in number. However, the extensive excavations required for the advocated approach are becoming increasingly rare, with small watching briefs becoming the normal method of intervention (Creighton 2002, 10). These aim to elucidate the architectural plans of buildings with little attempt to date the uncovered

remains or place them in a wider social context (Austin 1984, 72; Creighton 2002, 9). Thus whilst the number of landscape studies has increased, identifying a large number of sites which are yet to be fully understood, the volume of excavations to understand them has decreased; as Creighton (2008, 82-4) states, 'large-scale well-funded research excavations across a carefully sampled range of sites might be desirable…but are simply not very likely'.

There are, however, a significant number of exceptions to this, particularly sites which were excavated during the mid to late 20th century. These include Launceston (Saunders 1989), Pontefract (Roberts 2002a) and Sandal (Mayes and Butler 1983), although as with many excavations the published reports of these sites lagged several years, and in some cases decades, behind the completion of excavations. Different problems pervade other sites, such as the extensive excavations at Dudley where the excavations remain largely unpublished (see 10.3), and at others, such as Stafford (Soden 2007), the reports were produced by teams who had little if any association with the original excavation. Multiple small-scale excavations, such as those at Wallingford (Christie *et al.* 2003, 9; Creighton 2008, 84; Christie and Creighton 2013), also require synthesis alongside the large volume of grey literature concerning small interventions at many castle sites. Even where castles have been subject to clearance by the Ministry of Works as opposed to systematic excavation, analysis of the resultant assemblages is sometimes possible, as demonstrated by Andrew Morrison's work at Helmsley Castle, North Yorkshire (Harrington 2005, 108, see fig. 1.2). As with the study of landscape, material culture is not an appropriate approach for all sites, but this does not mean it should summarily dismissed as, given the right conditions, it has huge potential.

The focus on landscape archaeology as a tool in the interpretation of castles has led increasingly to the castle being situated in a wider geographical context (e.g. Higham and Barker 2000, 141-57). However, despite occasional instances of material culture being used to demonstrate the wider links between elite estates (e.g. Moorhouse 1983b), this approach largely examines landscape features as opposed to excavated material and reports usually deal with structural remains, omitting material culture for any purpose other than dating (Creighton 2008, 85). When artefacts are discussed, there is a preference towards gaming pieces, militaria and other household objects (e.g. Gaimster *et al.* 1996), supposedly because these can 'provide an altogether more informative

picture of life within castle walls than can be given by coins and pottery' (Kenyon 1990, 163). As a result, castle studies still give the impression that they are ground plan and landscape orientated with finds, if they are discussed, divorced from the main body of material.

Where excavated material is incorporated into the interpretation of castles, it is likely to be faunal evidence as opposed to other types of material culture such as ceramics. In one publication on castles, whilst environmental archaeology is demonstrated to give many insights into the economic and environmental context of castle life, there is scant mention of other excavated material, even in the directions for future research (Creighton 2002, 224-8). To some extent this reflects the nature of a publication emphasising the placement of castles within their landscape, yet whilst studies of faunal remains at Launceston (Albarella and David 1996), Dudley (Thomas 2005) and Barnard Castle (Donaldson *et al.* 1980) have proved fruitful, by themselves they cannot explain the way in which castles were used and experienced by those who inhabited them.

1.7 Conclusion

The castle cannot be seen as a straightforward symbol either of military strength or social status, but is instead an amalgamation of a variety of conflicting identities and ideals which are belied by the relatively static nature of its architecture. A castle is not a castle because an armchair archaeologist has said it conforms to a specific set of criteria; it is instead a castle because the people who experience it on a daily basis say it is a castle. The challenge to those who study the castle is to interpret it in its own terms rather than those we choose for it.

As Liddiard (2005, 11) states, 'castles are, fundamentally, about people, those who built and experienced them.' It is how to understand that experience which should be the primary concern of castellology in the future. Landscape approaches are to be valued, especially ones that realise the complexity of those who experienced it. However, they can only go so far, and the emphasis will always be placed on the inception of landscape as opposed to its consequent use. The design of castles was certainly meant to be symbolic (Heslop 1991, 54), but this does not mean that such buildings could not be defended when required. The principal problem with trying to interpret the role of

castles lies in how we define a castle in the first place. If we define it on the basis of its architecture, the result is not only a highly restrictive category, in which the inclusion of some examples such as Bodiam can be controversial, but also a static category that is unable to react to temporal and spatial variation and differences in social interpretation.

Material culture has a great deal to offer the field of castle studies, but the challenge is to use it to interpret deposits rather than as dating evidence, a purpose for which it is poorly suited (Moorhouse 1986, 85; Courtney 2001, 109). By placing material culture at the forefront as opposed to the rear of castle studies, it is possible to gain a deeper understanding of this most complex of institutions. Having outlined the biographical approach, the next chapter will discuss the reasons why the use of castles during the Civil War not only highlights the need for such an approach but also presents a unique opportunity to apply this methodology to the archaeological record.

2 The Role of Castles during the English Civil War

'Castles are at once the best known and least understood of medieval buildings' (Allen Brown 1989, 1)

2.1 Introduction

By determining the post-medieval study of castles to be 'inappropriate' (Kenyon 1990, 203), a paradox has been created between the revisionist interpretation of castles as defensively weak social symbols and the 17th-century reality, when a large number were put to military use and required a large investment of manpower or cannon to assault successfully (Cathcart King 1988, 29). Thus Raglan can be described as being built when the military motivation for castle construction was 'in retreat' (Johnson 2002, 84) or as 'one of the last great castles of medieval Britain' (Gaunt 1987, 186), depending on the focus of study. These two interpretations are clearly incompatible, but the divide between medieval and post-medieval schools of thought means this problem has yet to be resolved. This often leads to the use of the castle during the Civil War being ignored entirely, with focus placed instead on their role as romantic icons from the 18th century onwards (e.g. Austin 1984; Speight 2008; although see Rakoczy 2007). Such a divide is clearly detrimental to academic study and therefore it is imperative that the role of these buildings during the 17th century is reinstated into the wider field of castle studies.

The 17th-century fortification of buildings traditionally considered as castles alongside mansions, moated manor houses and converted abbeys highlights the complexity surrounding the definition of a castle during this period. Rather than interpreting the use of castles during the Civil War as an anomaly, this study proves the exact opposite as the definition of a castle remained just as complex during the conflict as it was in previous centuries. As a result, the examination of social discourse within castles during the Civil War has much wider implications concerning the role of castles within both medieval and post-medieval society. In addition, the deposition of significant amounts of material culture at garrison sites after the conflict provides an ideal opportunity to

demonstrate the benefits gained through a biographical approach, as will be seen at the three sites selected for study in this thesis.

2.2 The English Civil War: an introduction

It is impossible to underestimate the social and physical impact the English Civil War had on England and its neighbouring countries. It has been estimated that between 1642 and 1651, around 84,738 people were killed in England and Wales as a direct result of warfare, with a further estimated 100,000 dying as a result of disease. This represents 3.6% of an estimated total population of 5 million and does not include injured or maimed civilians and soldiers (Carlton 1991, 18-20). Not until modern times is it possible to find a suitable parallel, when an estimated 1.75% of the British population (around 740,000 people) were killed in World War I in a conflict which did not take place on English soil (Dumas and Vedel-Petersen 1923, 145; Winter 1977, 450-451). The catastrophic loss of life in the Civil War eclipsed previous civil conflicts such as the Anarchy and the Wars of the Roses and was accompanied by immense social change. By the end of January 1649, England was without a monarch for the first time since the Anglo-Saxon period and the monumental architecture of England was altered forever as castles and other high status residences were systematically destroyed.

The conflict, also referred to as the English Civil Wars, the English Revolution, the War of the Three Kingdoms or the English Wars of Religion, was a series of skirmishes, sieges and set-piece battles which affected almost every corner of the kingdom[1]. The term 'English Civil War' is a misnomer as the war was waged across Scotland, Wales, Ireland and England in three distinct phases, 1642-1647, 1648-1649 and 1649-1651 (see fig. 2.1). The causes and tactics employed during the three conflicts have been subject to extensive study by historians and were demonstrably different in the way they were

[1] The English Revolution often refers to the broad social and political change of which the conflict was a part, e.g. Hill 1955; Stone 1972; Morrill 1993. MacInnes (2005) adopts the title *The British Revolution*. See also *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms* (Gentles 2007), which differentiates between the Civil War and the wider socio-political context. The discord between the many denominations of Christianity is highlighted by scholars who prefer to refer to the conflict as the Wars of Religion (e.g. Prior and Burgess 2011).

conducted. Although any discussion of these within this thesis would be a great simplification of extremely complex events, a brief outline of the war is required to highlight the participation of castles during the conflict.

i. The first Civil War (1642-1647). War had become increasingly inevitable in the months leading to August 1642, when Charles I formally raised his standard at Nottingham to call for volunteers to fight his Parliamentarian opponents. In the resulting war, which ended in March 1647 with the surrender of Harlech castle, counties across the country were embroiled in a conflict that set neighbour against neighbour and led to large tracts of the country being damaged through pillage and disease. Although the conflict is noted for its battles, most notably Edgehill (1642), Marston Moor (1644) and Naseby (1645), in reality the majority of the fighting occurred within the less glamorous context of sieges and small skirmishes (Harrington 2005, 1; Hutton and Reeves 1998, 195). As a result, this phase saw the greatest use of castles during the Civil War, with many slighted after their surrender.

ii. The second Civil War (1648-1649) was caused in part by Scottish and Presbyterian dissent with Parliament. As many Royalists rigorously obeyed the oaths they had given to Parliament to never rebel again, strong resistance was only found in small areas of the country including Kent, Essex and Yorkshire. Only a small number of castles, including Pembroke and Pontefract, participated within the conflict alongside urban garrisons such as Colchester.

iii. The third Civil War (1649-1651) marks Charles II's ill-fated attempt to seize his father's throne, culminating in the defeat of his largely Scottish army at the battle of Worcester on 3rd September 1651 and his flight to Scotland. Although several Scottish castles were besieged during the conflict, most notably Edinburgh (Hutton and Reeves 1998, 221), no English castle played a significant role.

The termination of this thesis is marked by the formal surrender of Pontefract on 24th March, 1649. The conflicts marked the final large-scale participation of English castles within the theatre of war although, as demonstrated by the Cold War defences at Dover

Castle, individual castles continued to play a military role into the 20th century and beyond (Humphreys 2010, 87-88).

2.3 An inconvenient truth I: the post-medieval castle within medieval studies

The participation of castles in post-medieval social discourse has, in comparison to their extensively studied origins (e.g. Brown 1969; Saunders 1977; Thompson 1991), only received limited investigation (notable exceptions include Kightly 1979; Thompson 1987; Harrington 1992; 2004; Rakoczy 2007). This reflects their identification as an essentially medieval phenomenon and is characterised by the founding statement of the Castle Studies Group (1987, 2), which emphasises that the study of castles aids an understanding of *medieval*, as opposed to medieval and post-medieval society (see also Austin 1984, 69). Recent discussions on the future of castellology suggest this shows little signs of change (e.g. Creighton 2008, 80). Indeed, many studies of castles, fortifications and sieges terminate in the late 15th century, with the rise of Henrican forts in the 16th century seen as marking a new rise of private fortification aimed at protecting the kingdom as a whole rather than elite individuals (e.g. Platt 1982, 187; Coulson 2003, 301).

This neglect means that the military use of castles during the 17th century goes largely unnoticed. For example, one medieval companion to castles contains no mention of the Civil War in its entry on sieges, instead stating that 'in England relatively few castles or fortified towns were ever called upon to resist a siege' (Friar 2003, 263). A discussion on the distribution of castle sieges also ignores their occurrence in the Civil War, despite this being the period when castles reached the peak of their military activity (Liddiard 2005, 74-5). Other scholars discuss the Civil War in terms of the damage it has caused to medieval architecture, such as works which obscured the original form of the gatehouse at Banbury (Kenyon 1990, 68). In the rare publications which do address their participation in the conflict as a subject in its own right, the castle has been seen as in *decline* rather than in active use, with castles fortified 'when their day was thought to be over' (Bottomley 1979, 165).

The emphasis on the decline of the castle has led to an assumption regarding the castle's weakness when faced with gunpowder and their consequent loss of popularity, with

some castellologists going so far as to view their use in the mid-17th century as 'ironic' or as an act of desperation (Pettifer 1995, xx; Thompson 1987, 138). The rise of gunpowder and the preference for pitched battles in conflicts such as the Wars of the Roses in the 15th century has led to the walls of castles, constructed before the use of cannon, being viewed as easy prey for artillery with the defenders having little chance of success (Allen Brown 1954, 89; Brauer and van Tuyll 2008, 47). This leads to an element of shock amongst some castellologists, who note that 'the surprisingly large number of sieges that took place at medieval castles' proved they were 'surprisingly defensible' (Liddiard 2005, 95; Johnson 1981, 183).

Despite claims that castles were only able to withstand short sieges (Braun 1948, 112), more recent analysis has demonstrated this was not the case. Studies of 25 major Civil War sieges have shown that only two castles were successfully stormed, suggesting that castles were more suited to a defensive role than has been previously assumed (Carlton 1991, 29). This outcome has in some cases, such as Corfe, been attributed to artillery causing minimal damage due to the lack of trained gunners (Humphrys 2007, 82), but this cannot used as an explanation for all castles. It should also be remembered that, as demonstrated by the fall of Rochester castle to King John's forces in 1215, 'only in legend were fortresses arrogantly 'impregnable', even the most costly' (Coulson 2003, 121). The walls of the castle were always designed to be a deterrent, designed to resist the enemy for sufficient time for reinforcements to arrive or disease and supply depleting the numbers of the besieged. As a result, far from being an anomaly in the history of the castle, the Civil War instead fits perfectly into the depiction of an elusive institution which has always resided uneasily between concepts of status and defence.

2.4 An inconvenient truth II: the post-medieval castle within Civil War studies.

Somewhat paradoxically, whilst the castle has been studied during the medieval period as a predominantly social phenomenon, its analysis during the Civil Wars has been largely governed by studies of battlefield archaeology, with emphasis placed on the military action as opposed to the social impact (e.g. Foard 2001; 2012). By assuming that a building occupied during the Civil War must be unequivocally defensible, post-medieval scholars place themselves in direct opposition to medieval scholars who may view the same building as a symbol of status (Rakoczy 2007, 9).

Current methodologies focus on the identification of key areas of conflict through the use of metal detector survey, as at Cheriton, Hampshire and Edgehill, Warwickshire, whilst other studies concentrate upon the physical landscape of war, particularly the identification and assessment of standing remains and earthworks associated with Civil War sieges (Foard 2001; 2012, 121-186; Bonsall 2007). This means that whilst the history and site plans of fortifications is well developed (Foard 2001, 87), the social discourse conducted within them remains largely ignored (Rakoczy 2007, 9). Where utilised, the artefacts recovered from sites are primarily used to identify area which saw military action, with archaeological features subject to 'limited excavation' as opposed to the extensive excavation required for assemblage studies (Harrington 2005, 112). This is typified by Kenneth Wiggins' publication (2001) on the siege of King John's Castle in Limerick, which whilst being an excellent publication in terms of the utilisation of history and archaeology to recreate the military aspects of the siege, contains no mention of any non-military material culture uncovered during the excavation.

As sites are considered from a military viewpoint, so the selection of castles is seen in terms of logistics. Garrison sites are thus discussed in terms of their role as satellite defences for larger garrisons and control of territory rather than in terms of social significance (e.g. Harrington 2005, 95). Similarly, although there are many studies about the military effects of sieges (e.g. Hutton and Reeves 1998), there are far fewer on their social effects, and rarely are the two linked (a notable exception being Porter 1994). As a result, sieges are often discussed in terms of conflict and casualties, despite the fact that many besieged castles surrendered through starvation rather than storming (Hutton and Reeves 1998, 227), and sieges were only periodically interrupted by bloodshed. For example, at the siege of Pontefract, although 1,364 shots were fired from the Parliamentarian guns during the first five days of the siege in January 1645, only 42 shots were fired in the subsequent 38 days (Porter 1994, 54). Therefore, the study of the Civil War siege is the study of tedium and daily routine rather than the action of military combat, despite the prominence given to the latter.

However, there are a few publications demonstrating that archaeology can add another dimension to sieges through highlighting areas not normally covered by documents,

including diet, weaponry used and the treatment of the dead (Harrington 2004, 8). Most notable amongst these are the excavation reports for Pontefract Castle (Roberts 1988; 2002a), Harrington's *English Civil War Archaeology* (2004), and fragmentary reports concerning elements of the Civil War assemblages from Dudley Castle (Ratkai 1985; Moffett 1992; Gaimster *et al*. 1996; Thomas 2005). Rakoczy has taken a different approach with the *Archaeology of Destruction* (2007), exploring the social motivations behind the slighting of castles as opposed to their Civil War use. Her evaluation of a number of sites, including Pontefract, Helmsley and Kenilworth, demonstrate the overly simplistic approach which has been adopted towards Civil War castles, and the benefits which can be gained through a contextual analysis of the social discourse at siege sites. For example, Johnson's interpretation of the slighting of Kenilworth castle as a move by the 'middling sort' (Johnson 2002, 174), has drawn criticism as the motivations behind the destruction of castles have been demonstrated to be extremely complex (Rakoczy 2007, 29). The original proposal for Kenilworth was for the complete demolition of the castle, but this was abandoned in favour of the partial demolition of the Keep nearest to the town and the gatehouse was left as a residence for the governor (Thompson 1987, 147-8). The complexity of property destruction is supported by local studies of urban environments such as Exeter, London and Colchester (Stoyle 1996; Porter 1984a; Mabbitt 2012), although the difficulty in associating excavated urban artefacts with specific historical periods means such studies usually rely on military, documentary and architectural evidence, one rare exception being Leicester (Courtney and Courtney 1992).

The use of castles during the Civil War has often been explained in terms of social evolution, with the conflict marking a brief hiatus in the 'transition of the British and Irish from warrior to civilian societies' (Hutton and Reeves 1998, 233). However, the study of castles during this period demonstrates they were far from an anomalous throwback to a barbaric, uncivilised past, a conclusion which has far-reaching implications.

2.5 The castle during the Civil War

A survey of buildings from England and Wales occupied by troops in the Civil War, based on Gaunt's (1987) gazetteer of Civil War sites, demonstrates that a diverse range

of buildings were utilised during the Civil War (see fig. 2.2). Of those occupied in England and Wales during the course of the conflict, 120 sites are described as castles, 102 as urban sites and 114 are referred to as non-fortified dwellings, including mansions, houses and manor houses. The use of large numbers of traditionally non-military buildings highlights the weakness of the division between castles and houses already noted by some castellologists (Cherry 2007, 414; Creighton and Liddiard 2008, 167) and demonstrates that architecture is, by itself, insufficient evidence to identify a castle. Instead, a more complex study is required which investigates each site in terms of why it was occupied and its significance to both sides.

The distribution of buildings utilised as garrison sites during the conflict (see fig. 2.3) shows that only East Anglia, an area under firm Parliamentarian control, escaped any large-scale conflict with the single exception of Colchester, which played a significant role during the second Civil War (Mabbitt 2012, 3). However, even in these areas castles continued to be utilised; for example, at Cambridge the Norman motte and bailey was embellished with bastions and other defences despite never being under any serious threat (Cessford 2008, 137-140). Castle sites are distributed fairly evenly across the rest of the country along with other fortified sites such as moated or crenelated manor houses. Unfortified sites on the other hand are concentrated within the midlands, reflecting the intense fighting which took place here. This distribution demonstrates that there is a link between the fortification of buildings and the uncertainty of territory. However, few castles were used in the previous civil conflict, the Wars of the Roses, so this by itself cannot fully explain why during the Civil Wars the majority of troops were situated in strongholds as opposed to on the field of battle (Hutton and Reeves 1998, 195). In addition, although this explains why fortifications were required, it fails to elucidate why particular buildings, many of them seemingly unfit for defence, were occupied and successfully held by their defenders. Although the need for protection was a large factor in the decisions made, there is also a strong social element in explaining why certain buildings were fortified over others.

A study of the propaganda produced during the conflict has claimed that Royalists preferred to use castles defended by their aristocratic owners whilst Parliament preferred towns defended by their inhabitants (Hutton and Reeves 1998, 200). Whilst the distribution of garrisons does not differentiate between Royalist and Parliamentarian

strongholds, mainly through difficulties in identifying the original fortifier of a particular site, in reality the pattern was far more complex than the propaganda might suggest. The Royalists for example held a few towns, including Oxford, Bristol and Chester whilst garrisons such as Rushall Hall, Hopton and Beeston were fortified for Parliament. Both sides also commended the efforts of protagonists who defended their own property against the opposition, as demonstrated by the Parliamentarian praise heaped upon Brilliana Harley for her defence of Brampton Bryan (Hudson 1993, 91).

The large number of buildings utilised as midlands garrisons, despite their apparent lack of defence, is indicative of how castles could have a symbolic value which was more important that their physical presence. Even houses initially fortified by owners seeking to protect their property continued to be used as garrisons once they had been seized by their opposition. For example, the Royalist Coughton Court, Warwickshire was utilised by Parliament for the rest of the first Civil War following its capture in 1643 and this situation is repeated at many other houses including Compton Wynates, Warwickshire and Benthall Hall, Shropshire (Gaunt 1987, 140, 160). This continuation emphasises the symbolic importance many buildings had despite their poor military defences. Indeed, their lack of military strength could play a key role in propaganda that celebrated the struggle of homeowners against hopeless odds, as at Caldecote Hall. Here, Royalist forces led by Prince Rupert were initially repulsed with heavy losses by the owner's wife, her son-in-law and 11 servants, leading to Rupert sparing the eventually defeated garrison from further damage out of respect (Humphrys 2007, 120-1). The buildings occupied during the course of the conflict demonstrate the complexity of the definition of a castle in which architecture did not always play a primary role.

Some castles, such as Pontefract and Warwick, were intentionally occupied at the beginning of the war whilst others were adapted only when the need arose. For example, Brampton Bryan was fortified by its owner Lady Brilliana Harley after she refused to hand her home over to a new Royalist commander, with the castle successfully withstanding a siege lasting seven weeks until the Royalists withdrew (Fraser 1984, 175-181; Humphrys 2007, 121-3). Although many, such as Rushall Hall in the West Midlands, may have only been able to hold out against the besiegers for a matter of hours (Gaunt 1987, 164; Sherwood 1992, 39), the fact that these buildings were chosen and fortified despite being indefensible either suggests the defenders were

incompetent, which is unlikely, or that far more complex social factors were at work than military considerations alone. It has been claimed that other buildings such as mansions and churches were only utilised when castles were either too dilapidated or too few in number (Kightly 1979, 183). However, this needs to be balanced against the use of buildings which were not defensible in any way, such as Aston Hall in Birmingham (Gaunt 1987, 163). The range of buildings adopted for use as fortifications is clear evidence that during this period it was not just castles which were deemed to be defensible; never has the traditional adage that 'an Englishman's home is his castle' been more appropriate. Even when a 'true' castle such as Sandal was fortified, the motivations behind its construction were complex, with considerations of defence not being of primary concern (see below, 7.3).

2.6 The (un)changing role of castles

It has been claimed that when castles are incapable of a defensive role, the emphasis falls on large armies to determine the outcome of the conflict through pitched battles (Coulson 1979, 77). As a result, the use of castles and other buildings in the Civil War gives rise to a contradiction in which castles seemingly incapable of defence during the medieval period are suddenly defensively active in subsequent centuries alongside mansions, moated manors and churches. One example of this is Donnington in Berkshire, which has been described as 'very weak' (Coulson 1992, 97) whilst at the same time 'enduring repeated attacks and sieges' during the English Civil War, when it survived in Royalist hands from 1642 until April 1646 (Gaunt 1987, 6). Other castles, such as Wigmore, were deemed to be such a threat they were pre-emptively destroyed by their Parliamentarian owners to prevent their use in the conflict (Robinson 1869, 142).

The lack of defensive buildings is suggested as one reason why the castle had a minimal role in the Wars of the Roses (Pettifer 1995, xviii), yet if this is the case it fails to explain why buildings such as Wingfield Manor, with seemingly little defensive role, were not only occupied during the Civil War but also withstood a sieges for weeks at a time (Harrington 2004, 64-65). For example Wardour Castle 'might have kept a band of marauding peasants at bay but it would have stood little chance against a determined, well-equipped enemy' (Humphrys 2007, 21), but a garrison of 25 held out for five days

against an opposing Parliamentarian force 1300 men strong in May 1643. The castle subsequently withstood a four month siege by the Royalists which only succeeded through mining (Gaunt 1987, 174), and by Humphrys' own admission (2007, 87), 'the guns employed by the attackers were never large enough to do any significant damage'. The commencement of the Civil War did witness a shortage of trained soldiers and fortifications, but this does not mean that the 'primitive' defences were unable to endure a sustained siege (Courtney 2001, 105), as during this period the difficulty of obtaining and transporting large cannon meant many supposedly indefensible buildings could withstand a substantial siege (Saunders 1989, 75).

The negative perception of the use of castles during this period is compounded by the use of medieval techniques such as sows, a type of siege engine, during the conflict (Johnson 1981, 183; Hutton and Reeves 1998, 232). As a result, there is a tendency to dismiss the Civil War as inferior, with few 'proper' battles. However, although continental warfare may have developed different techniques, this does not mean that the Civil War should be viewed in terms of primitive warfare. Instead, the impact of using medieval methods and fortifications needs to be comprehended, as this would have a substantial impact on the social discourse at these sites (see below, 9.2). It should not be forgotten that in the 17th century a military calling 'was still the highest secular calling of all' (Saunders 1989, 70) and this must have had an impact on those who experienced life under siege. Although some archaeologists have seen the post-medieval period as being markedly different from the preceding centuries (e.g. Johnson 1996), there is much to be gained from a different approach which sees aspects of the 17th century as heavily influenced by earlier conflicts.

The complexity of the use of castles during this period should not be seen as separate from their use in the preceding centuries, but rather as reflecting their elusive definition and purpose throughout their life cycles; it is no coincidence that 'despite the increasing importance of gunpowder and sophistication of defences, many of the basic principles of siege warfare remained unchanged from the medieval period' (Courtney 2001, 105). The use of buildings which would normally not be seen as castles is not confined solely to the Civil Wars; in 1373 a house in Barton-on-Humber was held by its disgruntled occupant, in the words of contemporaries, 'as a castle' (Coulson 2003, 47). Therefore, the challenge is not to interpret buildings with military architecture in terms of whether

these can or cannot constitute fortresses, but instead see how contemporaries might consider calling a building a fortress even when its architecture may suggest otherwise.

To suggest a division between the medieval and post-medieval interpretation of castles is to ignore the organic way in which perceptions about monuments and other institutions develop, the generations of the present being influenced by the past and in turn influencing those of the future (Austin 1984, 72). As such, the experience of the castle during the 17th century cannot be disassociated from the preceding centuries, as seemingly indefensible castles and houses were not only occupied but also, to varying degrees, withstood sieges. Therefore, the ideological concepts of the castle could prove to be just as effective as its physical form, defence being as much an idea as a practical consideration (Wheatley 2001, 2). The use of castles during the Civil War demonstrates the flexibility of their role and this needs to be appreciated in the methods used to study them.

2.7 The biography of the Civil War castle

The complexity of social discourse surrounding the castle during this period presents the perfect opportunity to understand one chapter in its biography. This is aided in no small part both by the large amount of contemporary documentation, including diaries, letters and newssheets, and the nature of occupation at many sites. Many castles witnessed little or no occupation in the decades preceding the conflict and were demolished shortly after they had surrendered, resulting in layers of occupation which are clearly related to activity on the site during this period (Courtney 2001, 109). As a result, the substantial Civil War deposits from largely rural sites such as Beeston (Knight 1982; 1992; 1993; 1994), Montgomery (Ellis 1993a) and Helmsley (fig. 1.2) present a unique opportunity for studying the social experience of conflict during the mid-17th century. However, the marginalised status of the Civil War in castle studies means the presence of civil war material is often overlooked within excavation reports, for example although the medieval pottery report for Sandal castle is 129 pages long, discussion of the siege-period wares cover a mere five (Moorhouse 1983a; Brears 1983, 219-224). In addition, the nature of civil war archaeology means that, with the exception of militaria, occupation horizons at castle sites are largely overlooked.

In urban environments, the excavation of Civil War defences has suggested the physical form these took (Courtney 2001), but the challenge is to relate this to the social impact of the fighting remains. In many towns and cities the complications of urban environments, as at Newcastle-upon-Tyne Castle (Nolan 1990), mean such approaches are impossible but this only increases the importance of castle sites where it *is* possible to isolate Civil War deposits. Although problematic, it is possible to move beyond the recording of the layout of fortifications and place these within their social context.

The development of biographies does rely on largely undisturbed deposits; wells and garderobes in particular are extremely valuable sources of material, as demonstrated by the Civil War deposits from St. Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln (Mann 2008) and Dudley Castle (Moffett 1992). However, financial and practical restrictions often mean such features remain unexcavated; for example, at Launceston castle, whilst two garderobes were emptied, the well was not (Saunders 2006). Despite this, the amount of material gathered from sites such as Beeston Castle (Ellis 1993a) and Basing House (Moorhouse 1970; 1971a) demonstrate that such an approach is possible given the right resources. The excavation of other post-medieval garrisons from Mauritius (Floore and Jayasena 2010) and Fort Watson, South Carolina (Ferguson 1977), have similarly highlighted the important role artefacts can play in the social discourse of a military site. Therefore, the application of these approaches to English Civil War sites presents a fresh insight into the social, as opposed to military, occupation of a particular castle.

Although studies of Civil War sites have often focussed on the military aspects of occupation, arms and armour, like any other artefact, were embedded in the social discourse of a given site, as demonstrated by studies of militaria from the fort at Jamestown, Virginia (Straube 2006). Indeed, these alone could not sustain a garrison and the procurement of food and drink in particular were a vital part of ensuring an army's survival, especially when a garrison was besieged. Starvation was a common reason for the surrender of a castle; when the garrison finally capitulated at Beeston only two biscuits and a piece of pie remained (Barratt 1995, 17), whilst a commander who surrendered a well-provisioned fortification could be heavily punished (Carlton 1992, 168). As a result, this thesis will focus on the non-military artefacts recovered from Civil War sites, in particular the material culture consumed alongside food and drink. This aims to redress the bias of Civil War studies towards military aspects of

warfare whilst at the same time recognising the important role food and drink played within contemporary social discourse.

Although studies of other sites have highlighted possible differences between Catholics and Protestants within the archaeological record (e.g. de Groote and Pype 2007, 20), this thesis avoids religious stereotypes to fully appreciate the role food and drink played within individual garrisons. The comparison between the drunken catholic Royalist and the sober, Puritan Parliamentarian is erroneous, as in reality the latter viewed drunkenness and its effects with great suspicion rather than alcohol itself, a feeling shared by a number of Catholic royalist commanders including the Marquis of Worcester (Capp 2012, 152; Bayly 1650, 5). Alcohol was a useful anaesthetic to the terror and tedium of conflict, whilst the rituals associated with it were an essential part of the formation of group identity (see below, 9.5.1).

By focussing on non-martial assemblages, this thesis highlights the important role non-military social discourse played in the maintenance of a garrison at war. Although the approach discussed here could be applied to any Civil War site with large assemblages directly linked to the conflict, three case studies have been selected for inclusion within this thesis; Eccleshall, Staffordshire and Sandal and Pontefract, West Yorkshire.

2.8 Selected sites

The chosen sites exemplify the broad range of buildings selected for military use during the Civil War, incorporating a bishop's palace with limited fortifications, a largely ruined castle which was hastily modified, and one of the strongest fortresses within the kingdom. All have produced substantial assemblages from excavations of scales varying from a section of moat to near total investigation. The analysis of the material culture recovered from these demonstrates the complexity of social discourse and emphasises why a contextualised approach must be adopted when studying castle sites during this period.

2.8.1 Eccleshall

The palace of the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield was fortified on the orders of the King around February 1643. Despite its relative lack of defences which might be

interpreted by some scholars as evidence of status over military use, it successfully withstood a Parliamentarian siege for ten weeks until it was forced to surrender due to subterfuge in September 1643. Its triumphant captor, Sir William Brereton, intended to inhabit the castle after the conflict but was forced by Parliament to abandon his plans and instead the castle was slighted and fell into ruin until its final demolition in the late 17th century. Excavations around the castle's north wall between 1973 and 1975 revealed extensive deposits of largely complete material culture including a large collection of glass vessels. The assemblage is notable in its own right as a case study of an elite mid-17th century household, but also demonstrates the use of archaic vessels and raises important questions regarding the destruction of material culture after the conflict.

2.8.2 Sandal

The prominence of Sandal within castle studies is largely due to its status as one of the few castles subject to almost total archaeological excavation. A developed motte-and-bailey castle two miles south of Wakefield, West Yorkshire (see fig. 2.4), it played a role during the Battle of Wakefield in 1460 and was renovated by Richard III before his death in 1485. Despite being substantially in ruins, upon the outbreak of another civil conflict it was occupied by around 80 Royalists troops who withstood periodic sieges until 22nd July 1645, when the castle surrendered after a short bombardment by newly-arrived Parliamentarian cannon (Bishop 1645). Between 1964 and 1973 a team of volunteers fully excavated the interior of the castle, recovering extensive amounts of material culture relating to all phases of occupation, including the Civil War. The nature of the excavations facilitates a full spatial analysis of material deposited within the castle, highlighting separate areas of social discourse and demonstrating how conventions of everyday life were maintained even during times of duress.

2.8.3 Pontefract

One of the strongest castles in England, Pontefract was an active participant in the first and second Civil Wars (see figs. 2.5 and 8.1). Initially occupied by Royalist troops, it was besieged from 25th December 1644 until its surrender to Parliament on 20th July 1645, although the siege was briefly lifted by troops led by Sir Marmaduke Langdale on 1st March 1645 (Heylyn 1645a). A motion to slight the castle was rejected by Act of Parliament in 1645, but a few months later a small royalist party led by Colonel John

Morris seized the castle from its Parliamentarian occupants by subterfuge on 3rd June 1648. This led to the third siege of the castle, which lasted until 24th March 1649 when the garrison finally surrendered, several months after the execution of Charles I. This event, probably due to a fever which had decimated the garrison (Holmes 1887, 319), was swiftly followed by the almost total destruction of the castle, with most of the profit from the sale of materials being donated to the town for repairs. Partial excavations undertaken as part of conservation work within the castle between 1982 and 1986 revealed extensive deposits relating to the conflict, particularly in the basement of the Constable Tower. A siege diary written by Nathan Drake during the first two sieges presents a unique opportunity to study the material culture of a siege alongside eyewitness reports and highlight the importance placed on communal drinking rituals in creating a single group identity (Walker 1997).

2.9 Conclusion

The use of castles during the Civil War demonstrate that even when these sites do become the backdrop for conflict, the warfare they witnessed was not solely about 'terror, pain, killing and blood' (Carmen 1999, 243). Instead, the garrisons enclosed within their walls were subject to long periods of time in which little military activity occurred, yet this has received scant attention in the majority of studies. By emphasising the role non-military material culture played in the social discourse of the conflict through the analysis of artefacts deposited at three Civil War sites it is possible to redress this imbalance, in the process confirming the castle as a versatile phenomenon which is extremely active in contemporary social discourse.

The study of castles from 1642 until 1649 is only one chapter of a much larger biography. However, the analysis of material culture deposited shortly after the Civil War provides a valuable opportunity to evaluate the benefits of an approach determined by material culture which can then be applied to other sites and other periods. There are substantial benefits to be gained from this methodology, as the combination of historical and archaeological approaches can give an insight not just into how individual sieges were conducted (Courtney 2001, 113), but also into how the people within those sieges perceived themselves and the buildings around them. However, before this can be

achieved it is first necessary to fully appreciate the role material culture played in the social discourse of consumption during the mid-17th century.

3 The consumption of food, drink and associated material culture during the English Civil War

‘Enjoying feasts and drinking bouts that seemed excessive by civilian standards were privileges of military life’

(Tlusty 2002, 152)

3.1 Consumption: an archaeological introduction

The consumption of material culture lies at the heart of all social discourse, regardless of location or time period. It encompasses not just the inevitable destruction of material culture, but also the endowment of meaning on an object through its life cycle. Artefacts are more than mere tools, they are also participants in a complex, recursive relationship between agent and object which defines and sustains both parties (Weatherill 1996, 5). Only by understanding that relationship is it possible to fully appreciate the artefacts deposited within castles during the English Civil War.

Since its inception in the 1970s, material culture studies have diversified to the extent where a single approach to consumption is impossible (Fairchilds 1993, 857-858; Fine and Leopold 1993, 3-4). As a result the focus on particular aspects of consumption has often been determined by period of history and academic study (Martin 1993, 143-144). Economists have focussed on a consumer society associated with market forces and issues of supply and demand (e.g. Ashworth 2003; Stuard 1985), sociologists on the role played by consumption in modern society (e.g. Koptyoff 1986; Miller 1987) and historians on evidence for emulative consumption (e.g. Campbell 1993), with all schools examining the "Birth of the Consumer Society" in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (McKendrick *et al.* 1982, 9). There are comparatively few studies examining the consumption of artefacts in earlier periods and one such study, of medieval patterns of consumption (Stuard 1985), has been deemed to be ‘stretching a point' (Fine and Leopold 1993, 64). As a result, consumption is often seen as a post-medieval phenomenon solely relating to the rise of the consumer society and with no prevalence in earlier centuries.

However, it is important to note that 'the process of cultural appropriation of material things is not reducible either to production or consumption but is to do with a series of types of interactions between people and objects' (Dant 1999, 14). Rather than consumption being a separate process, beginning where market processes terminate (Douglas and Isherwood 1996, 36), it is integral to all stages of an artefact's life from initial conception through production and sale to use and eventual discard. All objects are consumed, even when the choice of artefacts available is limited. Rather than emphasising the procurement of objects and how they were purchased, it is often more useful to focus on how and where they were subsequently used (Pennell 1998, 202).

As the meaning of an object relies on its interpretation within a particular context, consumption patterns vary dependent on the *habitus* occupied by particular agents (Dant 1999, 21). As a result it is necessary to understand the role food, drink and associated material culture played during the 17th century, and the English Civil War in particular, before attempting the analysis of objects recovered from Civil War sites.

3.2 The English Irish Souldier: an introduction to the significance of food and drink during the English Civil War.

Despite the vast potential offered by material culture studies, current analyses of food and drink within the conflict concentrate on the economic and logistic concerns of both sides rather than the social discourse of warfare (e.g. Young and Emberton 1974, 88-94; Hutton 1999, 97-99; Edwards 1998, 256-257). However, the significance of foodstuffs and associated material culture during this period is demonstrated by *The English Irish Souldier* (fig. 3.1), a woodcut published in 1642 highlighting the potential dangers of the military. Rather than the traditional accoutrements of the common soldier, the depicted infantryman is regaled with food and drink and its associated material culture, including a dripping pan for a shield, a tripod pipkin for a helmet and a goose on a spit for a musket. The substitution of food and drink for arms and armaments is indicative of the importance they played in contemporary social discourse. In addition, the accompanying poem demonstrates how material culture is imbued with the properties of the substances they contain, for example 'Bandoleers Canary Bottles, which can quell base feares' whilst drinking vessels 'can steele the nose, & purg the brain of plots'. Although it is the contents of these artefacts, namely alcohol, which have these effects

on the soldier, it is the material culture itself which is imbued with this particular symbolism.

The woodcut illustrates the principal aspects of consumption during this period, namely the food and drink itself, the material culture with which it was consumed and the context in which it was consumed. In many instances the significance of the foodstuff and the container with which it was consumed may be shared, but at other times the container may come to hold specific significance due to its contents, and *vice versa,* as the nature of social discourse means that actors actively select vessels for use (Pennell 1999, 39). As a result, these two strands must be analysed in any study of consumption during this period.

3.2.1 Food and drink

Unlike most consumption goods, food is a daily necessity (Fine and Leopold 1993, 149), but it is also one of the key components of human identity as 'our eating habits are so close to the core of our memories, to the formation of our character and the launching of our conscious experience, that its substance may be said to have been a part of us' (Mintz 1993, 262). As a result, the study of food eaten by a particular society is reflective of the social discourse that occurred in that society, and it is impossible to understand the eating and drinking practices of a particular culture without placing it in the context of a wider social discourse (Bourdieu 1984, 185).

Although all foodstuffs had a role to play in social discourse, four areas are of specific interest due to the regularity with which they occur in Civil War accounts: bread, dairy products (particularly cheese), meat and alcohol (Young and Emberton 1974, 88). As a result although this chapter will deal with food in general, these four comestibles will be discussed in greater depth.

3.2.2 Containers

The majority of foodstuffs, particularly liquids, require a container or vessel with which it can be created or consumed. Even items such as bread, which can be eaten by hand as opposed to from a bowl or platter, rely on material culture for their manufacture and

storage. Consequently, a study of the consumption of food and drink must treat both foodstuffs and containers as social artefacts, equally active in social discourse.

The significance of the objects being consumed can vary dependent on the context of their consumption, an object made and consumed in the late 16th century will have a different significance to the same object consumed 50 years later during or after the Civil War. Thus the consumption of material culture must be contextualised on the basis of the particular social context in which it was used. The benefits of interpreting an object in its social setting is demonstrated by Goldthwaite's study (1989) of Italian maiolica during the Renaissance in which he suggests the investment of money in ceramic dining vessels, as opposed to those made of metal, was not a form of emulation but instead was the result of a complex set of relationships including the relative fragility of maiolica compared to metallic objects, the iconographical significance of the paintings on the ceramic and even the supposed ability of porcelain to react to poisoned foodstuffs.

Although individual objects have social significance by themselves, when consumed alongside other material culture the assemblage as a whole can play an equally important role in social discourse. This is demonstrated by the distribution of German stoneware in Novgorod, Russia which was restricted to areas of the city associated with Hanseatic merchants. The local residents preferred to use traditional wooden drinking vessels in preference to these western imports, resulting in distinct assemblages which visibly distinguished these two disparate groups (Gaimster 2005, 80-82). Similarly, studies in Southampton have suggested that high percentage of medieval continental pottery from one site, Bull Hall, is indicative of a continental inhabitant using ceramics to express his identity (Brown 2002, 165). As a result, it is imperative that objects are considered not just in their own right, but also within the assemblage in which they were consumed. Only by returning a particular object to its social context is it possible to fully understand an object not just in terms of its physical properties, but also in terms of how people were influenced by it.

3.3 Food and drink in the 17th Century

The early 17th century witnessed a gradual change in diet that had its roots in the previous century (Thirsk 2006, 59). Food formed a large part of the expenditure of a household as during this period the average householder spent more on beer, ale and bread than any other item (Ashworth 2003, 210). Bread and beer were also the principal cornerstones of diet, Brilliana Harley stating in 1643 that 'if I had money to buy corn and meal and malt I should hope to hold out [against Royalist opposition]' (Hudson 1993, 68, see also Anderson 1971, 48). Nonetheless, food was a social investment as well as a financial one. Books such as *The English Housewife* (Markham 1986) demonstrate far broader concerns than cookery, including the preparation of food and treating illness (Mennell 1985, 84), and the medicinal value of certain foods was almost as important as its nutritional value. For example, butter made in May was meant to be 'exceeding sovereign and medicinable for wounds, strains, aches, and such like grievances' (Markham 1986, 173). Similarly fruit was often eaten preserved or cooked rather than fresh as it was believed that, when consumed raw, it might cause sicknesses including dysentery and diarrhoea (Giorgi 1997, 204).

The majority of England followed subsistence agriculture, in which the rural population grew and produced the majority of the food they consumed and even the urban population often kept a kitchen plot and a few livestock (Anderson 1971, 5). However, variety rather than conformity marked society, with diets and cooking styles varying from region to region (Thirsk 2006, 84). One example of this can be seen in the preference for grains to make bread as wheat dominated the south and south-east, barley was preferred in the midlands and Lancashire preferred oatcakes (Thirsk 2006, 197). Despite these general trends, certain fashions meant that some foodstuffs could spread from beyond their traditional homelands, thus in the early 17th century there was a preponderance for oatcakes amongst the Scottish gentry at the court of James I, with the result that oatcakes were still popular in London in the 1640s (Thirsk 2006, 206).

Another important aspect which needs consideration is the role of women, as in a world of patriarchal domination the kitchen and dairy were very much a female domain (Pennell 1999, 42-3). Women held various roles, including the procurement of much of the food from the garden, herblore and the preparation and cooking of food (Anderson

1971, 87; Markham 1986, xxvii). This has particular implications for the role of women within Civil War garrisons, as despite the assumption that garrisons were male-only, there is documentary evidence from Pontefract for women being responsible for cooking (see below, 8.5). Some studies of material culture have gone further, associating light-coloured ceramics with a female-dominated domestic sphere of cooking and domestic chores and dark-coloured ceramics with a male-dominated culture of drinking and socialising (Yentsch 1991, 193-195). The presence of women tending the fire in a depiction of Naseby alongside evidence for women at Pontefract, Sheffield and Dudley Castles suggest this is an area of Civil War studies which merits further study (see fig. 3.2 and below, 9.3).

3.4 Food and Drink during the Civil War

It might be expected that during the Civil War the social importance of food would decrease as people subsisted on what little was available. However, evidence suggests this is not the case, for example Ann Fanshawe when moving to the King's Court at Oxford during the Civil War moaned not only about the state of the accommodation, but also the food, as they only had 'one dish of meat' being 'as poor as Job' (Hudson 1993, 74). In addition, the variety in diet throughout the country rose to greater prominence during the Civil War, as the mobility of troops, compounded by the large numbers of troops from outside England (Stoyle 2005, 1), meant many were exposed to new foodstuffs that were not readily available in their home area. For example, cider spread from the West Country due to soldiers sampling the drink near the battlefields of the west midlands and exporting it back to their homes (Thirsk 2006, 103). Other food, originally a necessity, became a delicacy due to their widespread consumption. Biscuits were originally a method of providing food for long voyages or armies on the march due to their durability. Increasingly, however, and with the addition of other ingredients such as fennel seeds and almonds, they became popular amongst the upper and middling classes (Thirsk 2006, 109-110).

The use of undomesticated or wild foods was familiar to all areas of society and less affluent persons were dependent on them for food all year round (Thirsk 2006, 73-4). This practice continued during the Civil War as such foodstuffs were a useful supplement to meagre rations. For example, at Pontefract on 11th May 1645 a nine year-

old boy had been shot 'as he was getting of greane sawse' (Walker 1997, 30). 'Greane sawse', a variety of sorrel, was still found next to the castle in the 19th century and was renowned for its medicinal properties (Holmes 1887, 66). It was also noted to be 'much used formerly as a sauce with meat, especially veal' (Lees 1883, 57), which is particularly pertinent given the prominence of cattle in Drake's diary (see below, 3.4.3).

The mention of this foodstuff in Drake's diary demonstrates the multiple roles a single foodstuff might play. Sorrel for example was noted by John Evelyn (2009, 162) in *Acetaria* as 'sharpning Appetite, asswages Heat, cools the Liver, strengthens the Heart; is an Anti-scorbutic, resisting Putrefaction, and imparting so grateful a quickness to the rest, as supplies the want of *Orange, Limon,* and... therefore never to be excluded.' The use of sorrel in preventing scurvy and fevers would have been of particular use to a besieged garrisons, Scarborough's garrison during the first Civil War was crippled by scurvy, with only 25 men being fit for duty[2] before they surrendered (Firth 1917, 586; Binns 1996, 160) and it was a constant threat to the besieged. Examples such as this demonstrate how raw ingredients did not have to be transformed to participate in social discourse as they were already significant in their own right.

3.4.1 Bread

Cheese, meat, bread and some form of grain (wheat, corn or oats depending on the area of the country) dominate most army provision lists. The parish of Rugeley, Staffordshire is a typical example of this, providing the men billeted with a certain Mr. Spratt four cheeses, four quarts of oats and five 'doz of bread' worth £2 and 10 shillings (Mander 1941, 150), and William Hinde noted that without bread the Parliamentarian army would not last another day (Dore 1990, 152-3). However, despite its importance, evidence for baking at Civil War sites is virtually non-existent. At Dudley cereal bran was only tentatively identified in the form of pollen, although this may be due to difficulties in preservation or a preference for white bread on the behalf of the garrison (Moffet 1992, 273). At Pontefract the deposits surrounding the ovens were removed by Victorian excavations, although the conversion of the adjacent brewhouse into an

[2] The figure of 25 men fit for duty may be an underestimation on the part of the governor, whose account tries to avoid all blame for his eventual surrender of the castle (Binns 1996, 161).

industrial building suggests it may not have been used as a bakehouse during the siege (Roberts 2002b, 40-41). This may be due to the difficulties in procuring flour, for example at the siege of Brampton Bryan castle, 'during the siege our sufferings were great…All our bread was ground with a hand mill, our provisions were very scarce' (Hudson 1993, 90). Therefore, the use of manually intensive labour to produce a limited amount of food may have prevented its use under siege conditions.

Bread is also rarely mentioned in contemporary accounts, items such as Drake's diary (Walker 1997, fig. 3.3) or the *English Irish Souldier* (fig. 3.1) omit it altogether whilst others only mention it in the context of staving off starvation rather than in connection with social discourse. This suggests that despite its necessity it had little social significance in sharp contrast to the other dietary staple, alcohol (see 3.4.4).

3.4.2 Dairy products

Dairying had a varying role in society, by the end of the 16th century diminishing from a staple foodstuff to being suitable only for 'the inferior sort' (Harrison and Edelen 1994, 126). However, it still provided vital sustenance, for example a character in the 1594 play *A Looking Glasse for London and England* states that 'my cow is a Common-wealth to me, for first sir, she allowes me, my wife and sonne, for to banket [banquet] our selues withal, Butter, Cheese, Whay, Curds, Cream, sod[3] mild, raw-mile [milk], sower-milke, sweete-milke, and butter-milke' (Lodge and Greene 1970, 67). Dairy products formed the mainstay of an army diet, being transported great distances to feed troops (Thirsk 2006, 97). For example, William Savile wrote to Major Beaumont, the governor of Sheffield castle, on the 3rd June 1643 to state that 'I have att Pontefratt Castle, that is for your house, twenty firkins of butter' (Hunter 1819, 107). This extract also demonstrates how key garrisons, such as Pontefract, were used as depots by which other strongholds might be supplied, as match intended for Sheffield was also sent to Pontefract (Hunter 1819, 107).

Cheshire cheese grew increasingly important in the mid-17th century, a trend associated with the Civil War and its role in feeding the troops (Thirsk 2006, 280). Nantwich in

[3] Boiled milk (Thirsk 2006, 93)

particular was noted for its cheese, and when Parliament fortified Beeston Castle in Cheshire they installed as its governor a cheese merchant from the town, described as ‘a rough-hewn man; no soldier’ (Dore 1995-1996, 106; Brereton 1646). The presence of a milk strainer at Eccleshall castle is also testament to the important role it played within Civil War garrisons (see fig. 6.14), although despite its prominence within financial accounts there is little mention of it elsewhere, suggesting it had a similar social status to bread.

3.4.3 Meat

Meat was a staple source of food during this period, comprising of up to three quarters of the diet of most households (Brears 1985, 9) and was also of great social importance, as attested by Nathan Drake, who only considered a man to be recovered from his injuries when he could ‘speake & eate meate’ (Walker 1997, 58). The meat supplied was often dependent on the location of the garrison, thus whilst beef was the primary source of meat for the parliamentarian garrison of Great Chalfield, Wiltshire, with the garrison consuming 40,000lb over the course of 180 days (Pafford 1940; Peachey 1988, 4), in Chester mutton dominated the diet (Peachey 1988, 4). Garrisons also supplemented their diet with food which could be found in the local area, at Great Chalfield for example a shilling was paid ‘for pitch and taw to mend the boat to fish the moat’ (Pafford 1640, 68).

A comparison between the documentary evidence of meat consumption during a siege and the archaeological evidence gives an insight into the relative social importance of meat. A study of the different types of animal included within Nathan Drake’s diary (see fig. 3.3) reveals the predominance of cattle, particular as the two references to beasts probably relate to cattle as well (Holmes 1887, 51). However, a comparison of Drake’s diary with the principal types of mammal bone found at the site, namely cattle, sheep and pig, demonstrates how the diary favours cattle over the other two sources of food (figs. 3.4 and 3.5). This is partially due to the need to graze cattle, as most of the references to cattle concern injuries or fatalities suffered by individuals gathering fodder or overseeing grazing of the animals. However, sheep have similar requirements and yet their only mention is in conjunction with Parliamentarian provisioning as opposed to the Royalists; ‘this morning the enemy drove both sheepe & Cattell towardes Ferry Brigge’

(Walker 1997, 30). Pigs are also only mentioned once, in conjunction with a morale boosting episode when 'in the fore noone there Came downe 5 very good hogs…and our Souldyers seeing them (out of the Barbican), went out & fetcht then [them] in, wch was a good booty for the Souldyers' (Walker 1997, 26). The preoccupation with cattle as opposed to other animals demonstrates their social standing, as unlike sheep and pigs they are the subject of numerous entries.

Unlike most foods, meat was also the subject of religious observances, which meant its consumption had great social significance. The garrison of Sheffield, for example, were to be supplied enough fish, 'as will serve you one day in a weeke for a yeare' (Hunter 1819, 107). The role of religion was an important aspect of consumption during this period, particularly in conflicts both at home and abroad. During a siege at Rochelle 'he [God] sent into their [the besieged Protestants] Haven (never seen among them before) exceeding multitudes of Muscles, Cockles and small fishes, whereby they plentifully stored themselves in despite of the Romish Catholiques their enemies' (Parker 1642, 6). The importance of faith is also demonstrated by the deliverance of the Protestant besieged by divine providence as God was on their side as opposed to the Catholic besiegers, and was a feature of other garrisons, such as Raglan castle (see 3.4.4).

The complexity of exploring the social discourse of consumption during this period is demonstrated through the animal bones found at Civil War sites. For example, the appearance of juvenile cattle bones at castles such as Pontefract has been cited as evidence that the garrisons were on the verge of starvation (Richardson 2002, 384), yet it was the fashion during this period to consume younger, rather than older, beasts (Thirsk 2006, 46, 80). Therefore, although starvation may have been a partial cause for juvenile slaughter the social discourse behind the consumption of food at these sites was still complex. Similarly, when besiegers finally entered Beeston castle at the end of the siege they found that the defenders had 'neither meate, Ale nor Beere…save only a peece of Turkey pye, Twoe Bisketts, a lyve Peacock and a peahen' (Malbon 1889, 189). This preservation of a peacock at a time of starvation, albeit a bird that, according to contemporary accounts, had an unappetising taste (Fothergill 2013, 43) demonstrates the importance of social factors when considering the consumption of food at these sites; even when under starvation conditions the consumption of food was far from straightforward.

3.4.4 Drink

As one study puts it, 'to consider seventeenth-century drinking is to consider friendship, community, conviviality' (Smyth 2004, xv). It is also the study of the role of alcohol, as the health risks presented by water meant its participation in many people's lives was negligible and so alcohol was a daily necessity, as indicated by Drake's diary (see below, 3.6.2). Although there were several types of drink mentioned by Gervase Markham in 1613, including ale, beer, perry, cider and mead, wine was also an important part of consumption, albeit one which could not be produced by the household (Markham 1986, 137). Other drinks were also important, Brilliana Harley for example exhorted her son to drink liquorice juice as a cure for colds, or beer with liquorice for the kidneys (Hudson 1993, 28, 29) and, like herbs, many forms of alcohol were also seen as medicinal (Curth and Cassidy 2004).

The social role played by alcohol is emphasised by *The English Irish Souldier* (fig. 3.1), which lists its qualities as being able to subdue fear and provide courage. This can be seen in several contemporary documents, including a letter from the Royalist Sir Richard Byron at Newark to Prince Rupert dated 8th May 1644 in which he states that the enemy may force an attack on the town either through encouragement or by filling them with alcohol (RCHM 1964, 19). Although traditionally the mass consumption of alcohol and its resulting drunken behaviour were associated with the Royalists, in reality the picture was far more complex, the inhabitants of Malmesbury complaining that a number of the Parliamentarian garrison, 'have rather applied themselves to excessive drinking, profane swearing, and vicious and riotous living' (Pafford 1940, 29). As this insight demonstrates, there was little difference between the conduct of either side, probably because heavy drinking was an accepted form of release after heavy exertion (Clark 1983, 114). Nevertheless, just as Parliamentarians may have reviled the Royalists for their heavy drinking, so many Royalists gloried in it due to the connotations such behaviour implied (Keblusek 2004, 60).

Unlike foodstuffs such as cheese and bread, there was a deep social significance in the consumption of alcohol, probably due to its sensual effects. Drink was frequently personified, thus in one publication wine is never separate from tobacco and is a 'companion of Princes', beer, rarely seen with wine, is a drunkard and ale is the

mediator between the two as 'the prince of liquours' on the basis of its antiquity, wisdom and strength (Anon 1629). They also contained an implicit social hierarchy, the same source labelling wine as a drink for the elite, beer a drink for the urban middling classes and ale as appropriate for the countryside (Anon 1629, C2; Curth and Cassidy 2004, 143-4). The idea of wine as a superior drink is demonstrated by Robert Herrick, who clearly stated in *The Welcome to Sack* that wine and poetry were inextricably linked and were of a far higher standard than beer, which could only be confined to 'the Tap, the Tost, the Turfe' (Herrick 1915, 80). Herrick's poetry is full of classical references when referring to wine, reinforcing the idea that it was the drink intended for the upper echelons of society, even if it might occasionally filter down the social scale. Beer on the other hand was consumed by drunkards who were rude and lazy and gout is similarly deemed to have been caused by beer as opposed to wine (Brown 2004, 8).

This demarcation of rank on the basis of the type of drink consumed was maintained by Royalist exiles, who embraced wine as matching their elite Cavalier image (Keblusek 2004). Wine was seen as leading to poetic eloquence whereas beer led to drudgery and could be associated with the opposing side, a phenomenon which was to persist until the end of the 17th century (Jones 2004, 87). Beer was also seen as a foreigners drink, or a 'Dutch Boorish Liquor' (Taylor 1651, 11), thus consumption caused a degradation of English values (Anderson 1971, 98). One poem (Mews 1646), probably authored by a Catholic (Curth and Cassidy 2004, 147), goes further by suggesting that 'with this same beere came up heresies here, the old Catholike drinke is a pot of good ale' (Mews 1646, 6), suggesting beer as the mark of the new Parliamentarian rulers. As ale had been seen as a drink only for the rural population by this period, this statement is also evidence of the reminiscences for the past life, a theme which can be seen in other forms of consumption (see below, 9.5.1).

3.5 Containers for consumption

The importance of the material culture in which food was prepared is demonstrated by Gervase Markham's comments in 1613 on the three types of material used to produce dairy containers and their varying popularity amongst their users. He states that 'only this opinion is generally received, that the wooden vessel which is round and shallow is best in cold vaults, the earthen vessels principal for long keeping, and the leaden vessels

for yielding so much cream' (Markham 1986, 170). Earthenware was particularly important for the purposes of dairying, cream being recommended to be kept in an earthenware vessel to preserve it whereas butter was recommended to be made in a wooden bowl or 'pancheon of earth', and earthenware vessels played a key role in the production of cheese (Markham 1986, 171, 172, 176). These comments demonstrate that containers were not always chosen due to their financial value, but rather for their social properties, in this case wooden vessels were deemed to be more useful than leaded ones in specific circumstances. However, vessels could also be multi-purpose, for example a bowl could be used for the preparation of medicine, food or as a serving device (Pennell 1999, 44), whilst the Venetian glasses purchased by the Great Chalfield garrison (see table 3.1) were for both beer and wine.

Despite this, there was often a social hierarchy in the types of vessels used, as demonstrated by William Harrison's comments:

'As for drink, it is usually filled in pots, goblets, jugs, bowls of silver in noblemen's houses, also in fine Venice glasses of all forms, and for want of these elsewhere, in pots of earth of sundry colors and molds, whereof many are garnished with silver, or at the leastwise in pewter'

(Harrison and Edelen 1994, 127)

Here it is glass and metal which are given prominence over the 'pots of earth', and the varying significance of each of these materials, in addition to wood, will be explored below. However, it should be noted that most documentary evidence is ambiguous in terms of the material containers were made from, thus Brilliana Harley refers to 'bottles of cider' without reference to the material of manufacture (Hudson 1993, 28).

3.5.1 Ceramics

Despite the ways in which ceramics were active in social discourse, they are a prime example of how examination of their production has been favoured to the detriment of consumption (Miller 1987, 3). Thus, with a few notable exceptions (e.g. Boyle 2006, 216-259, Cumberpatch 2003), studies of ceramics during the early medieval period have focussed overwhelmingly on production sites with little emphasis on their use in social

discourse (e.g. Crossley 1990, 243-274). However, the adaptability of ceramics, as well as their durability, meant their uses were varied and extended far beyond the purpose for which they were manufactured.

Ceramics, being extremely cheap, were used for almost every household task, including cooking, drinking, storage and even candlesticks. This does not mean they held no social significance, as attested by the drinking vessels with which the *English Irish Souldier's* socks are gartered (see fig. 3.1). However, due to their low value individual items rarely appear in social accounts (Weatherill 1996, 110) and there are only occasional references to the purchase of pottery within Civil War accounts (for a rare example of this see below, 3.6.1). When they are mentioned, it is often due to their contents rather than the objects themselves, such as the two pots of butter requested from the constable of Wrottesley (Sherwood 1992, 82).

Although many vessels were multi-purpose, there are occasional references to specific forms of pottery in diaries or in personal correspondence. Thus in a letter to her son in Oxford dated the 29th November 1639 Lady Brilliana Harley states 'all my fruit dishes are broken; therefore, good Ned, if there be any such blue and white dishes as I used to have for fruit, buy me some; they are not porcelain, nor are they of the ordinary metal of blue and white dishes' (Hudson 1993, 30). Other references are to storage vessels, important as a means of preserving foodstuffs. This includes butter pots from the midlands (Brears 1971a, 243-244), but other food, including meat, was preserved by placement within a vessel and sealing it with butter. This process is demonstrated in the following account for an account for Lord Arundel from Sheffield Castle in 1642:

‘Charges of sending venison to London for my Lo. Arundall.

Paid for a dozen earthen potts to bake venison in, to send to London	£1 12 0
Item paid for butter for fillinge the potts with the venison	1 12 0
Item paid more for butter for fillinge the potts at the second bakeing	1 12 0
Item paid Rich. Wadsworth for spice, for seasoning the venison	2 2 10
John Hemmingway for the carriage of XII potts of venison to London	2 7 0
Items paid for canvass to tye upon the heads of the potts’	0 3 7

(Hunter 1819, 103)

The preservation of meat and other perishables was a well-established practice as meat sealed in butter remained edible for up to six months (Young and Emberton 1974, 90) and large ceramic vessels were vital for the sustenance of a large garrison, particularly those threatened by siege.

Certain vessels were important due to their properties, thus the glaze on ceramic vessels prevented the seepage of the liquids they contained, important in the manufacture of dairy products (Markham 1986, 173). The use of ceramics in dairying is particularly important; for example a study of probate inventories in Essex showed that 75% of the ceramic mentioned in inventories were located in dairies. These may have been larger, and thus more valuable, vessels but nevertheless this example demonstrates the social significance of ceramics in dairying as the same percentage was found in households of low and high status (Deetz 1977, 55).

The use of glazes, as well as the non-standardisation of forms, meant there were indeed ‘sundry colors and molds’ (Harrison and Edelen 1994, 127), and vessels were individually recognisable. Some producers even put unique marks on their vessels which could identify them, such as the triple fingermarks under handles from

Wrenthorpe, West Yorkshire (Moorhouse and Slowikowski 1992, 97, see SAND*817* and PONT*1479* for examples). This has important implications for the use of ceramic objects during the Civil War, as they could be immediately identified with a place of manufacture (see below, 7.4.5 for Sandal and 8.4.5 for Pontefract).

3.5.2 Glass

There are two principal types of glass vessels; the forest green or potash glasses with a characteristic green tint made in many small furnaces and the clear crystal glasses made in London or imported from the continent (Willmott 2002, 5-6). By the mid-17th century glass was not as valued as it had been previously (Willmott 2005, 138-140), thus in one pamphlet when wine remarks 'I am served in plate' ale retorts, 'but thou art come downe of late to a glasse' (Anon 1629, C). However, it was still considered valuable not just because of its monetary value but also its physical properties, thus in Herrick's *How he would drinke his Wine* the poet states 'Fill my Wine in Christall; thus, and thus/ I see't in *puris naturalibus*' (Herrick 1915, 188). The use of *façon de Venise* in this context was important, not because of the wealth it may have implied, but the improvement it gave to its contents. The value of glass was also compounded through its fragility, much to the disgust of Harrison as 'they breed much strife toward such as have the charge of them….their pieces do turn unto no profit' (Harrison and Edelen 1994, 128). Like wine, crystal glass also became linked to the royal course, thus in 1660 it was found that 'many people regarded fine crystal as a relic of royalty' (Thorpe 1961, 135).

The fragility of glass and its role in social discourse is demonstrated by the following incident at Brampton Bryan, where the Royalists, 'gave us [the Parliamentarian besieged] three shots out of the steeple which broke some Venice glasses in a high tower which formerly entertained some of those capon-faced cowards who have unmanned themselves in offering violence to so noble a lady, an action which will render them odious to man' (Bath 1904, 4). The 'capon-faced cowards' in this instance had not only disobeyed the laws of chivalry but, moreover, had broken the laws of hospitality by breaking the very glasses with which they had been entertained (Willmott 2002, 28). Therefore, as a container for alcohol, glass was fundamental in social discourse amongst the higher echelons of society.

By the Civil War the glass industry in England had collapsed due to the Scots invasion of 1640, higher prices due to a monopoly on glass production and finally the total banning of glass production by Parliament in 1642 (Charleston 1984, 74-78; Willmott 2002, 11). Even before this, the monopoly had meant the closure of all other forest glass furnaces, including those surrounding Eccleshall (Sheale 1993, 10). As a result, the majority of vessels found at Civil War sites were several decades old at the time of deposition.

3.5.3 Metal

Metal was the most expensive of material used for culinary objects and was often recycled; therefore, it rarely appears in the archaeological record. Despite this difficulty, it is imperative that its use should be considered, as it played a vital role in social discourse (Martin 1991, 161). This is clearly demonstrated by the assemblage from the *Mary Rose*, which contained 75 pewter and nine copper alloy vessels compared to just 50 ceramic vessels (Weinstein 2005a, 423-429).

The malleability of metals meant they were often used for large items such as cooking pots as well as smaller items such as plates, which due to their shape were not manufactured in earthenware until the mid-18th century (Weatherill 1996, 8). Pewter was predominantly used for food serving vessels such as platters, saucers and dishes, although it could also be used in the manufacture of spoons (Duncan 2002, 255). Copper-alloy was employed in the manufacture of cooking vessels such as cauldrons (see fig. 3.1) and iron was used for knives, a universal personal possession during this period.

The malleability of pewter meant it was used to convey important social messages regarding status, for example eleven of the platters deposited on the *Mary Rose* were stamped with the initials of Vice Admiral George Carew and a further three bore the arms of the Lord High Admiral of the Fleet, Lord Lisle (Weinstein 2005b, 440-441). The restriction of pewter to the wealthier members of society meant it could be used to demarcate rank, as the majority of the populace were forced to use less valuable objects such as ceramic and wooden vessels.

During the Civil War plate was also in great demand as a means of financing the two opposing armies. Thus Brilliana Harley faced a dilemma with her husband's belongings, concluding to her son Ned that 'it were better to borrow money, if your father will give any, than to give his plate. For we do not know what straits we may be put to, and therefore I think it is better to borrow whilst one may, and keep the plate for a time of need' (Hudson 1993, 40). An appeal near Stratford to maintain the Parliamentarian garrison at Warwick castle gained a significant response, with Thomas Nash (married to the sole heir of William Shakespeare) donating 364 ounces of plate worth 5*s.* 4*d.* an ounce (Tennant 1996, 25), whilst the garrison at Scarborough castle used pieces of plate to make their Civil war coinage (Firth 1917, 585). However, it should be noted that only the wealthiest households felt able to respond to this request, as not all households had access to these objects. Consequently, pewter had an important role within certain echelons of society, but its use was restricted. Although it is important to appreciate its role within contemporary discourse, its loss only impacts the study of one particular group of people.

3.5.4 Bone, horn, ivory and leather

The role of animal products in medieval consumption practices is well attested (e.g. MacGregor 1985; 199l; MacGregor *et al.* 1999) but the role they play in the early 17th century is subject to only minor study. However, bone, horn, ivory and leather were all used to produce elements used in the consumption of food and drink including knives, spoons and drinking vessels. With the exception of bone, all these material rarely survive archaeologically.

Horn, bone and ivory were all employed in the manufacture of handles for a number of objects including knives. There was a hierarchy in the type of material used, with wood usually being more common than other materials such as bone (e.g. Duncan 2002, 264; Every and Richards 2005, 145). However, at Pontefract six out of sixteen handles retrieved during the excavations were made from elephant ivory (O'Connor and Duncan 2002, 306-7). As a relatively rare material, and moreover one traded for its own sake as opposed to a by-product of food production, the use of ivory in this context reflects the use of a simple knife as a social artefact. Its predominance at this site may be indicative

of the relative status of its volunteer defenders, many of whom were of the "middling sort".

Leather played a vital role in the consumption of liquids through their use as blackjacks (large leather jugs) or bottles, eleven of the latter being found on board the *Mary Rose* (Weinstein 2005a, 428). It was also more durable than pottery vessels, leading to the Earl of Northumberland replacing the latter with the former in his households at Wressle and Leconfield Castles (Cherry 1991, 314). Unlike pottery, the fabric from which the vessels were made could also have particular significance, as demonstrated by a blackjack supposedly belonging to Oliver Cromwell and manufactured from the skin of his horse, Black Jack (BBC 2011).

3.5.5 Wood

Although less popular than during the medieval period, wooden vessels were still used during this period, as evidenced by their inclusion in the deposits at St. Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln (Morris 2008). Their importance in the early post-medieval period is emphasised by the assemblage from the *Mary Rose*, which included 194 serving vessels (predominantly bowls and dishes), 27 tankards and fifteen flagons (Weinstein 2005a, 424). Despite this predominance they rarely appear in contemporary documents due to their low financial value, being even cheaper than ceramic vessels (Draper 2001, 7). Their organic properties also means they are recovered only rarely from archaeological deposits.

Despite their anonymity in both the contemporary and archaeological records, these vessels must still be included in any consideration of social discourse during this period. However, although they have a limited impact on drinking vessels, wood, along with pewter vessels, occupies a niche which is largely unfulfilled by ceramic vessels, that of food serving vessels. As a result, their impact on the wider dining assemblage is restricted and it is still possible to analyse the significance of consumption within the archaeological record.

3.6 Consumption during the Civil War

Food and drink played a crucial role in defining and sustaining groups during the Civil Wars. Indeed, some writers claimed the conflict was dominated by issues of food, as demonstrated by the following lines:

> 'now they laugh, at giving Battle
> Unless it be to Herds of Cattle:
> Or fighting convoys of Provision,
> The whole design of the Expedition.
> And not with down-right bloews to rout
> The Enemy, but eat them out...
> There's no fear of wounds nor maiming,
> All dangers are reduced to famine'
>
> (Butler 1806, 384-385)

Although food was of great economic import, as supply chains played a key role in the Parliamentarian victory (Edwards 1998, 250), it was also of huge social importance. Two areas in particular need to be studied: firstly how goods were procured and secondly how they were used in communal consumption. Naturally artefacts and foodstuffs were destroyed both during and after the conflict but this will be discussed in the next chapter.

3.6.1 Procurement of goods

To focus solely on the purchase of goods is to ignore the way in which they were used and eventually discarded. It is this aspect that is particularly important when studying material culture during the Civil War. Although it has been suggested that some, such as Sandal, purchased bulk supplies (Brears 1983, 219), at others this is clearly not the case (for analysis of Sandal see 7.4.5). For example, the accounts for Great Chalfield, Wiltshire (table 3.1), demonstrate that small purchases of ceramic and glass vessels were made when the need arose, such as a shilling paid 'for earthenwares about the house' (Pafford 1940, 70) and 6*d* 'for a great earthen jug for the use of the table' (Pafford 1940, 72). These entries also indicate how inexpensive such items were, as

even Venetian glasses, sometimes seen as relatively high-status items, only cost the garrison 4*d* each, less than a large earthenware jug.

At the outbreak of war, the importance of procuring food was already noted. The recent wars on the Continent were well documented for their lack of food and one pamphlet published on the 2nd July 1642, less than two months before Charles I raised the Royal Standard at Nottingham, noted that the inhabitants of one town were reduced to making 'meat of their old shooes, horns, horses, and bullocks hoofs which had many years lien in the dunghill….roots, herbs, grasse and bark of trees were accounted for dainties' (Parker 1642, 6). Therefore, the need to provision castles and other headquarters was of paramount performance. Lucy Hutchinson had reason to complain that Nottingham Castle, 'was as ill provided as fortified, there being but 10 barrels of powder, 1150 pounds of butter, and as much cheese, 11 quarters of bread corn, 7 beeves, 214 flitches of bacon, 560 fishes, and 15 hogsheads of beer' (Hudson 1993, 83). The areas surrounding the various garrisons were dominated by requests for food to supply both the garrison and the army, thus the constable of Wrottesley was requested in April 1644 to supply prince Rupert's army with 40 quarter malt, 20 quarter wheat, 20 hundred weight of bacon, 20 hundredweight of salt butter and 'your rateable part of forty hundred weight of good sound cheese' (Shaw 1798, 61 cited in Sherwood 1992, 81).

It was under conditions of siege that people suffered most as armies forced to be static had to rely on supplies from outside the local area for sustenance. This problem afflicted the besiegers as much as the besieged, whilst besieging Chester the Parliamentarians stated that 'if we be not forthwith supplied with bread and meal within 24 hours we shall be put to a greater mischief than we can express' (Dore 1990, 146). However, even within wartime, the procurement of food was used to maintain social hierarchies. At Great Chalfield Manor occasional small items such as jackfish (Pafford 1940, 69) and 'wine for the Governor' (Pafford 1940, 71) are indicative of luxuries available to officers only (Peachey 1988, 4). Evidence for this is even stronger within Drake's diary where, at the end of the siege when the garrison was at the point of starvation:

'the Governor sent into all the Gentlemen's Chambers wthin the Castle to see what p'vition they Could (find…) allowing to themselves no more then [sic] a common

Souldyer, that soe wee might all live or want together; wch being done, there was p'vition found to keepe us all at a reasonable rate of dyate about (blank) daies'

(Walker 1997, 58)

This entry is telling in two respects. Firstly, the officers of the garrison had their own private supply of provisions but secondly they were allotted more than an ordinary soldier, so that by handing out their personal stores the whole garrison could expect to be sustained for several days. This is indicative of the fact that even when the garrison was at the point of starvation, the officers maintained a superior diet until the last possible moment. The situation at Pontefract is mirrored by the inhabitants of Chester, where only the wealthier inhabitants ate beef and bacon whilst the soldiers were forced to boil their bread in beer as their only form of sustenance (Dore 1990, 365).

Aside from the obvious employment of starving a garrison into submission, foodstuffs also became a psychological weapon, either to demonstrate chivalry on the one side or parsimony on the other. For example, despite being at war Parliament permitted the transportation of the King's favourite wine from London to Oxford, along with other necessities that passed through periodically (Sherwood 1992, 72), emphasising their initial claims that it was not the King they were fighting, but rather his misguided advisors. On the other hand Nathan Drake writes how 'the enemy basely stayd all wine from coming to the Castle for serving of the Communion upon Easter Day' despite the Parliamentarian governor giving instructions to the contrary (Walker 1997, 19). Examples such as this demonstrate that the procurement of foodstuffs for consumption was just as socially active as the consequent rituals of eating and drinking.

3.6.2 Communal Consumption

Communal consumption has always played an important role in social discourse and the 17th century is no exception. Although food and drink were also consumed individually, communal consumption played an important role in military life. The battle plan of Naseby includes a large suspended cooking pot capable of feeding several people (fig. 3.2) and at Great Chalfield there are several references to 'making clean the hall and tables where the soldiers dine' (Pafford 1940, 77). This practice was typical of this period as early Stuart yeoman households contained an average of around eight to

ten members and dining practices meant all, from the servants to the head of the household, would have shared the daily meal (Anderson 1971, 234). As a result hospitality was an integral part of social identity, the governor of Nottingham was praised by his wife, Lucy Hutchinson, for paying for the drink his soldiers partook whilst abroad in the country and running into heavy debt because of his generosity to his followers at 'his table', which at times had 'more room and meat than guests' (Hudson 1993, 100, 106). The provision of food could be an important guarantee of the troop's loyalty; it only took Parliamentarian Hastings Ingram a decent meal to persuade a group of would-be deserters to change their mind (Tennant 1996, 46). As a result, the cooking of food meant it had a key symbolic and as well as physical role in the maintenance of group identity (Weatherill 1996, 146). This hospitality extended beyond the boundaries of loyalty to King or Parliament, thus the Royalist officer requesting Parliament surrender Nottingham town and castle was entertained by the governor and offices and given wine (Hudson 1993, 98).

Communal groups were often linked with communal drinking, Mr. Hill earning Brilliana Harley's displeasure as he was 'much given to keep company and so to drink, and I fear he will put his mind much to plundering' (Hudson 1993, 69). The link between drink and plunder was confirmed by the destruction linked to alcohol during the conflict, as depicted in contemporary woodcuts (e.g. fig. 3.1). There was, however, a less criminal element to drinking, group drinking in peacetime could be seen at times of festivity to be an opportunity to bond with the local gentry and alcohol has long been used as a means of maintaining and reproducing social identities (Brown 2004, 5; Wilson 2005, 3). After the war wine was used as a way of reaffirming friendships amongst those defeated Royalists forced into exile, with drinking rituals both referring to friends and also the traditions of the past, a pattern mirrored by the Royalists who remained in England (Keblusek 2004; Jones 2004).

The use of communal drinking in the form of pledges is a key concept, being a 'very public display of the close social bonds and group solidarity forged by kinship ties among the elite' (O' Callaghan 2004, 45) which were underpinned by ideas of honour and friendship. As a result there was an emphasis on the company you drank with, as to a certain extent this could be deemed to reflect the sort of person you were. The poet Robert Herrick in his poem *The Hock-cart* uses the idea of drinking around the hearth,

the lord and tenants combined (Brown 2004, 5), as a way of inducing solidarity and accounts of the Civil War suggest similar events took place here.

The use of food and drink are also particularly strong when used to evoke memories of the past, thus Herrick in *The Wassaile* bemoans times in the past when food and drink were plentiful (Brown 2004, 6). The feelings of nostalgia evoked by the use of alcohol is extremely important in the context of the Civil War, where the pre-war period was increasingly seen as a time of idyllic peace and plenty. This feeling was maintained after the war, Robert May noting that;

'such Noble Houses were then [in the early 17th century] kept, the glory of that, and the shame of this present Age... then was Hospitality esteemed, Neighbourhood preserved, the Poor cherished, and God honoured...then did men strive to be good, rather then to seem so.'

(May 1685, A6v)

Such nostalgia is important when considering the assemblages from this period, consisting as they do of a significant amount of antiquated material culture (see below, 9.4) as it demonstrates the way in which the past was idealised during the conflict.

3.7 Conclusion

Consumption of foodstuffs played a primary role in all aspects of garrison activities during the Civil War. Food, drink and their associated material culture were of vital importance to the maintenance of social discourse at these sites, as evidenced through woodcuts such as *The English Irish Soldier* and Nathan Drake's diary. Therefore, by applying this knowledge to the archaeological material retrieved from garrison sites it is possible to examine in detail social discourse during the Civil War.

There is, however, one aspect of consumption which has not been examined during the course of this chapter, namely destruction. This final act of consumption is one of the key aspects of the Civil War as well as being the primary source for the vast majority of archaeological assemblages related to the conflict. Due to its importance, it is analysed

separately as it is only after fully understanding this aspect that social discourse at castles can be fully understood.

4 Destruction

‘The violence of the first civil war, in England at least, was directed less against persons than it was against property’ (Carlton 1992, 264)

4.1 Introduction: the case for a theory of deposition during the Civil War

Destruction is the inevitable consequence of war. Although it can be measured in monetary terms or by the number of casualties, destruction is archaeologically most visible through the ruined buildings and shattered artefacts it leaves behind. This is particularly noticeable at castle sites, where the Civil War resulted in assemblages discarded both during the conflict and in its aftermath, when many buildings were slighted. However, whilst the effect of the war on the built environment is well understood (e.g. Rakoczy 2007; Mabbitt 2012), its effect on artefacts has not been studied to the same extent.

The phenomenon of material culture deposited at siege sites is not solely related to the Civil War, as attested by excavations at Fort William and Watson’s Fort, South Carolina (Pollard 2008; Ferguson 1977). However, the national impact of the Civil War has produced an unusually large number of sites with extensive deposits of destroyed material. In order to understand these artefacts it is imperative to appreciate the actions which both preserve and modify assemblages in the creation of the archaeological record (Schiffer 1972, 156; 1987, 7; Thomas 1991, 56; Tani 1995, 231).

Each assemblage is as unique as the site in which it was destroyed. As a result, although a broad social framework can be constructed for deposition during this period, ultimately the occupation and abandonment of each site must be understood contextually. This chapter explores the need for a theory of deposition in greater depth before analysing the destruction of the three castles studied within this thesis. In so doing, it demonstrates how the destruction of material culture was not the result of meaningless devastation but instead was due to purposeful actions executed within a site-specific social discourse.

4.2 Structured deposition

It has long been established that there is no "Pompeii premise" in archaeology (e.g. Binford 1981, 205; Schiffer 1985, 18). Therefore, the archaeological record is not a perfect representation of the past, but is instead shaped by a series of formation processes which produce the remains archaeologists study. As a result there is no such thing as a fossilised record of past activities; excavated artefacts form only a biased sample of the material that could have potentially entered the ground. Archaeological studies of modern waste disposal practices have demonstrated that the relationship between consumers and the rubbish is extremely complex and disposal practices in the past were no simpler than those of the present (Rathje and Murphy 2001, 55-58). As a result, before artefacts can be understood in terms of their social significance the way in which they were discarded needs to be fully understood.

4.2.1 Site Formation Processes

Despite the complexity of archaeological deposits, there is often a tendency to identify them without providing an explanation (Brudenell and Cooper 2008, 16). However, the archaeological material found in deposits does not have a straightforward link to the material consumed on that site, as both are subject to a plethora of linked and separate social principles, and features containing refuse deposits 'often exhibit a complex depositional history' (LeeDecker 1994, 347). Abandonment processes at any site, including castles, are extremely complex and objects can be destroyed, deposited or a combination of the two alongside the building itself (LaMotta and Schiffer 2002, 43-45; Rakoczy 2007, 261). This can be clearly seen in the destruction of monasteries following the Dissolution, where 'the process of dismemberment is likely to have been complex, requiring considerable care to disentangle' (Greene 1992, 197). As a result, by analysing the post-occupational history of a building it is possible to place not just the destruction of property but also the destruction of material culture in its appropriate context. Pursuing this approach also reveals key aspects of contemporary social discourse, as the way in which artefacts are discarded can be as socially significant as the manner in which it was used (Chapman 2000a, 359-360).

The complex motivations behind the deliberate deposition of objects is not restricted solely to the 17th century, but instead pervades all human activity (see Richards and

Thomas 1984; Thomas 1991; Hill 1995; Chapman 2000a; 2000b for prehistoric examples and Clarke 1996 for a study of Roman depositional practices). Even when objects are discarded as 'rubbish', or seemingly no longer of practical or social use, the act is still meaningful in defining social boundaries and the way the individual or group conceptualises the world (Thompson 1979, 90-91), and the act of selecting items as suitable for discard is itself a social one (Thomas 1991, 57). By treating deposits through the examination of the social processes which created them as opposed to mere rubbish, new insights can be gained into the social discourse at that particular site (Chapman 2000a, 360).

4.2.2 Destruction and Abandonment

In order to understand the nature of destruction it is first necessary to distinguish this from that of abandonment, as the outcomes and motivations of both acts are markedly different. Abandonment, leading to decay without human interference, results in demonstrably different deposits from that of destruction, which requires the active breakage of objects and architecture through human agency. Therefore, when interpreting archaeological assemblages, it is important to demonstrate these are the result of deliberate action as opposed to ecological and other natural factors (Richards and Thomas 1984, 214).

Destruction is a complex and multifaceted process (Rakoczy 2008a), and just as the destruction of the buildings themselves is motivated by a complex social discourse, so too is the destruction of the material within them. As a result, deposits found within these contexts 'cannot be assumed to have been a representative sample of everyday life' (Clarke 1996, 80) but instead are a transformation of this through the social discourse surrounding destruction and abandonment. However, the large-scale deposits at castles and other Civil War sites pose a problem to current approaches to deposition. Closure deposits in other periods are often linked to spiritual rituals (e.g. Clarke 1996, 80) but, whilst the 17th century was not exempt from such deposits (e.g. Merrifield 1987, 163; *contra* Bradley 1990, 19), the destruction of material at Civil War sites should be viewed as ideologically, as opposed to spiritually, motivated. As a result, the identification of who deposited particular deposits is extremely important, as both sides had separate political and social motivations. The question becomes not only '"whose

trash is it" but "who deposited this trash?"' (LeeDecker 1994, 368). As a result, although the nature of destruction during this period needs to be understood, the unique character of each site means deposits from each castle must be contextualised, as the events at each castle are unique to that particular site.

4.3 Destruction in the Civil War

Accounts of the destruction of buildings during the Civil War often attribute damage to direct enemy action or preventative measures by defenders (e.g. Thompson 1987, 138-139). This is supported by contemporary accounts and advice, for example garrisons were encouraged to lay waste to the ground surrounding their defences to avoid their use by the enemy (Firth 1917; Walker 1997; Porter 1984b, 86). However, studies by Rakoczy (2007) and Mabbitt (2012), have demonstrated a far greater complexity to destruction than has previously been thought. Therefore, rather than linking material culture with an unproblematic slighting of castles, it is essential to investigate the complexity of the social discourse in which it was destroyed.

Destruction was not motivated by a single cause, and three areas are of particular concern to this study:

- Destruction during the course of a siege. This falls into two categories: deliberate destruction by the defenders and incidental destruction that may have occurred during the bombardment or siege through actions by both defenders and attackers. For example, the clearance of suburbs at Exeter was part of an effort to improve the town's defences, whilst at Lyme Regis large areas were fought over by the opposing sides, leaving much in ruins (Stoyle 1997). The damage caused by clearances tended to be greater than that caused by bombardment, as the latter were episodic or short-lived events, a notable exception being the first siege at Scarborough, which lasted twenty-two weeks without ceasefire or truce (Binns 1996, 150). A monument to this type of damage is All Saints Church, Pontefract which was destroyed during the course of the three sieges of the castle (fig. 4.1).

- Damage caused by victors after the surrender of a garrison. This includes the slighting of castles and the destruction of artefacts within the garrison itself.

- Pillaging of buildings not related to siege warfare. This type of damage could result from many motives, including the need to provision troops or destruction for entertainment. This destruction was the most denounced form of destruction on both sides and was the focus of many newssheets (e.g. Carlton 1992, 265; see also Ryves 1643a; 1643b).

Although these types of destruction are clearly distinct, differentiating these within the historical and archaeological record can be extremely difficult for a variety of reasons. For example, several types of destruction could occur in a single event, such as the sacking of a town by victorious troops who stole items indiscriminately. A building or town could also be subjected to several different phases of destruction, for example Sudely Castle was damaged by soldiers in 1642, its interior fittings burnt in 1646 and it was finally slighted in 1650 (Warmington 1997, 78). Although we can talk broadly about such categories they are by no means bounded. Nevertheless, it is still essential to discuss the historical and archaeological evidence for these types of destruction as they all have separate, complex motivations.

4.3.1 Destruction: the documentary evidence

There are detailed accounts of all aspects of damage caused by both sides during the conflict and regional studies have enabled detailed analysis of the damage caused at a local rather than national scale (e.g. Richardson 1997). Aside from requests for compensation by the unfortunate victims, looting was also used for propaganda by both sides, the misdemeanours of the opposition being highlighted to demonstrate their infamy and the need to defeat them. Destruction could also be used as a threat; for example in October 1645 the inhabitants of Elmley Lovett in Worcestershire were told that unless they paid the required contribution to the Parliamentary Committee for Worcestershire they would be imprisoned, their property looted and their houses burned (Sherwood 1992, 77). The study of documents demonstrates the universal devastation caused by the conflict, as well as highlighting the intricate social discourse surrounding it.

4.3.1.1 Destruction by siege

Studies of the urban preparation for sieges have demonstrated that the reasons behind the demolition of buildings were extremely complex. For example, studies of the areas destroyed at Exeter show that although one of the foci of destruction, St. Sidwells, was vulnerable to attack it was also owned by the Dean and Chapter, and as such was a target for the puritans who held the town as much for its symbolism as for its strategic value (Stoyle 1996; 1997, 133). At Boarstall, the buildings were cleared very late in its Civil War history; originally fortified in late 1643 by the Royalists the hall changed hands twice before the surrounding village and church was demolished by the Royalists in June and July 1645, possibly due to a reluctance to alienate the local population by destroying their homes (Porter 1984b, 89).

The damage caused by this type of destruction was an annoyance at the very least. However, there is very little documentary evidence of material culture being damaged during this type of destruction. Although there are occasional references to material property, such as Venetian glasses at the siege of Brampton Bryan (Bath 1904, 4, see above, 3.5.2), it is far more likely to find accounts of buildings being destroyed during or after the conflict than to find accounts of material possessions.

4.3.1.2 Victorious destruction

As Carlton (1992, 175) states, 'ever since the walls came tumbling down at Jericho, victorious soldiers have believed that they were entitled to a sack after taking a city.' The burning and pillaging of cities and towns such as Birmingham, Cirencester and Brentford was mirrored in the devastation caused at the fall of Basing House, Sherborne Castle and Bretby (Carlton 1992, 175-176). It was understood that if a garrison refused to surrender when requested, no quarter was to be expected or given if a subsequent attack proved successful (Donagan 1994, 1144). The destruction of many buildings after their capture by the Parliamentarians can be attributed to victorious destruction; however, the motivations of such destruction may be complex (Rakoczy 2007, 258). For example, according to Lady Hutchinson (2000, 249-250), her husband demolished the castle at Nottingham to prevent Oliver Cromwell using it for his own personal gain, despite the fact they were both on the same side. This type of vindictive destruction can be seen at a number of other sites, including Eccleshall (see below, 4.6.1).

Evidence for the destruction of castles comes largely from parliamentary motions for their slighting, claims for the goods belonging to them, and eyewitness accounts. Often the description of such events is extremely brief, thus the Earl of Chesterfield's house at Newark was described as being 'burned' (Hutchinson 2000, 204) and 'Wiverton house was by order pulled down and made incapable of being a garrison' (Hutchison 2000, 204). However, where available they do offer insights in the movement of materials around the country; for example the timber resulting from the slighting of Holt castle was suggested as a means of rebuilding nearby houses damaged during the conflict (Bennett 2000, 101).

4.3.1.3 Pillage

Although stealing for necessities and wanton destruction are separate categories, the way in which they were reported often means that they occurred within the same event. For example, Gruffyd ap Stephen lost £3, a horse worth £3 10*s* as well as clothes and other belongings in a night time raid by the nearby Royalists at Abbeycwmhir (Bennett 2000, 98). Indiscriminate plundering by both sides meant that many in the country were disillusioned with military ill-discipline. As the war progressed looting became endemic and increasingly well-organised; for example at the battle of Edgehill men were nominated to retrieve items of value from the field (Tennant 1996, 45).

Wherever you were in the country, it was impossible to escape destruction as where there were troops, there was inevitably plunder for victuals, horses or for entertainment. For example, the books belonging to Bulstrode Whitelocke were used as tapers by the Royalists to light their tobacco pipes, an act which was on a par with the consumption of £200 of hay and corn and the invasion of the house by soldiers and prostitutes (Carlton 1992, 270). Even when the loot was useful this did not guarantee its safety. For example, in Sandwich the Royalists destroyed the supplies of beer and wine that they had not already consumed (Carlton 1992, 268, see also below, 9.5.1). Loyalty to a particular side often mattered little; Stephen Powell's house was plundered by Parliamentarian forces whilst he was a prisoner of the Royalists (Bennett 2000, 100).

Although raiding a house for food and other essential supplies may seem to be a necessary, if reprehensible, act the wider destruction of material within this context was

often more than wilful violence. Religious belief or allegiance to a particular side may have played a role, Coughton Court for example was ransacked with a focus on the:

'abundance of Images and Pictures, which they brake and committed to the fire. They likewise burnt many popish Bookes…and others were throwne into a great moate…In the house we found 3 or 4 Murthering peeces, brasse pots, and a great sheet of lead about 500 weight, which was hidden under the ground. The Souldiers dranke up his Perry, Sider and Beere almost all, they did lye on his Fether-beds all night, and in the Morning cut them, emptied out the feathers, carried the tike away with them, and also silke hangings for the beds'

(Anon 1642b).

Such detailed accounts are relatively common for the loss of property relating to the elite or the middling classes; however, similar accounts for the lower classes are far scarcer. In addition, complaints could be exaggerated for propaganda or for personal gain, for example the supposed ruination of Lady Scudamore's house turned out to consist of only slight damage to the roof of the chapel and the loss of some trees for kindling (Carlton 1991, 268).

4.3.2 Destruction: the archaeological evidence

Documentary evidence can identify possible areas of devastation but finding physical evidence to support this can be extremely problematic (Mabbitt 2012, 16-19). In some cases this is due to difficulties in excavating and recognising Civil War remains, for example despite their substantial size the remains of the London defences were unidentified until recently (Anon 2011). Even when Civil War remains are visible, the emphasis is all too often placed on the archaeology of defence or attack as opposed to the archaeology of destruction (e.g. Courtney 2001; Foard 2001). Thus although artefact scatters may be analysed (Foard 2001), the objects considered are all too often military items such as musket shot rather than a broader analysis of material culture (although see Mabbitt 2012, 141-151 for a study incorporating ceramics into the study of a Civil War siegework at Sheepen, near Colchester). However, archaeology can still play a part in the analysis of destruction during this period, as demonstrated by the examples discussed below.

4.3.2.1 Destruction by siege

Siege destruction is clearly visible in terms of damaged architecture, as demonstrated by the scars made by cannon shot at Wingfield Manor, Derbyshire (Harrington 2004, 65). However, it is extremely difficult to definitively identify material culture directly associated with this type of devastation. One rare example is from Sandal Castle, where the remains of a meal were destroyed by a collapsing wall (see below, 7.4.4).

4.3.2.2 Victorious destruction.

Much of the destruction within the archaeological record can be attributed to the aftermath of conflict. This is visible both architecturally and archaeologically through the large number of broken objects present at Civil War sites. For example, the large number of burnt vessels at Basing House, Hampshire is evidence of the large fire which swept the building after its surrender (Moorhouse 1970, 36). The systematic destruction of artefacts is also a phenomenon noted at many castles including Dudley (Ratkai 1985, n.p.). The complexity surrounding such destruction has been noted in studies of architecture ruined during the conflict and these conclusions can be extended to cover other forms of material culture (Rakoczy 2007; Mabbitt 2012).

4.3.2.3 Pillage

The wanton destruction of property during the conflict has very similar hallmarks to that of victorious destruction, as they both result in large deposits of broken material. This similarity emphasises the importance of placing sites into a specific historical context when interpreting deposits. However, the archaeological evidence for pillage is the archaeology of absence, as items which have been looted will not be present in the archaeological record. For example, despite Beeston Castle in Cheshire being used as a Parliamentarian storage facility for the valuable possessions of the local gentry (Barratt 1995, 3), very little evidence of this was found during the extensive excavations there (Ellis 1993b, 122). As a result, studies of extant material culture associated with Civil War destruction must consider objects which may not be present within the archaeological record, particularly those made of metal which played a crucial role in the consumption of foodstuffs (see above, 3.5.3).

4.4 Deposition

Analysis of the majority of Civil War sites suggests that excavated material was deliberately deposited and destroyed rather than abandoned. This is evidenced by both the distribution and abundance of objects retrieved from a variety of locations including wells (Mann 2008), around the base of towers (Ratkai 1985, n.p.) and within large voids and depressions such as ditches and basements (Moorhouse 1970, 37-39). Therefore, Civil War deposition can be seen as a form of destruction, a more purposeful form of disposal with its own particular meaning. This phenomenon is not universal amongst fortifications; studies of Fort Watson, South Carolina suggested that the ceramics deposited there were looted as opposed to destroyed (Ferguson 1977, 55). As a result, the large-scale deposits related to the conflict are extremely important and require a detailed investigation of the social discourse which created them.

However, many publications concerning the Civil War interpret material culture as a perfect representation of the occupation of the site by the defenders of the castle, in some cases linking specific phases of sieges to individual contexts (e.g. Roberts 2002b, 108). In addition, although there are rare instances in which material can be deemed to be preserved *in situ* (see below, 7.4.4), the depositional history of the majority of artefacts is far more complex. Therefore, any study of artefacts related to the conflict must first consider the motivations and methodology which resulted in their presence at a given site.

4.4.1 Deposition: the documentary evidence.

The documentary evidence for the destruction of material during the Civil War far outweighs the evidence for deposition. Occasional lines within accounts, such as Farington being a ‘good hansome Market Towne turned into Ashes and Rubbidge’ (Taylor 1649) indicate that destroyed material was still evident in towns in 1649, but the disposal of this waste is unclear. There are occasional references to clearance events such as those related to the heavily damaged gateway and barbican at Scarborough castle in 1645 (Binns 1996, 194). However, although some of the resultant building materials were probably used to repair other areas of the castle or damaged buildings within the town, the sources remain silent on the subject.

It cannot be assumed that the destruction of a house meant the destruction of the property within that house. The account of the steward, Robert Fawdon, at Milcote house, Staffordshire, fired by the Parliamentarians on 5th December 1644 to prevent it from being used as a Royalist garrison, was given time, albeit extremely limited, 'to gett what I could of Yor Honnrs [his master, the Earl of Middlesex] Goodes into the open feilds, where the most part Lay that night; and betwixt souldiers & other badd people, a greate deale thereof was lost' (Kent Archive Office U269/E.126 cited in Tennant 1996, 109). The conflation of 'souldiers' with 'badd people' is particularly informative about general feelings towards the infantry. Once the looting had stopped Fawdon was able to make an inventory of what remained, although this was expanded at a later date. This consisted of one large and five smaller trunks, mostly holding hangings and linen, including cushions, bed furniture and India curtains. However, the fourth trunk contained:

'13 pewter dishes with my Lords Armes ingraven
two dozen and eleaven plates
9 sawcers
two greate chargers of old pewter
one greate bason
two old dishes
2 pie plates
one pastie plate
one Salte
8 Chamberpotts
8 stoole panes
2 bed panes'

(Kent Archive Office U269/E.228/10 cited in Tennant 1996, 111)

Even though the list includes several items described as 'old', and thus does not represent the most expensive items relating to the household, the fact that Fawdon saved them suggests they still had some value. A similar pattern can be seen at a house in Shropshire where Mr. Barker's daughters rescued sixteen cart-loads of furniture, fittings and provisions when their house was burnt down, only to have the soldiers who destroyed their house plunder the things they had salvaged (Sherwood 1992, 119).

Where rare accounts of deposition do survive, they are almost always due to the slighting of castles, such as the accounts at Pontefract detailing the infilling of the ditches (see below, 4.6.3). At Newark the task of backfilling the siege works was given to the local villagers who apparently completed the task within a week, although this is indicative of a lack of thoroughness rather than industry on the part of the workforce as many of the earthworks still remain (RCHM 1964, 24). It can be assumed that much of the waste left behind at castle sites was also used as convenient backfill along with the earth that had originally been extracted.

4.4.2 Deposition: the archaeological evidence.

Within the archaeological record there are four types of deposition associated with Civil War sites; incidental deposition, proactive deposition, ambiguous deposition and hoards.

1. Incidental deposition. This may be identified as destruction resulting from action as part of the siege or accidental destruction in the subsequent dismantling of the fortification. Archaeological examples include the destruction of a dining assemblage at Sandal castle (Brears 1983, 224), where two cooking vessels and the remains of a meal were crushed by falling masonry, or the bodies of two workmen at Rievaulx abbey crushed by masonry during the dismantling of the chapter house (Fergusson and Harrison 1999, 188; Masinton 2008, 244). Such examples are rare, however it is important that they are identified as such events are incidental to the principal motivations of those responsible for destruction.

2. Proactive deposition. This can be defined as artefacts resulting from the deliberate deposition of material culture, often within large depressions and voids left by the demolition of buildings and change of land use. The accounts for Pontefract castle give explicit instructions for the ‘filling upp of graftes about the said Castle’ (Fox 1987, 146; Rakoczy 2008b, 263; see below, 4.6.3), and the infilling of cellars and other voids within this building and many others can be seen as part of similar intentional acts.

3. Ambiguous deposition. The motivations for the destruction of castles are extremely complex and thus it can be impossible to determine the motivations that result in some deposits. An example of this type of destruction is the deposits from Basing House, where many ceramic vessels proactively deposited within the ditch were burnt (Moorhouse 1970; 1971a; Allen and Anderson 1999, 66). However, significant damage was also caused by the preceding bombardment and as a result it is difficult to relate the destruction of artefacts to a particular event. Such examples demonstrate that the causality of destruction is complex and sites can contain a combination of incidental and proactive destruction, at times even within the same assemblage.

4. Hoards. Over 200 hoards are associated with the Civil War, including Tregwynt, Pembrokeshire (Besly 1998), Breckenbrough, North Yorkshire (Besly 1987, 6-16) and Middleham, North Yorkshire (Barclay 1994). Many of these, including those from Breckenborough and Middleham, are contained within ceramic vessels indicating a further use for these objects during the conflict. Another example of a hoard is from Newark, where a brown-glazed jug uncovered in August 1957 contained 465 silver and seventeen gold coins, an early 17th-century thimble, a casket, a sealing wax case with the coat of arms of the Vaughan family who lived eight miles from Newark, the remains of a beaded bag and a bone counter. A further hoard of 97 coins was found in 1961 (RCHM 1964, 74).

4.5 Creating a biography of destruction

As Riedlmayer (1995, n.p.) states ‘a people's identity is inextricably linked with the visible symbols of its culture. Once those anchors are gone, the past, like the future, can be recreated by the victors’. Therefore, understanding the destruction of a building and associated material culture is of great importance in appreciating how new identities were formed in the aftermath of war. As seen in previous chapters, the approaches used must be contextualised to each particular site, as factors influencing the destruction of the castle are often founded on local, rather than national, social discourse (Rakoczy 2007, 257). Only through exploring the individual biographies of each site is it possible to establish the factors influencing the damage caused there.

The contextualised study of the destruction of military institutions during the Civil War requires a number of factors to be taken into consideration. These include:

- Site history
- The origin of material deposited
- The instigators of destruction
- The composition of material destroyed
- The location of deposition

Each of these factors will be outlined below before a study of the context of deposition and the instigators of destruction at each site. The origin and composition of the material deposited at these sites is subject to the analysis of the material culture at each site, and as a result will be discussed within the site chapters.

4.5.1 Site history

When evaluating the likelihood of recovering deposits directly related to the Civil Wars, an appreciation of the site's history is vital. Whilst many of the castles fortified during the Civil War, such as Holt, Wrexham and Harlech, Gwynedd, had already witnessed a period of abandonment for several decades prior to the conflict, other strongholds had been occupied continuously. For example, Basing House was the home of the Marquis of Winchester (Moorhouse 1970; 1971a), whilst Brampton Bryan was the residence of Lady Brilliana Harley (Gaunt 1987, 79). The prior occupation of these sites adds additional complexity to their interpretation as the artefacts recovered here are associated as much with their pre-war history as their participation during the conflict.

The problems related to the destruction of castles have been highlighted by previous analyses that demonstrate the motivations and methodology employed at such sites were far from uniform (Rakoczy 2007; 2008b). For example, at Kenilworth the needs of an individual dictated the areas of the castle to be dismantled and embellished to enhance the reputation of its new owner, Colonel Joseph Hawkesworth (Rakoczy 2007, 204-205). This is very different from the motivations of those responsible for the slighting of Pontefract, as will be demonstrated below (see 4.6.3).

In addition to identifying the length of occupation and the likelihood of recovering deposits relating to the Civil War, the study of a site's history is also important when understanding the social discourse at that particular site. For example, where a site was particularly resistant to attack, as at Basing House, the level of destruction tended to be more severe, with the site being extensively pillaged and many of the occupants killed (Carlton 1992, 177-179). The use of documentary evidence means, in addition to recreating events at that particular site, the way in which a stronghold was viewed by both defenders and attackers can also be analysed. Whilst the social discourse at some sites such as Montgomery dictated that all buildings were demolished, including those from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (Lloyd 1965, 63), at other sites, such as Kenilworth and Tattershall, only partial demolition occurred (Johnson 2002, 174; Rakoczy 2007, 41). As a result, an understanding of each site is necessary to fully appreciate the social discourse surrounding destruction at each site.

4.5.2 The origin of deposited material

Excavated material needs to be analysed in order to establish whether it originated from the garrison as opposed to other sources such as local middens. At Newcastle upon Tyne, for example, the bastion ditch was filled from the mid-17th century onwards with refuse from nearby dwellings rather than material from the castle (Ellison and Harbottle 1983; Nolan 1990). Therefore, it is vitally important to ascertain, as far as possible, that the material being studied resulted from the consumption practices of the garrison as opposed to opportunistic dumping by local inhabitants. In some instances this can be achieved through the distance of the fortification from the nearest settlement, the remote situation of Beeston makes it highly unlikely that the material excavated here derived from any source other than the castle (Ellis 1993a). However, at others the situation is more complex and as a result the identification of Civil War deposits may have to be achieved on the basis of conjecture following a careful analysis of the site's history.

4.5.3 The instigators of destruction

In order to establish the motivation for a site's destruction it is essential to identify the perpetrators behind this action. In some instances, as at Basing, those responsible for the damage caused at a particular site are the same as those responsible for attacking it. However, in many cases the length of time between the capture of a castle and its

subsequent demolition means there is some doubt over who was actually responsible for this act. Montgomery for example was seized in 1645 but it was only in 1649, after considerable negotiation with the owner, that the castle was finally slighted (Lloyd 1965, 61). Such identification is not always possible, nevertheless it is still an important consideration when analysing resultant assemblages.

4.5.4 The composition of deposited material

The analysis of any archaeological collection must assess how representative the excavated material culture is of the original assemblage. Objects are subject to preferential deposition but are also context dependent, with certain materials only surviving under specific conditions. Environmental factors mean that organic material only survives in rare circumstances and wooden bowls such as those found at St. Paul-in-the-Bail well are rarities which do not usually survive in the ground unless there are waterlogged conditions (Morris 2008, 40-42). Other objects, such as those made of metal, may have been curated for recycling or for reuse, being more valuable than the objects remaining (see above, 3.5.3). Although scraps of these vessels may remain, many will be absent due to their comparative financial or social value. At other sites, deposition may be influenced by other factors; at Basing House a number of ceramic vessels were probably discarded as they had been severely damaged in a fire which swept through the building after its surrender (Moorhouse 1970, 42). Excavation methods also have an effect on the material culture analysed. For example, where areas have been subject to partial excavation or preferential retrieval of material, such as the absence of sieving to recover botanical remains, the artefacts recovered may be a biased representation of the archaeological record.

4.5.5 The location of deposition

The location of deposited material is important as it may, to some extent, reflect the location of consumption but the relationship between the two is complicated. Artefacts may originate from multiple distant sources rather than a single nearby location and, in addition, any material deposited in shallow features may be more susceptible to disturbance. It is also important to understand the methodology employed in excavating contexts, as deep features may have been excavated mechanically and excavation may have been dictated by modern needs rather than archaeological research (Creighton

2008, 82). Where questions of archaeological procedure have been satisfied however, analysis of the location of deposition can reveal important insights into the preferential discard of artefacts in particular areas.

4.6 Destruction at the selected sites

Having outlined the questions that need to be addressed before an assemblage can be analysed, the social discourse of destruction at Eccleshall, Sandal and Pontefract will be examined to evaluate the factors that may have governed the deposition of material at each site.

4.6.1 Eccleshall

Of the three castles analysed within this study, Eccleshall is the least well documented. A palace belonging to the Bishop of Lichfield, Robert Wright, the castle was subjected to siege which lasted some ten weeks in 1643 until its surrender in early September[4], during the course of which the Bishop died (Wood 1692; Pemberton and Roots 1957, 147). The castle then served as a garrison for Parliament until the end of the war, largely under the command of Sir William Brereton who described it on 24th October 1645 as 'the only place of Safetie wherein those few goods which are remaining unplundered and wherein any of my servants can in this Countie bee in any safetie' (Pemberton and Roots 1957, 345). Brereton himself evidently made known his intentions to inhabit the former bishop's palace after the conflict, as the Stafford Committee on the 15th July 1644 (Pemberton and Roots 1957, 147) voiced its preferment for the castle's garrison to be governed alongside the county as opposed to being a separate garrison under Brereton's command which 'would be inconvenient and prejudiciall to the garison of Stafford and to the safety of the County' (Pemberton and Roots 1957, 147, 152). It was judged that Brereton's ownership of the castle would reduce the power of the Earl of Denbigh, mean fewer troops joined the garrison at Stafford and divert funds originally intended for Stafford towards this rival garrison (Pemberton and Roots 1957, 152-3).

[4] The length of siege, albeit short, is somewhat disputed, as Gaunt (1987, 152) states it began in early August, which would support the seven weeks stated in the accounts of the Stafford Committee (Pemberton and Roots 1957). However, *Athenae Oxienses* (Wood 1692) reports that the siege was conducted during July to September and thus it would appear that ten weeks is more accurate.

The fact that the primary cause of grievance is listed as ‘it much eclipseth the Earle of Denbighs our Lord Generall his power’ is significant as it suggests the politics of rival garrisons was the primary cause for the petition as opposed to a military concern (Pemberton and Roots 1957, 153). Such petty rivalries were a problem for both sides; the Royalist commander of Dudley castle, Colonel Thomas Leveson quarrelled so frequently with Colonel Richard Bagot that they had to appeal to the king to settle their dispute (Hutton 1999, 101).

Significantly the petition states that the garrison ‘is of that strength that fiftie souldiers are a competent number to keepe it against a potent Army’ (Pemberton and Roots 1957, 153). Although there might be an ulterior motive to underestimating the garrison needed for the castle, this statement belies the suggestion that the castle was 'badly damaged' (Gaunt 1987, 152), and indeed the castle had succumbed to treachery rather than bombardment (see below, 6.2). In any case, the Parliamentarians maintained the castle for the rest of the war, transporting cannon to the castle in April 1646 and ordering the repair of one of its turrets (Cooper 2008, 76; Pemberton and Roots 1957, 89).

As the garrison was not threatened again until the end of the conflict, it can be assumed that the castle was largely intact when its future was subjected to further discussion. Brereton still had a vested interest in the castle, as the first order issued by Parliament on 4th August 1646 was ‘[t]hat the Works and Fortifications of *Eccleshall-Castle* be dismantled: And that it be referred to the Committee of the Revenue, to continue Sir *William Brereton* to dwell in the said Castle, if they shall think fitting’ (C.J. 1802a, 633). Brereton's many enemies, who had already denied him more resources for Eccleshall, operated throughout the bureaucratic hierarchies to deny him the castle. His own nephew, George Booth, charged him with corruption, accusing Brereton of seizing Eccleshall for himself rather than on the behalf of Parliament (Morrill 1985, 320). This culminated in a discussion over whether Brereton was allowed to keep the castle due to military services rendered, which ‘led to a debate so heated that Sir John Clotworthy moved that a ballot box be brought in so that the issue could be settled by a secret vote’ (Morrill 1985, 320-321). As a result Brereton was refused the castle and the next order, issued on 2nd March 1647, was ‘[t]hat *Eccleshall Castle* be made untenable: And that it be referred to the Committee in the Country, to see it done accordingly’ (C.J. 1802b, 102), a vote which was adhered to on 19th March 1647 (C.J. 1802b, 250).

The rivalries between different Parliamentarian factions surrounding the destruction of Eccleshall is significant, as it suggests that the impetus to demolish the building came not from a need to prevent it being used again by the Royalists but as a way of denying its future use by a man who had made himself unpopular amongst some of his peers. The damage done to Eccleshall as a result of Parliamentarian slighting was so great that the bishops of Lichfield declared it uninhabitable and it was extensively rebuilt in the late 17th century (Sheale 1993, 15). As a result, the destruction of the castle was a vindictive action not against its Royalist defenders but rather the Parliamentarian who had occupied the castle and subsequently lost political favour.

4.6.2 Sandal

The surrender of Pontefract on 20th July 1645 led to a call for the surrender of Sandal on the following day, but the besiegers replied 'that the taking of Pontefract Castle cannot take away our Allegeance, but shall contract it, and adde vigour to it' (Whalley 1645a). The siege intensified throughout August and September, with artillery from Hull being installed by the besiegers in late September and producing a breach in the castle's defences (Pecke 1645). This action did not result in an attack, despite initial reports of the siege and more recent analysis (Collings1645; Credland 1983, 260). Instead, an eyewitness account records the surrender of the garrison whilst the Parliamentarians were 'drawn up to storme the breach' on 30th September 1645 (Bates 1645). It would appear that it was the threat of storm as opposed to starvation that led to the surrender, as it was found that there were plentiful supplies of beef, corn and beer for the garrison (Coe 1645). A decree was made the following April, along with several other fortifications, to make the castle untenable as it was an 'inland garrison' (C.J. 1802a, 528).

The geographical location of slighted castles has been discussed by Rakoczy (2007, 54-57), who suggests that despite previous theories (Thompson 1987, 154) there is no particular pattern in castles being targeted due to their geographical location. The documentary record suggests that the castle was already untenable at the end of the siege, due to the breaches made by Parliamentarian garrison. This is confirmed by the archaeological excavations conducted at the site, which revealed substantial damage,

particularly on the motte where the Royalists were forced to excavate a trench in order to pass through the site in relative safety (Mayes 1983, 46).

The state of the castle before, and certainly after, the conflict suggests that the demand for demolition was superfluous to requirements. Unlike Eccleshall there were no internal politics surrounding its demolition, neither were there any petitions such as those at Pontefract (see below, 4.6.3). Nevertheless, the deposition at Sandal should be considered as the result of bombardment and slighting, rather than slighting alone.

4.6.3 Pontefract

Pontefract was one of only two castles in Yorkshire to have escaped slighting at the end of the first Civil War, the other being Scarborough (Binns 1986, 113). Instead a Parliamentarian garrison was installed and, despite supposedly losing its military status in February 1647, a grant of £360 was later made to the castle for the garrison's relief (Binns 1996, 194). Some deposition had already occurred prior to the end of the war, on 16th January 1645 the Royalist defenders, 'hearing they [Parliamentarian troops] would plant them [cannon] against Pip' tower & betwixt that & the Round Tower where there was a hallow place all the way downe to the well, the gentlemen & Souldyers fell all upon Carrying of earth & Rubbish & so filled up the place in a little space' (Walker 1997, 12). However, the bulk of the destruction occurred in 1649 after it had been recaptured by the Royalists and held by them during the second Civil War.

In terms of demolition, Pontefract is one of the most well-documented Civil War sites, benefiting from the pleas for demolition from the aldermen of Pontefract and the West Riding Jury and an account book listing the expenses and income resulting from the destruction of the castle and subsequent sale of materials. Study of these accounts has revealed the complexity of social relations between the military and civilian parties responsible for the dismantling of the buildings and associated structures, as well as providing some understanding of the processes by which artefacts entered the archaeological record.

The castle was already a focus of ill feeling in Yorkshire, on 1st October 1648 Parliament imposed a £10,500 levy on the county to pay for the siege (Bennett 2000,

151). However, ill feeling itself cannot account for the destruction of the castle, for example the townspeople of Scarborough suffered two prolonged sieges in both wars, yet they gave no such plea for demolition and the castle continued in active use (Binns 1986, 116). As a result, the treatment of each castle was unique and based on equally unique circumstances.

The two petitions requesting the demolition of the castle came from two related but distinctly separate authorities. The first, forwarded on 19th March 1649 by the West Riding Jury, was broadly focussed on the slighting of Pontefract, requesting that 'order may be given for the sale of the materials in it, to help to demolish it self:' (HC 1649, 5). The mention of the slighting of Middleham castle within the same petition has been interpreted as demonstrating the strategic rather than emotive motivations of the Jury (Rakoczy 2007, 226-7). However, there are significant differences between this, which has been seen as a strategic move on the part of the Jury, and the second petition, sent with a letter written by the commander of the Parliamentarian army, Major Lambert, dated 22nd March 1649. This petition, signed by the mayor of the town, Edward Fuller on behalf of the aldermen of the town, mentions the destruction placed on the town, but in a very different way. Whereas the former discusses the 'tyranny and oppression' caused by the Royalists, the latter discusses much more specifically the human and economic impact of the sieges, with 200 houses destroyed, trade and farming disrupted and the destruction of the church, in all it is estimated that the siege cost the town £40,000. Only once is the Royalist threat mentioned in the context of destruction as 'confused heapes [which] are lively and speaking Monuments of the Enemies cruelty and yo' Peticoners' misery' (cited in Holmes 1882a, 27-8).

The subsequent demolition of the castle has been well analysed in terms of the political implications (Rakoczy 2007, 226-257; 2008b), but whilst being extremely informative such approaches do not explore the social motivations of destruction. Pontefract is notable not only for the extensive demolition but also the retention of profits by the local populace, resulting in only £2 12*s* 10*d* being immediately returned to Parliament (although they were due a further £145 11*s* 07*d* once outstanding debts had been collected) (Roberts 2002a, 442).

The names of the trustees who were granted the overseeing of the destruction by the West Riding Committee is significant; Captain John Ward, Edward Field (mayor), Robert More, Robert Franke, Matthew Franke, Christopher Longe and John Ramsden. Of these, all bar Captain Ward were aldermen of Pontefract, although Christopher Longe may have only been an alderman from 1650 (Rakoczy 2007, 243). Furthermore, two of these, Robert More and Robert Franke, had been aldermen in 1644 at the time of the first siege. Of the thirteen aldermen at this time just three, including More and Franke, had not entered the castle as part of the Royalist garrison, the final alderman, Joshua or Joseph Wakefield[5], probably being too infirm to participate on either side as he was at least 70 when he died in 1650-1 (Holmes 1882a, 9-10). The rift which formed at the beginning of the conflict amongst the aldermen is symptomatic of a wider rift within the town, especially as members of the garrison had families within the town. For example, Isobel Francke was the mother of Richard Oates, one of the Royalist aldermen, and is the 'I.O.' whose initials appear on some of the 1649 tokens (Holmes 1882a, 12). As someone with Royalist sympathies, her story is symptomatic of many in the town as her house may have been used to quarter Parliamentarians; Nathan Drake's diary mentions the firing of shots at her house by the castles garrison (Holmes 1882a, 12; Walker 1997, 19). Although personal advancement may have played a part in slighting the castle, the emotional impact of the conflict also needs to be taken into consideration. Those in charge of the demolition may have been puritans or had Parliamentarian sympathies, but at least one member of the Royalist garrison from the first and second sieges, John Oxley, participated in the dismantling of the castle (Holmes 1887, 20; Rakoczy 2007, 241). The prominence of local inhabitants in the slighting is also important as at other castles, such as Beeston, the evidence suggests those responsible for demolition came from much further afield (Ellis 1993c, 213). Therefore, the involvement of the local community in the destruction of their castle was by no means a regular occurrence and suggests the events at Pontefract were of great social significance. The act of dismantling the castle, whilst in part leading to a financial gain for certain members of the community, also led to some collaboration between two formerly opposing sides and even the gradual healing of some of the scars left by the conflict.

[5] Both forenames are used in Holmes (1882, 9).

The forging of a civic identity from a military conflict can be seen in the accounts through the conflict between the Parliamentarian forces and the civic authorities, particularly over the theft of timber for use as firewood (Rakoczy 2008b, 268), one entry giving £1 to 'six carpenters for loading timber that was secured from burning by the soldiers and surveying the rest of the timber' (Fox 1987, 152) and a further 18*s* being 'paid for coals to several guards to secure the timber from burning' (Fox 1987, 152). Although such payments can be seen as the civic authority defending their 'new "investment"' (Rakoczy 2007, 234), it can also be seen as evidence of the unity of the civic authority against their erstwhile allies, the castle forming a new focus around which the town could forge a new identity.

Within this new identity, it is significant that the very name of the castle was altered. From medieval times it had been referred to as Pomfret, and is mentioned as such in Shakespeare's *Richard III* as:

> 'Pomfret, Pomfret! O thou bloody prison,
> Fatal and ominous to noble peers!
> Within the guilty closure of thy walls
> Richard the second here was hack'd to death'
>
> (Richard III Act 3 Scene 3)

As this extract demonstrates, the name Pomfret was already associated with bloodshed and a symbol for the struggle for the crown, Edward V's uncle and half-brother being executed there in 1483 when Richard III seized the throne. Pomfret was referred to in the Civil War (Anon 1642c), however within the *Booke of Entries of the Pontefract Corporation,* 'it may be as well to state that the debased name, Pomfret, does not once occur in this authentic record' (Holmes 1882a, 12). From this it would appear that there was a consensus amongst the population to erase the very memory of the castle, just as the castle itself was dismantled so too was the name with all of its bloody and inglorious connotations.

Although the order to dismantle Pontefract was carried out with more zeal than at other sites, probably due to a combination of profit-seeking and genuine hatred of the castle,

the actual process of dismantlement may have been more complex than the accounts suggest. Work started on the 5th April 1649, the day after the order was issued by the West Riding Jury to begin demolition (Rakoczy 2007, 228), but the date it finished is uncertain. Robert Moore paid ten weeks of wages to labourers and workmen and the final accounts for payments were received on 7th May 1649. However, a list of debts were still outstanding when the final accounts were signed on 11th April 1651 and work was still being conducted as late as 16th August 1654, when John Evelyn noted that Pontefract castle 'was now demolishing by the Rebells' (de Beer 1959, 348). In 1656, the corporation ordered that the widow of Samuel Childe should be made to pay the £60 9*s* 9*d* still owed for wood, along with an order 'that the arrears of the Assessmt for p'videing of Bucketts and ropes, &c., be forethewith collected and paid to Richard Lile and Willm Farrey to be imploied...for p'videing of more buckets, ropes, and neccessaries' (Holmes 1882a, 24). Although this may be for activities unrelated to the castle, the combination of these two actions within the same order suggests that the buckets and other materials were required for activities relating to the castle. This is understandable given the nature of the accounts which cover the most profitable materials from the castle, namely the lead, timber and glass. All such materials can be retrieved from the roof and windows of various buildings which would take a much shorter time than the recovery of masonry, which is not mentioned in the accounts. Therefore, although the materials most suitable for resale may be salvaged quickly and as a result appear in the accounts at an earlier date, the removal of masonry may take much longer, thus explaining why activities on the castle continued long after the accounts had been finalised. The fall of several towers, which maimed at least one workman (Fox 1987, 151-2; Rakoczy 2007, 238-9), does not disprove this as these may have only been partial collapses and many towers did not fall in this manner.

Amongst the towers to fall was the Constable Tower, as evidenced by £2 14s being 'paid for baring of timber from under the fall of [the] Constable Tower'. As this is the area from which the majority of material culture was retrieved this is of great importance, as it either suggests that the cellars of the Tower were backfilled prior to the collapse of the Tower or that the material from the Tower collapse was thoroughly removed and the area then backfilled. The lack of masonry in the lower deposits of the Tower suggests that the former is more likely, although the upper deposits are more mixed (see below, 8.4.2.1).

The explicit instruction to fill the depressions of the castle was complied with, as evidenced by the demolition accounts in which £4 10*s* was 'paid for filling up the graft at the upper Drawbridge and the chapel walls pulling down' (Fox 1987, 151) and £1 7*s* 4*d* 'for filling up the graft at the low Drawbridge, and pulling down part of the screen close by the Constable Tower' (Fox 1987, 151). However, such a process was by no means straightforward, as demonstrated by several instances of towers falling as opposed to being demolished in a controlled manner. As a result, the accounts of Pontefract demonstrate that the demolition of a castle was quite complex and could take a considerable length of time to complete. The study of the politics and economics of demolition can illuminate the social networks formulated and exploited throughout the demolition process (Rakoczy 2007; 2008b); however, it is only when the psychological impact of the siege is fully understood that the social impact and implications of the demolition can be understood.

4.7 Conclusion

Analysis of each site demonstrates the unique nature of destruction, as the motivations for the slighting of the three castles were very different. The great complexity of destruction means it is impossible to examine assemblages resulting from the inhabitation of buildings during the Civil Wars without taking into account the processes by which they entered the ground. The differing social discourse which occurred during destruction means that even if assemblages appear to be very similar, in reality they are very different due to the motivations which led to their discard. Only when such motivations are explored thoroughly is it possible to analyse the resulting material culture not just as an integral part of the consumption of food and drink but also as an integral part of the social discourse surrounding destruction.

5 Methodology

5.1 Introduction

An approach focussed on the social discourse at Civil War sites requires a detailed methodology with a holistic approach to material culture. This approach should include the identification of appropriate sites, the analysis of artefacts related to consumption from those sites, and a subsequent comparison with other sites. Although this approach should be broadly universal to all case studies, where necessary it should be adapted to suit particular sites due to their own peculiarities.

5.2 Castle Selection

This thesis relies on the selection of case studies with substantial deposits of material culture relating to the Civil War. As a result, all castles involved in the conflict need to be identified along with the level of archaeological excavation conducted at each of them. All known Civil War sites were listed using Gaunt's *Cromwellian Gazetteer of the English Civil War* (1987) alongside additional information such as the type of site (for example castle, stately home, town), when it was occupied and by whom. A review was then conducted of all published literature relating to castle excavations (appendix 1). Although an area of great potential (Creighton 2008, 84), unpublished excavations or Ministry of Works clearances at castles such as Helmsley, Yorkshire were not covered in this survey as sufficient sites had already been identified without this time consuming process. The review resulted in an evaluation of Civil War castle sites which were subsequently categorised as high, medium or low priority sites based on the following criteria:

1) High potential sites. Extensive excavations which revealed a significant area of the site and produced a large amount of archaeological material. Sites include Basing House (Peers 1909; Moorhouse 1970: 1971a; Allen and Anderson 1999), Montgomery (Lewis 1968; Knight 1992; Knight 1993; Knight 1994) and Dudley (Ratkai 1985: 1987; Moffet 1992; Gaimster *et al.* 1996; Thomas 2005).

2) Medium potential sites. Sites with a moderate level of archaeological investigation or extensive excavations with little documentation and/or a high risk of contamination. Sites include Newark (Barley and Waters 1956; RCHME 1964; Courtney 1973; Drage 1987; Kinsley 1988; Holyoak 1997; Samuels 1998; Jennings 2003), Nottingham (Drage 1978: 1989) and Sheffield (Armstrong 1935).

3) Low potential sites. Sites with little or no archaeological investigation. This was the largest category and included sites such as Banbury (Fasham 1973: 1983; Rodwell 1976), Corfe (Chambers 1950; Grace and Papworth 1997; RCHME 1960) and Raglan (Kenyon 1982a: 1982b).

A feasibility study of each identified high priority castle was subsequently conducted based on geographical location, date of excavation and accessibility to archives. On this basis three sites were chosen; Pontefract and Sandal in Yorkshire and Eccleshall in Staffordshire. Visits to the relevant museum service were then conducted to examine the ceramic and glass assemblages from each castle.

5.3 Recording of ceramic vessels

It is essential to maintain the same methodology across all sites to ensure uniformity and ease of comparison (Orton 2000, 75). As a result all three sites were assessed or, in the case of published excavations, reassessed using identical criteria for each site. These criteria are listed here and discussed in detail below.

- Estimated number of vessels (ENV)
- Number of sherds
- Weight
- Location of vessel
- Form
- Fabric
- Glaze colour and glossiness
- Number of handles
- Completeness

- Sooting
- Kiln notes
- Decoration

Data was entered directly into a separate spreadsheet for each site and these have been included within the appendices in electronic form (see appendices 2, 3 and 4).

5.3.1 Estimated number of vessels (ENV)

A meaningful study into artefact consumption must rely on an accurate number of vessels (Orton 1993, 177). As a single vessel can be represented by multiple sherds within the archaeological record, the sherd count alone cannot give an accurate representation of an assemblage; therefore, the number of sherds recovered from each site is less important than how many vessels these represented (Orton *et al*. 1993, 16-19). However, due to the fragmentary nature of the archaeological record the number of vessels at a given site will always be a subjective estimate. A minimum number of vessels, derived from a basic rim or base count, can produce wide variability between sites and vessel types (Orton *et al*. 1993, 169), but other methodologies also have their limitations. For example, estimated vessel equivalents (*eve*s) rely on key areas of the ceramic such as rims and bases to be present to the detriment of other fragments such as body sherds. In addition, *eve*s are still only an estimate of the total number of vessels present as it is usually not possible to identify all the sherds of the same vessel (Orton 1993, 173), and they are also heavily dependent on context due to the individual nature of each deposit. As a result *eve*s cannot be used for a direct comparison between sites without some processing (Baxter and Cool 1995, 90).

However, the sites studied produced moderately complete assemblages which are more representative of the original composition of artefacts than most excavated sites (Orton *et al*. 1993, 169). As the deposits consisted of predominately whole contexts with a resultant high level of joining sherds, an approach could be adopted which estimated the number of vessels through the similarity of fabric and glaze. Each group of sherds, or 'sherd family', could then be estimated as a single vessel (Baxter and Cool 1995, 91). Although moderately subjective, the unique nature of many vessels justified this approach and several previously unmatched sherds were joined using this method.

Each sherd group was assigned a unique identification number for each site, preceded by the initials RMCA which was retained with the sherds after analysis. RMCA has been substituted by a three or four letter site identification within this thesis: ECC for Eccleshall, SAND for Sandal and PONT for Pontefract. Body sherds and handles which could not be identified were given a single identification number and an estimation of vessels given.

5.3.2 Number of sherds

The number of sherds present in each sherd group were listed along with how many were joining and non-joining.

5.3.3 Weight

All sherds were weighed on scales accurate to one gram. Sherds were weighed both collectively and individually to facilitate movement between entries where necessary.

5.3.4 Area and location

The area and, where applicable, context of all sherds within each sherd group were noted. Both area and context were defined by the original excavations and thus varied from site to site. These differences are explained briefly below.

5.3.4.1 Eccleshall Castle

As the fill of the moat at Eccleshall was deemed by excavators to be a single, homogenous context, the excavation was separated into areas which were subsequently excavated by spit, with sherds from each spit being assigned an individual bag number. Therefore, vessels were initially analysed by bag number which were then linked to the area of excavation and the spit from which the sherd originated from, as listed in appendix 5. As it is highly likely material originated from a single event horizon, spits were omitted from the final analysis and sherds were analysed by area alone. A list of areas along with their generalised location is shown in table 5.1 (see also fig. 6.1).

5.3.4.2 Sandal Castle

Sandal was originally excavated by context but these were amalgamated as part of the post-excavation process with all finds being assigned an area code, year of excavation

and phase of occupation (P. Judkins *pers. comm.*). The subsequent loss of the paper archive for the site has led to some confusion in artefact location, particularly as the same code was sometimes used for different areas excavated in different years. For example 'F' could refer to the seal over the bakehouse if excavated in 1965, but when used in 1967 probably refers to area F on the motte, an area subsequently assigned as MF. Conflicts were resolved as far as possible using a list of area codes and the published site plans (Mayes 1983; Moorhouse 1983a 205-206), although as some area codes were omitted from both sources this was not always possible. The pottery codes used for this study, alongside their original codes and their location, appear in table 5.2 (see also fig. 7.1). Further conflicts are discussed within the appropriate chapter but it should be noted that, as far as possible, sherds with different codes were analysed separately even when they appeared to originate from the same area. For example, sherds marked L/K and SCL/K probably originated from the courtyard between the kitchen and larder but remained separate within initial analysis to prevent confusion if this is proved not to be the case. Four codes, A, AKX, BRT and JA were impossible to identify whilst a further four codes, M, MA, MGC and MN cannot be exactly located although the 'M' prefix suggests they are in the vicinity of the motte.

5.3.4.3 Pontefract Castle

The excavations at Pontefract Castle employed single context recording, with which all pottery sherds were marked. These contexts were adopted for use in this study alongside the area each context originated from (see table 5.3).

5.3.5 Form

Identification of vessel form is important when understanding their role within social discourse. However, vessels are imbedded within the *habitus* in which they are consumed and as a result the modern interpretation of vessels may differ from their past use (Cumberpatch 1997, 128). For example, during the 17th century a dish could be variously seen as a saucer, salad dish, basin, broth dish, platter, trencher or middling dish (Holme 1905, 4 cited in Beaudry *et al.* 1983, 26), but such distinctions are impossible to make within the archaeological record. In addition, multiple terms such as tyg, drinking cup, tankard and mug may be used as subcategories for the generic category of drinking vessel or 'pot'. Although these terms can be used for slightly

different forms, they are often used interchangeably within contemporary and modern literature. The impossibility of associating historical terms with individual artefacts meant this study adopted broad vessel categories. These categories were based on established medieval typologies (MPRG 1998), with some exceptions in deference to contemporary forms, for example pancheon was used in preference to concave-sided or flared bowls (MPRG 1998, 5.1.3 and 5.1.4). The primary categories used within analysis were:

- **Drinking Vessels**. These encompass a number of terms used elsewhere, including cup, tyg, drinking pot and mug (e.g. Beaudry *et al.* 1983, 30).

- **Medium fine jars.** These are differentiated from larger storage jars through both their smaller size and fabric, having been manufactured from refined fabrics such as yellow-ware or blackware.

- **Fine handled jars**. Although often referred to as chamberpots, the variety and form of such vessels adds credence to the suggestion that the term chamberpot is too specific (Cumberpatch 2002, 221). In addition, contemporary depictions show a form not dissimilar to that of the modern form but with marked differences to many archaeological examples, some of which would have been somewhat impractical due to their size and shape. As a result, fine handled jar has been adopted for the purposes of this study.

- **Storage jars.** These are large vessels constructed of coarseware fabrics, many with handles. They are usually substantially larger than other jar forms.

- **Storage cisterns.** Used for the storage of liquids, these are of a similar form to storage jars but can be differentiated through the presence of a spigot hole near the base of the vessel. As a distinction between a jar and cistern can only be achieved through the presence of a significant section of the lower portion of the vessel, there are a significant number of vessels assigned as **storage jar/cistern**.

- **Small storage vessels.** These are otherwise known as drug jars or cylindrical jars (MPRG 1998, 4.1.3). Some literature refer to these as albarellos[6] (e.g. Cumberpatch 2002, 221), but this term specifically refers to a form of drug jar often imported from the Mediterranean (Griffenhagen and Bogard 1999, 5) and as a result is not employed within this thesis. Although associated with ointments and medical uses, they may also have been used for storing small amounts of condiments such as mustard (Moorhouse 1978, 7).

- **Jugs.** Usually upright or sometimes globular vessels with a handle and spout used for the transportation and pouring of liquids.

- **Costrels.** Distinctive small flasks with narrow necks and lug holes on either side for the transportation of liquids, these are often identified through the presence of neck or lug hole fragments. However, other sherds could be tentatively identified due to the lack of glaze and prominent narrow throwing rings on the interior of body sherds.

- **Flasks.** This is used in reference to specific imported forms such as Martincamp flasks and denote small vessels used in the serving and transportation of liquids.

- **Bowls/Pancheons.** These refer to deep, steeply sided vessels used for food preparation, often referred to in the production of dairy products such as cheese. The two terms are differentiated based on the gradient of the sides but as this division can lead to extensive overlap, bowl/pancheon is employed within this analysis.

- **Dishes.** Shallow, wide vessels used for the serving of food. These were rare items at all three sites and were usually manufactured from red slipware.

[6] Strictly speaking, the plural of albarello is albarelli but albarellos is employed in the majority of English ceramic studies.

- **Pipkins.** Used for the cooking of food, pipkins usually possess three short feet at their base leading to their identification as **tripod pipkins.** Other cooking vessels identified were a **skillet** and medieval forms such as a **dripping pan** and **cooking jars**, differentiated from other jars by their globular base and evidence of sooting.

- Other terms relate to the specific function of an item, such as **candlestick** and **salt**.

Illustrated examples of the principal ceramic forms can be found in fig. 5.1.

5.3.5.1 Sub-categories

The categorisation of objects is essentially a subjective process, a cup and a mug only being seen as essentially separate objects due to our own perceptions (Beaudry *et al.* 1983, 19). Therefore, rather than relying on complex typologies of vessels it is preferable to produce broad categories referring to generalised vessel use. Such categories need to be narrow enough for a meaningful comparison, as although the use of hollowware and flatware may avoid being overly specific (Celoria and Kelly 1973 cited in Beaudry *et al.* 1983, 20), they also heavily restrict function analysis. As a result, nine categories were created which included all identified vessel forms. These categories are similar to those used by Cumberpatch (2002, 221, table 22,) but do vary slightly.

- **Drinking vessels.** *Includes: drinking vessels*

- **Fine storage vessels.** *Includes: fine handled jars, fine medium jars*

  The inclusion of all medium jars regardless of the presence of handles recognises their similarity of form but also accommodates problems of identification, as a handled jar requires the presence of a handle or handle scar which may not be obvious or present on incomplete examples.

- **Small storage vessels.** *Includes: small storage vessels*
- **Large storage vessels.** *Includes: heavy duty storage jars, heavy duty cisterns, heavy duty storage vessels*

  Although cisterns and jars are separated through the presence of a spigot hole on cisterns, the necessity for this to be present to identify such a vessel means a large number of incomplete vessels are ambiguous. As liquids could also be stored in jars if necessary the creation of a single category overcomes problems of identification.

- **Liquid transportation.** *Includes: jugs, costrels*

  The two vessel forms included within this category perform different social roles despite sharing a similar physical function, that of carrying liquids. Due to their size jugs are more suited to the communal consumption of liquids whereas costrels are more suited to individual consumption. As a result, although initial analysis included these two vessels within the same category comparisons of the two types are made within the text.

- **Food preparation vessels** *Includes: bowls/pancheons*

- **Food serving vessels.** *Includes: dishes and plates*

- **Cooking vessels.** *Includes: tripod cooking vessels, skillets*

  This category refers to vessels which were intended to be used for cooking, such as tripod cooking vessels and skillets. Other vessels which were adapted for cooking, such as jug SAND*1710,* are discussed separately.

- **Other** *Includes: candlestick, salt*

A small number of vessels performed a specific purpose and could not be categorised, for example candlesticks and salts. As a result these were placed within a separate category and are discussed individually.

5.3.6 Fabric

Compared to medieval ceramics, pottery produced between 1600 and 1650 is often overlooked as it falls between medieval studies terminating at 1600 (e.g. McCarthy and Brooks 1988) and studies of post-medieval ceramics often commencing after 1650 (e.g. Weatherill 1971; Draper 1984). Other studies of this period concentrate on imports such as Rhenish stonewares and colourful wares such as tin glazed earthenware rather than more mundane fabrics such as blackware or yellow ware (e.g. Gaimster 1994). As a result wares commonly found on sites outside the South-East receive less attention, although there are rare exceptions (e.g. Barker 1985; 1986b; Cumberpatch 2003; Boyle 2006; Vaughan 2007).

As opposed to earlier periods, post-medieval fabrics are often identified on the basis of glaze rather than fabric, for example blackwares, yellow wares and red wares. Although it is possible to distinguish individual fabrics chemically, the possibility for ceramic petrography is reduced as fabrics are heavily refined (Vince 2001, 108-109). In addition, whilst the study of fabrics provides some information about their movement around the country (e.g. Moorhouse 1983b) the mobility of troops during this period means interpretation would be extremely complex if not impossible, as the person who consumed the vessel may be completely unrelated to the person who transported it to the site. As a result, this study focussed on the phenomenological appearance of vessels rather than their place of origin (Cumberpatch 1997, 129), and ceramics were assigned to broad categories such as blackware and yellow ware, with sub-categories used to aid cross-matching rather than draw conclusions concerning production sites. All fabrics were examined by hand-lens at 10x magnification.

The classification of fabrics at Pontefract and Sandal broadly follows that used in the original study of the pottery from Pontefract (Cumberpatch 2002) although some sub-types were amalgamated after sherds from different types were found to join. At Eccleshall medieval fabrics of largely complete vessels were defined using *Medieval*

Pottery in Staffordshire, AD800-1600 (Ford 1995). The predominant fabrics at all three sites are discussed below, with a full description of all fabrics and sub-fabrics appearing in appendices 6 and 7. A list of abbreviations used for ceramic fabrics can be found in table 5.4.

5.3.6.1 Principal Fabric types

5.3.6.1.1 Cistercian ware (Cw)

Produced from the mid-15th century onwards, Cistercian ware is characterised by a hard, semi-vitrified fabric which varies in colour from purple to dark orange-red. Vessels are usually covered by a black or dark brown glaze which is often patchy and poorly-fired to produce a semi-metallic spotted finish and some are subsequently embellished by the application of clay strips or pads (Boyle 2006, 3). Cistercian ware was widely produced in the midlands and north of England (Barker 1986a, 53), with substantial kilns situated near to Pontefract and Sandal at Potovens, Wrenthorpe (Brears 1967; Bartlett 1971; Moorhouse and Roberts 1992). In the midlands, kiln sites include Ticknall, Derbyshire (Boyle 2002-2003; Spavold and Brown 2005; Boyle and Rowlandson 2006-2008), Wednesbury, West Midlands, Chilvers Coton, Warwickshire and Burslem and Hanley, Staffordshire (Barker 1986a, 53; Boothroyd and Courtney 2004)[7]. The dominant form is drinking vessels characterised by globular forms with wide, flaring rims or tall, upright vessels (Boyle 2006, 6).

Petrographic and glaze analysis of fabrics from the west midlands showed vessels from a number of sites were indistinguishable, although inductively-coupled plasma spectrometry (ICPS) reveals key differences (Hurst and Wright 2011, 59). As differences between fabrics were only visible chemically, fabric by itself is demonstrably less important than phenomenological aspects when considering its role in social discourse.

[7] For a general overview of sites in the west midlands see Hurst and Wright 2011, 55

5.3.6.1.2 Blackware (Bw)

Produced from the late 16th century onwards, blackwares are characterised by predominantly well-fired orange-red fabrics with a rich, glossy dark brown to black glaze that is of a higher quality than the Cistercian wares which preceded them (Brears 1971a, 37). Blackwares were produced across the country including Hanley and Burslem, Staffordshire (Barker 1986b, 60) and many of the forms and fabrics at Sandal and Pontefract were replicated by examples recovered from the nearby kilns at Wrenthorpe (Moorhouse and Roberts 2002). Drinking vessels predominate and are characterised by straight-sided, flaring vessels as well as vessels with slightly rounded sides (Barker 1986b, 58), although other forms such as fine handled jars and jugs are also represented.

As blackwares are essentially developed Cistercian wares (Boyle 2006, 9) there is difficulty in assigning some sherds to either category. Where there was doubt over the identification sherds were assigned as Cistercian or blackwares (**Cw/Bw**). Costrels in particular are difficult to categorise due to their similarity in fabric and form (Cumberpatch 2002, 186; Moorhouse and Slowikowski 1992, 95).

5.3.6.1.3 Transitional Cistercian/blackware (Trans Cw/Bw)

A number of drinking vessels from both Sandal and Pontefract had characteristics which could be identified as transitional between Cistercian ware and black wares. Such features included vessels which had a metallic glaze, were poorly fired or had a distinctive upright form (e.g. PONT*1*). These wares are found on production sites dating from the end of the 16th to the early 17th century and thus would have been archaic by the beginning of the Civil War.

5.3.6.1.4 Yellow ware (Yw)

Yellow wares were introduced alongside Cistercian wares and continued to be produced throughout the 17th century. They consist of a pale, fine fabric usually, but not universally, covered with a white or pale slip and a clear glaze (Brears 1971a, 32). Early forms coinciding with Cistercian ware are thought to be distinguished from later forms by a lack of slip (Moorhouse and Slowikowski 1992, 95; Cumberpatch 1996, 63). However, early and late yellow wares are difficult to distinguish due to a significant

overlap between wares and, with the exception of occasional forms such as salts found at Sandal castle, most vessels were produced throughout both centuries. As a result yellow wares were treated as a single entity in this study. Main forms include small storage vessels, fine handled jars and bowl/pancheons.

5.3.6.1.5 Brown-glazed coarseware (BGCw)

Also referred to as BERTH (brown glazed earthenware, see Young and Vince 2005, 231-2), brown-glazed coarseware was produced alongside blackwares and were widely produced from the late 16th century onwards (Cumberpatch 1996, 64). Coarsewares are usually demarcated by an oxidised red-orange fabric with moderate inclusions, although as the fabric is essentially a blackware clay with a greater amount of temper there is some overlap in ware types. The glaze is often a mid to dark brown and the forms produced are generally larger than blackwares, including jugs, bowl/puncheons and heavy duty storage vessels.

5.3.6.1.6 Redware and slipware (Rw, Slip)

Redwares are distinguished by an oxidised red fabric with a clear glaze (Cumberpatch 2003). Some vessels are also decorated with a yellow slip, in which case they are referred to as slipwares **(Slip)**. Slipware originated in North Europe from where it was imported until the late 16th century, when it began to be produced at sites across England, including South Yorkshire (Barker 1993, 8; Crossley 1990, 251; Cumberpatch 1996, 65). Other common types of slipware include Metropolitan slipware, produced in Essex (Davey and Walker 2009) and Staffordshire slipware which began to be produced in Burslem and Hanley during the 1640s (Barker 1993, 11, 14). Although visually similar, recent studies have demonstrated it is possible to separate slipwares on the basis of both petrographic and chemical study (White 2012). Common forms include bowl/pancheons, dishes and plates.

5.3.6.1.7 Tin-glazed earthenwares (TGE)

Tin-glazed earthenware, characterised by a pale or white body with a thick white glaze, was produced in England from the end of the 16th century, although many vessels were imported from the Netherlands (Gaimster 1994, 296). The study of tin glazes is highly specialised (Watkins 1987, 124; Cumberpatch 2002, 193), and as it is highly unlikely

consumers would have differentiated between the majority of English and Dutch earthenwares their origin is of little relevance to this study. Some Mediterranean tin-glazed wares, such as Spanish lustreware and maiolica, can be differentiated more easily, but these fabrics were not present at the selected sites.

5.3.6.1.8 Rhenish stoneware

From the late medieval period, stoneware imports from the Rhine valley are a noticeable feature of many ports and further inland, although they are absent from both Eccleshall and Sandal. The most common fabric at mid-17th-century sites is Frechen, characterised by a hard, grey purple fabric with a mottled brown salt glaze. This is often present in the form of Baartman flasks, distinguished by bearded face masks applied to the neck and a decorative roundel on the belly (Gaimster 1997, 94). The bulbous shape of these and other Dutch vessels, including Malling jugs, is mirrored by English vessels such as the manganese mottled vessels found at both Sandal and Pontefract (SAND151 and PONT*1480, 1481* and *1482*). A fragment of Westerwald from Pontefract is unusual, as this fabric was a recent introduction during the mid-17th century and is absent from other Civil War sites such as Basing House (Gaimster 1997, 94).

5.3.7 Glaze colour and glossiness

Previous studies have noted the importance of colour in social interactions with pottery, particularly in the post-medieval period (Cumberpatch 1997, 126-128: 2002, 222; Yentsch 1991). Therefore, the colour of vessels was recorded in numerical form to allow for variance in colour, for example light brown as opposed to dark brown (see table 5.5). The level of inclusions within the glaze, such as yellow speckles, were also noted on a scale ranging from 0 (no inclusions) to 3 (high density of inclusions) (see table 5.6). In addition, the glaze finish is sometimes important in distinguishing between different fabric types, in particular Cistercian ware and blackware, the former often being over-fired which results in a metallic finish (Boyle 2006, 3). As a result the glossiness of the glaze was recorded on a scale ranging from 0 (completely glossy) to 4 (completely metallic) (see table 5.7). Further descriptions for each vessel provided extra details on vessels where required.

5.3.8 Number of handles

Multi-handled vessels have been suggested to be of social importance in communal drinking as they facilitate the easy passage of a vessel around a group, although due to the size of vessels this may have been more symbolic than functional (Barker *pers. comm*. in Cumberpatch 2003, 4; Boyle 2006, 233). As result, if handles were present, either in their entirety or as handle stumps, these were noted along with how many may have been present when the vessel was complete, although an exact count was not always possible. In addition the form of the handle, usually a rod in the case of drinking vessels or a strap in the case of large heavy duty storage vessels, was noted along with any distinguishing features. This included the "Wrenthorpe mark", a triple finger impression made at the base of a significant number of sherds and identified with a production site at nearby Wrenthorpe (Brears 1971b, 20-22; Moorhouse and Slowikowski 1992, 97). This mark was evident on yellow wares, blackwares and transitional Cistercian/blackwares.

5.3.9 Percentage of vessel present

As the assemblages were largely homogenous, originated from predominantly primary deposits, and were subject to extensive cross-matching, it was possible to gauge the approximate percentage of the vessels represented. An estimation of the completeness of the three main elements of the pot, namely the rim, base and body, was recorded using a separate percentage for each element. A rim chart was used to obtain the proportions of the rim and base present with an approximation given for the proportion of body sherds.

As stated above (see 5.3.1), a vessel may have been identified through similarity of sherds rather than physical joins. Where this was the case sherds were added together to achieve a single percentage for the vessel; for example two non-joining sherds representing 17% and 34% of a vessel respectively would form 51% of the entire vessel.

5.3.10 Sooting

Sooting is a useful indication of a vessel being heated over a fire for purposes including (but not confined to) cooking, although it has been suggested that, as opposed to soot, the blackened residue on vessels instead represents the leaching of food residue due to

repeated exposure to heat (J. Hudson *pers. comm.*). However, it is often under-represented in archaeological assemblages due to post-excavation processes such as washing (Moorhouse 1983b, 108; Orton *et al.* 1993, 222). Any evidence of sooting, food residue and other evidence of heat exposure was noted for all vessels. Where sooting was in unusual places such as on the breaks of sherds this was noted as although this may be related to post-depositional practices or exposure to fire during the slighting of the castle, and medieval recipes sometimes required sherds for the mixing and heating of compounds (Moorhouse 1978, 12).

5.3.11 Production notes

The production of 17th-century pottery has been discussed elsewhere (e.g. Brears 1971a) and identification of manufacturing techniques is not of primary importance to this study. However, a number of vessels had manufacturing defects which could have influenced social discourse, including stacking marks from placement within the kiln, distorted handles and overfired vessels (e.g. PONT*698*, SAND*1084*, and SAND1065). Therefore, all distinctive marks resulting from methods of production were noted.

5.3.12 Decoration

Decoration in this context refers to the application of other decorative motifs in addition to the primary glaze, although the glaze of a vessel can also be considered as decoration as it alters the physical properties of fired pottery to accommodate social values (e.g. Yentsch 1991, 193-5). It is also an obvious method of individualising vessels as well as conveying specific social messages (e.g. Goldthwaite 1989). Decorative methods included applying clay to a vessel in the case of Cistercian ware (e.g. ECC*192*), applying a different coloured slip to slipware vessels (e.g. PONT*788*) or painting on a vessel in the case of porcelain and tin-glazed ware (e.g. ECC*201*). All decoration, including incised lines, slipped decoration and painting was recorded and selected for photography and illustration where appropriate.

5.3.13 Photography and illustration

Vessels noted for their largely complete profile or particular features such as decoration were recorded through photography and illustration, with some vessels selected for illustration or photographic record only. All illustrations were originally made at 1:1

scale and, unless otherwise stated, reduced to 1:2 for inclusion within volume two the thesis. All illustrated vessels discussed within the text are italicised for identification.

5.4 Additional analysis of ceramic material

Having recorded the details of every sherd from each site further analysis was required to profile the ceramic assemblage, including cross-matching sherds, fragmentation analysis and the analysis of vessels by form.

5.4.1 Cross-matching sherds

Ideally all sherds with the same fabric should be cross-matched to ensure that an exact number of vessels can be attained. All three assemblages had already been checked for joining sherds during the original post-excavation process and these were rechecked during analysis. Every sherd from Eccleshall castle was checked due to the size of the assemblage but at Sandal and Pontefract due to time constraints only partial checking was conducted concentrating primarily on blackwares and imported wares, with the addition of small storage vessels at Sandal. Matching sherds were combined within the same vessel number. Very few additional matches were found, indicating that the initial checking was extremely thorough and a more comprehensive survey is unlikely to have identified many more matches.

In addition to ensuring an accurate vessel count, the distribution of pottery across the site has been described as providing 'a unique source of information for interpreting stratigraphy, relationships and the uses of areas or buildings' (Moorhouse and Slowikowski 1987, 161; see also Moorhouse 1986, 86). Contexts with multiple cross-matching sherds indicate deposits with a more homogenous origin than those with few or no cross-matching sherds, where the origin for each deposit is likely to be separate. Several methods have been suggested for representing cross-context joins (e.g. Brown 1985; Young 2008, 33), but a plotted distribution of sherds facilitates the easy identification of areas with large numbers of cross-joins, although it does not convey the exact number of sherds joining from each context. Due to the lack of contextual information at Eccleshall and Sandal this was restricted to a distribution in plan only. At Pontefract a plan of distribution was not necessary as only one vessel joined across the site, but the depth of deposits within the Constable Tower facilitated a distribution in

section. The information gained by such plotting needs to be evaluated carefully; sherds joining from adjacent contexts for example may be a result of excavation strategy or taphonomic process rather than depositional practice (Davey 1988, 6).

The plotting of cross-matching sherds enabled the identification of separate zones of consumption at each site. As a result vessels could be analysed on the basis of areas in which related vessels were consumed rather than by context, feature or area of excavation, resulting in a more accurate understanding of consumption patterns across the site.

5.4.2 Fragmentation analysis

As this study requires an accurate representation of vessels consumed during the Civil War, residual material needed to be identified and discounted. Although a certain amount of contamination is to be expected due to taphonomic processes and conditions of excavation, such material is a useful measure of how pristine deposits are as secondary deposits are likely to have a high level of residuality and fragmentation.

Despite the fact that the majority of medieval vessels encountered in this study are probably residual, studies of other Civil War sites such as the well at St. Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln, have indicated that vessels produced decades before the Civil War, such as Cistercian ware, were consumed during the conflict (Young 2008, 30). Therefore, similar vessels at the sites selected needed to be identified for inclusion within the analysis, whilst residual material needed to be excluded. In addition, as with many archaeological contexts, a substantial quantity of material consisted of fragmented pottery which, if included, would overestimate the number of vessels found at the site. These two problems, although arising from different circumstances, were addressed using the same methodology.

The percentages of the separate elements (rim, body, base) of each vessel were totalled to give a vessel completeness index out of 300 (representing a vessel with a complete rim, body and base). This was then divided by three to ascertain the average completeness of a vessel. For example, a vessel with 10% of the body, 20% of the base but no rim would have an average completeness of 15% ((10+20+0)/3). As this figure is

gained from an estimate of how representative sherds are of the entire vessel, it should not be seen as an exact record of how complete a particular vessel is. It is also biased towards the rim and base of a vessel which are smaller than the body but have the same importance in calculating the fragmentation of a vessel. However, unlike other approaches such as *eve* this approach utilises body sherds and accepts the possibility that these might be the more complete part of a vessel. All non-contemporary vessels less than 5% complete were identified as residual and were excluded from further analysis. The majority of contemporary vessels less than 5% complete were also excluded from subsequent analyses of vessel numbers although some unusual vessels, such as porcelain vessel ECC*200*, were discussed elsewhere within the text.

5% may appear a relatively low percentage but this still represents a significant percentage of a particular element, for example 15% of a rim or base. Furthermore as no site, including Sandal, was subject to total excavation a large number of complete vessels were unlikely. Although the degree of fragmentation was analysed and discussed within the analysis, this threshold enabled the selection of an appropriate number of vessels at all sites without heavily overestimating the number of vessels present.

Analysis of non-residual and residual material during fragmentation analysis enabled an insight into how mixed the archaeological deposits were as well as the proximity of their deposits to their original source. This was particularly important as more fragmented deposits are likely to have originated from a diverse number of sources or sources which were further away, as fragmentation usually increases with distance from a particular source. As a result fragmentation analysis included the following criteria:

1. Total estimated number of vessels (ENV)
2. Total number of sherds
3. Total completeness of all vessels (%)
4. Average completeness of all vessels (= criteria 3/criteria 1)
5. Total non-residual ENV
6. Total completeness of all non-residual vessels
7. Average completeness of all non-residual vessels (=criteria 6/criteria 5)
8. Number of vessels at least 5% complete

9. Total completeness of all vessels at least 5% complete
10. Average completeness of vessels at least 5% complete (=criteria 9/criteria 8)
11. Percentage of vessels at least 5% complete. (=criteria 8/criteria 1 *100)
12. Percentage of non-residual vessels (=criteria 6/criteria 1 *100)
13. Percentage of non-residual vessels at least 5% complete (=criteria 8/criteria 5 *100)

5.4.3 Form analysis

In order to compare social discourse both within and between sites, the proportions of vessels within each zone of consumption were analysed using the sub-categories outlined above (see 5.3.5.1) and displayed visually through the use of pie charts. This is similar to approaches used for medieval ceramic assemblages from Southampton (Brown 2002, 155), although to gain a more accurate understanding of each assemblage only non-residual vessels at least 5% complete were analysed.

5.5 Customised analysis

The differing excavation and post-excavation procedures conducted at each site meant that although a universal approach was applied, it had to be partially customised to the particular requirements of each castle as outlined below.

5.5.1 Pontefract Castle

Some of the pottery excavated from context [99], part of the Constable Tower, was unavailable for analysis. This included seven vessels noted to have complete profiles which would probably have been viable for use analysis (Cumberpatch unpublished). However, due to the difficulties in identifying all suitable vessels from vessel weight and ENV counts, all unseen vessels were omitted from this study.

5.5.2 Sandal Castle

A small number of near-complete items were on display at local museums and as a result could only be inspected visually. These were included in form analyses but some details such as weight and, occasionally, location could not be recorded.

5.6 Glass vessels

The glass assemblages from all three sites were visually checked and compared with the original report with some re-identification of vessels. Forms were identified on the basis of the established typology for early post-medieval glass (Willmott 2002). Due to the fragile nature of glass and difficulties in its preservation vessels are usually highly fragmented, with vessels at both Sandal and Pontefract being less than 5% complete. At Eccleshall however, many vessels were substantially more complete, with extensive efforts made to join fragments (Sheale 1993, 20). Due to the size of the assemblage, although the identification of vessels was checked no further efforts were made to join fragments.

The quantification of glass vessels is difficult due to their fragmented state, so a minimum vessel count was established using the number of separate identifiable elements such as rims and bases. The composition of the small assemblages at Pontefract and Sandal could be analysed through description but at Eccleshall ceramic sub-categories of form were applied (see table 5.8). Urinals and distillation equipment were added to these sub-categories to include forms such as alembics, cucurbits and urinals which do not feature in the ceramic assemblages.

5.7 Additional excavated material

As pottery and glass are rarely used in isolation, in order to understand the role material culture played in consumption practices during the siege it is necessary to combine ceramic analysis with other archaeological material, including metals and faunal evidence. There was no botanical material recovered from any of the sites, although studies from other castles such as Dudley (Moffett 1992) demonstrate their significance during this period.

5.7.1 Additional material culture

Other artefacts associated with the consumption of food and drinks were compared with the ceramic material using the original excavation reports. The full list of materials, which appears in table 5.9, mainly consisted of metal, wooden and worked bone implements such as cauldrons, bowls and knives.

5.7.2 Ecological evidence

As the consumption of foodstuffs is as important as the vessels with which they are consumed, where possible the published faunal reports were incorporated into the analyses. Due to the nature of these reports this was only fully applicable to Pontefract and, despite the presence of a bone report, analysis was impossible at Eccleshall due to the unstratified nature of the deposit, (Eccleshall Archive unpublished). The bone report for Sandal was used with caution as it restricted itself to analysis and discussion of material by phase, which is problematic (see below, 7.7).

5.8 Use of written sources

In addition to archaeological sources, other forms of evidence were applied to the analysed material to help contextualise the archaeological data. This was particularly comprehensive at Pontefract, where a diary of the first and second sieges written by Nathan Drake and an account of the third siege by Thomas Paulden reveal personal details about the social discourse at the site (Walker 1997; Paulden 1702). At other sites newssheets such as *Mercurius Aulicus* and *Mercurius Britannicus* were used for contemporary information about the sieges, although account was taken of the difficulties in using material which was essentially propaganda for the relevant sides.

5.9 Inter-site comparisons

Having fully explored the social discourse of each site individually, the assemblages from all three sites were compared to other excavated sites with published reports. These included military sites such as Beeston Castle, Cheshire (Ellis 1993a), Dudley Castle, West Midlands (Ratkai 1985; Gaimster *et al*. 1996; Thomas 2005) and Basing House, Hampshire (Moorhouse 1970: 1971a; Allen and Anderson 1999) as well as non-military sites such as the well of St-Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln (Mann 2008). As part of this comparison other written sources concerning consumption patterns during this period were also employed, including domestic accounts from other garrisons such as Great Chalfield, Wiltshire (Pafford 1940).

Although this process identified broad social trends at each site, it also identified substantial differences demonstrating the need for a specific approach to each site.

Where such difference occurred, these were contextualised within the history of that particular site to elucidate why social discourse may have varied.

5.10 Conclusion

The study presented here is characterised by its holistic approach, concentrating not on one single element of material culture but instead on the entire assemblage relating to the consumption of food and drink. This requires an alternative approach to artefact study, placing less importance on the identification of fabrics and their provenance in favour of a social analysis of vessels situated within the temporal and spatial context in which they were used. Only when this is achieved is it possible to fully appreciate the significance material culture played in the complex social discourse of garrisons during the English Civil War.

6 Eccleshall

6.1 Introduction

The palace of the Bishops of Coventry and Lichfield, Eccleshall was, unlike most castles, an active elite residence at the outbreak of war. Located four miles north-west of Stafford (Grid reference SJ827295) the castle had originally been constructed by Bishop Muscamp (died 1208), although it was rebuilt by Bishop Langton in the early 14th century (Maddison 1993, 68). The bishop at the outbreak of war, Robert Wright, was present when the castle was fortified for the King, although after a brief siege it was surrendered to Parliament in September 1643. Slighted by Act of Parliament, the castle was eventually demolished in 1689 with only part of the North Wall and North-East Tower surviving above ground level. Excavations in the 1970s focussing on the North Wall and its two towers produced an extensive assemblage which raises important questions about the nature of deposition at the site.

It has been suggested that the deposits at Eccleshall relate to destruction during the siege rather than its aftermath (Sheale 1993, 101). However, the subsequent use of the castle as a garrison suggests this is not the case. The castle was still occasionally threatened by Royalists (Vicars 1646, 66) and the infilling of a defensive feature, however shallow, does not conform to its use as a military site. At other sites, most notably Great Chalfield, Wiltshire, the ditch was cleared during the garrisoning of the castle (Pafford 1940, 72) and despite being shallow it is likely such a process was undertaken at Eccleshall. Consequently, the clearance of the site almost certainly took place at some point between the end of the conflict and the demolition of the site around 1689. Viewing the assemblage at Eccleshall as an act of deliberate destruction rather than the collateral damage of warfare highlights the role of many clearance sites in marking a change in social discourse at the site.

6.2 Brief History of the Site

Robert Wright, Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield from 1632, had been an outspoken critic of Parliament before the outbreak of war, being imprisoned in the Tower of London for eighteen weeks in 1641 after protesting against Parliamentary procedure

(Stone 1870, 26). He was also a prominent anti-Puritan, playing a role in the publication of a book in 1634 by Peter Studley in which two murders in Clun, Shropshire were blamed on the murderer's Puritan beliefs (Coulton 2003, 38). Noted for his dedication to enriching himself rather than the diocese within his care, he had been subject to complaints about his activities at Eccleshall**,** including the deforestation of the local woods (Laud *et al.* 1853, 346). Despite returning to Eccleshall after his imprisonment it was not his favoured residence, a note by Archbishop Laud in 1639 stating 'that he cannot have his health at Eccleshall, and hath therefore since resided in his palace at Lichfield' (Laud *et al*. 1853, 364; Cope 1990, 3). Nevertheless, he was resident at Eccleshall at the commencement of the Parliamentarian siege.

Given the bishop's religious stance it is unsurprising that Eccleshall was fortified for the king, although a letter dated 25th February 1643 stating Charles I 'hath written to the Bishop of Lichfield to give way that a garrison may be kept at Ecclesall [sic] Castle for the security of those parts' indicates the fortification was at the king's request (Bickley 1930, 94). A certain Captain Bird was placed in charge of the garrison (Wood 1692, 655) and the castle, as with other garrisons such as Beeston, was used as a secure storage place with 'many of the chiefest papists and great malignants in those parts having brought their Money, Plate and Goods thither, thinking to secure them there from the Parliaments Forces' (Bates 1643). One such malignant may have been Lady Gerrard of Gerrards Bromley whose goods were restored to her after the siege at the bequest of the Parliamentarian Committee at Stafford (Pemberton and Roots 1957, 76-77) although another, the Bishop's daughter, had her dowry seized despite being supposedly innocent of Royalist sympathies (HMC 4th report 1874, 266). As the assemblage at Eccleshall reflects not just a constant and largely unthreatened garrison but also a store for the gentry's wealth, the material deposited there has a greater complexity than those of Pontefract and Sandal, whose assemblages almost totally related to a siege garrison.

After the fall of Stafford Castle in June 1643 Eccleshall was besieged by Sir William Brereton during July or August, a newssheet of 8th September suggesting the siege lasted ten weeks (Alsop 1643). Throughout the siege the town of Eccleshall was occupied by Parliamentarian troops, although all outbuildings had been burnt by

Captain Bird to prevent their use by the enemy (Sanderson 1658, 658). Royalist reports suggest that those besieged were predominantly:

'Ladies and Gentlewomen of the County, who purposely came thither to secure themselves in these times of danger. And that they are so gallantly resolved upon it, that though their victuals doe begin to faile already, they meane to stand upon their guard and defend the place (in hope His Majestie will relieve them e're it come to that) as long as they have horse flesh, water, and old leather left to preserve nature. Which as it shewes the bravery, and courage of those noble Ladies, so is it an infallible argument of the incivility and rudenesse of those barbarcus Rebels (who regard neither sex nor quality of persons) from whom the best that can be looked for, is more unsufferable then the miseries of warre and famine.'

(Heylyn 1643a)

Reportedly two 24 pound cannon were employed to besiege the castle but after a week of bombardment, and despite the collapse one of the castle's turrets, the lack of a serviceable breach caused the besiegers to surround the castle and starve the occupants into surrender (Sanderson 1658, 658). The siege was raised and the castle's stores replenished in early September by Royalist troops belonging to Lord Capel and commanded by Colonel Hastings (Heylyn 1643b]) but the relief was temporary as the castle surrendered two days later. This was reportedly due to the treachery of the new commander, the Danish Captain Eball, who 'negotiated with the Rebels...and for *200l* no more (for at so meane a price did he set his honour) gave it up unto them, to the great disshonour of his nation, and the extreame griefe of the Gentleman [Colonel Hastings], whose confidence he had abused in so base a manner' (Heylyn 1643c). An alternative account suggests it was another member of the garrison, disaffected with the new foreign governor, who informed the Parliamentarians of a weakness in the castle defences which forced a surrender after a renewed bombardment but Captain Eball[8], was subsequently put on trial and imprisoned by the Royalists for his perceived treachery (Sanderson 1658, 659; Bickley 1930, 105; Ellis and Atherton 2009, 235, 244). At some point during the siege Bishop Wright died within the castle walls and was

[8] Also written as 'Captain Abel a Dane' (Sanderson 1658, 659)

possibly buried at the local church (Ingler 1643; Stone 1870, 26)**.** The cause of his death is unknown, but as he was aged around 84 it is likely to have been natural causes.

An account of the siege is given by Bishop Wright's widow Bridget, who petitioned the House of Lords on July 1660 to recover some of her belongings. Her account reads as follows:

'in 1643 his late Majesty sent Captain Thomas Bird to make a garrison of Eccleshall Castle, then the habitation of petitioner and her husband, the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield; they were besieged about ten weeks; while helping in the works of the castle petitioner received a wound by a shot in the shoulder, of which she lay sick and weak for six months; her husband died and lay for five weeks unburied; the Queen hearing of their distressed condition sent Lord Lowthberrye with forces to relieve them, and petitioner being wounded then went out of the castle, leaving her servants with Lord Lowthberrye's soldiers to keep it; they were afterwards obliged to deliver it up upon conditions to Sir William Brereton, one of the conditions being that petitioner should have all the goods, plate, jewels, and money belonging to her, contrary to which Sir William Brereton has converted them to his own use and refuses to give them up, amounting as they do to the value of 5,000l.; petitioner has lain five years in prison for debts contracted by her husband in the time of the late wars, and is in a most necessitous condition. She prays that Sir William Brereton may be ordered to make her satisfaction for her goods, plate, jewels, and money, which would both maintain her and satisfy her creditors, and that this her right against him may be excepted in the Act of general pardon.'

(HMC 7th Report, 121)

In addition to the county's valuables, the Parliamentarian troops also took control of forty barrels of beer and a trunk of plate, which was subsequently employed by the military (Pemberton and Roots 1957, lxiv). Despite being threatened briefly by Royalist troops from nearby garrisons at Linshall and Tong Castle (Vicars 1646, 66), the castle was subsequently held for Parliament for the duration of the war. The castle was used to house prisoners, a parallel with its use during the medieval period when it was regularly employed for this purpose (Sheale 1993, 9, see below 6.7).

The garrison at Eccleshall was comparatively small when compared to the 80 men present at the surrender of Sandal Castle or the hundreds of men present at Pontefract at any given time (see 2.8.2 for Sandal and 8.2.1 for Pontefract). References to the garrison in Brereton's letterbooks suggests a permanent garrison of fourteen men on 7th March 1646, although other men and horse paid out of the allowance for the castle were possibly engaged in duties elsewhere (Carr and Atherton 2007, 71). This reflects the comparative safety of the castle in 1646 as it was situated in an area almost totally under Parliamentarian control with the nearest Royalist garrisons, at Lichfield and Tutbury Castle, being under siege.

The slighting ordered by parliament in 1647 was not as drastic as that of other buildings, such as Pontefract, but led to the castle being largely uninhabited. A drawing of the East Wing at Eccleshall dated 1687 (MS. Tanner 217, fol. 45) shows a section including the North-East Tower standing but in ruins. It was demolished in the late 17th century, a document dated 1689 referring to the cost of 'pulling downe of ye Great Tower ye stands in ye middle of ye Court of ye Castle and make good ye repairs' at a cost of £120[9].

6.2.1 Excavations

The excavations of the castle were conducted by Stafford and mid-Staffordshire Archaeology Society between 1973 and 1975 and directed by Jack Fisher. The investigations focussed on the North Wall of the castle including the moat, the North-East Tower and the North-West Tower, with each trench assigned a separate code (Fisher 1993; see fig. 6.1). The base of the North-West Tower was excavated by Keele University Summer School under the directorship of Dr. Francis Celoria. The principal material groups within the archive are pottery, glass, bone and tobacco pipe although limited amounts of metalwork were also recovered. With the exception of the glass (Sheale 1993), the results of the excavation were not disseminated outside the unpublished archive, although some notes on aspects of the excavations and the resultant finds are stored at the Potteries Museum, Stoke-on-Trent.

[9] A copy of the document is included within the Eccleshall excavation archive.

6.3 The pottery

In total 1,151 sherds of pottery were analysed, representing an estimated 370 vessels and with a combined weight of 421.51kg. 212 vessels (57.30% of all vessels) are not residual or intrusive and these are on average 11.81% complete. 67 vessels (29.11% of all vessels) are at least 5% complete, being 36.89% complete on average (see table 6.1). The relatively high number of residual vessels when compared to other sites such as Sandal can be attributed to the lack of stratigraphy within the moat as, although it was probably cleared prior to the 1643 siege, some residual material is likely to have remained. This is supported by the majority of residual vessels being represented by single sherds, many of which were abraded. Significantly, despite the partial excavations, non-residual vessels were more complete at Eccleshall than Sandal and Pontefract, suggesting a localised pattern of deposition and a relative lack of post-depositional disturbance, although cross-matching sherds do indicate some variation within this practice (see below, 7.4 for Sandal and 8.4.1 for Pontefract). Although an estimated 66 vessels are intrusive these are mostly garden furniture such as flower pots and reflect the use of the area as a garden after the construction of the new bishop's palace in the late 17th century.

6.3.1 Cross-matching sherds

Out of 213 non-residual vessels an estimated 37 have sherds deposited in several different trenches[10]. Joining sherds from adjacent areas are to be expected due to the arbitrary demarcation of trenches but five vessels join across areas. Four vessels (ECC9, *57*, 203 and 207) join between the North-East Tower and the North Wall and one (ECC91) joins between the North-West Tower and the North Wall. In addition, ten non-residual vessels from trench B joined with sherds from trenches on the opposite side of the North-East Tower (ECC*8*, *14*, 23, 48, *57*, 91, 115, 132, 144, and *195*). This distribution suggests that some vessels were broken prior to disposal from the Tower, a pattern mirrored by medieval ceramics at Sandal (Moorhouse 1983a, 172, fig. 64). No vessels join between trenches J and K, although the distribution of glass vessels within

[10] This figure excludes sherds which were from a bag number linked to multiple areas, for example C/F.

the area suggests an identical origin for the deposits in these two areas (see below, 6.4.2).

Significantly, only two vessels with sherds joining between areas (ECC*57* and 91) were at least 5% complete. The other three (ECC9, 203, 207) were unidentified body sherds, demonstrating the thoroughness of the post-excavation process and highlighting the confined disposal of vessels at the castle. Therefore, analysis of vessels suggests that the vessels deposited in each area closely relate to the consumption practices from separate areas within the castle.

6.3.2 Distribution of vessels

An estimated 183 vessels were recovered from the North-East Tower and the North Wall; the two areas which were the focus of the excavation (see fig. 6.2). This figure is considerably less around the North-West Tower (32 ENV), reflecting the smaller scale of excavations there. 33 vessels deposited along the North Wall are at least 5% complete, compared to 23 vessels around the North-East Tower (see fig. 6.3). This may reflect different disposal strategies, with vessels deposited from the tower being more diffuse, and thus less complete, than those deposited over the wall and this is supported by the number of vessels joining around the base of the tower (6.3.1). Given the concentration of glass vessels within trench J (see below, 6.4.2) the relative paucity of ceramic vessels in this area is surprising, with just nine vessels at least 5% complete. However, the deposits from the North-East Tower have a bias of ceramic over glass vessels, suggesting preferential use of different material in different areas of the castle. This will be discussed in greater detail with reference to the glass assemblage (see below, 6.4.2).

6.3.3 Vessel analysis by form

Analysis of all vessels at least 5% complete demonstrate that drinking vessels form only 11% of the assemblage, six vessels in total, a phenomenon in sharp contrast with Sandal and Pontefract (see fig. 6.4). Food preparation and liquid transportation vessels dominate, comprising of 25% and 30% of the total assemblage respectively (fourteen and seventeen vessels). The lack of drinking vessels is indicative of the importance

glass vessels played within the castle, a phenomenon discussed in greater detail below (see below, 6.4).

The North-West Tower produced only one identified vessel at least 5% complete, a fine storage vessel, and therefore cannot be analysed. A food preparation vessel from the North-East Tower and North Wall and a large storage vessel from the North-West Tower and North Wall were also excluded from further analysis as these joined between separate areas. An examination of the remaining assemblages, from the North-East Tower and North Wall, revealed significant differences that merit further examination.

6.3.3.1 The North Wall

The assemblage from the North Wall (see fig. 6.5) contains 30 identified vessels which form eleven categories of vessel including a candlestick, lid, fuming pot and a perforated cover which may be the lid of a leech jar or fuming pot/heating stand (ECC*4*, *188*, *195* and *197*). The assemblage also has a higher proportion of drinking and cooking vessels than the rest of the castle (four vessels from each category representing 13% of the total assemblage respectively), and two fine storage vessels, a form which is only represented elsewhere by a single vessel (ECC43) from the North-West Tower. There are no food serving vessels, despite their presence in the assemblage from the North-East Tower (see below, 6.3.3.2).

Due to the proliferation of other forms, liquid transportation vessels form a smaller percentage of the assemblage than in the North-East Tower (26% compared to 41%) despite both areas having a comparable number of vessels (eight vessels compared to nine vessels from the North-East Tower). With the exception of one bottle/flask (ECC215) all the liquid transportation vessels are jugs, unlike Sandal where personal vessels such as costrels were dominant (see 8.4.7.1 for a comparison between Sandal and Pontefract, which also has a high number of jugs). The lack of personal vessels highlights the importance of communal consumption at the site, although as many of the jugs pre-date the 17th century they also indicate the role out-dated material played in social discourse. The North Wall produced a similar number of food preparation vessels as the North-East Tower, six compared to seven, but due to the greater number of other vessel types they form 19% of the assemblage as opposed to 32% of the assemblage

from the North-East tower. Only two heavy duty storage vessels (7% of the assemblage) are present which, along with the paucity of storage vessels from the rest of the excavation, suggests that the area of the castle responsible for the North Wall deposits was not associated with the longer term containment of foodstuffs.

6.3.3.2 The North-East Tower

The assemblage from the North-East Tower consists of 20 identifiable vessels (see fig. 6.6). In contrast to the North Wall it contains a restricted variety of forms with two categories being dominant: liquid transportation (nine vessels representing 45% of the assemblage) and food preparation (five vessels representing 25%). As with the North Wall all the liquid transportation vessels from this area are jugs. However, the restricted vessel forms from this area combined with the relative paucity of glass vessels (see below, 6.4.2) suggests a more restricted social discourse than the assemblage from the North Wall and may suggest the area was primarily used for the preparation of food rather than its consumption. Given the number of jugs and the large size of the pancheons, many of which are over 350mm in diameter (several are over 450mm, including ECC*8* and 13), the food prepared within this area was probably intended for communal consumption, although the relative lack of finewares including glass suggests this may have been consumption amongst the lesser ranks rather than the resident elite.

Four categories: drinking vessels, large storage jars, small storage vessels and cooking vessels, are represented by a single vessel each (5% of the total assemblage), whilst food serving vessels are represented by two Chinese Ming porcelain dishes (10% of the total assemblage). One other porcelain bowl (ECC*200*), recovered from the North Wall, was less than 5% complete but indicates that serving vessels were not confined to the North-East Tower alone despite their absence within the North Wall analysis.

6.3.4 Sooted vessels

Eleven vessels at least 5% complete have evidence of sooting[11] (see table 6.2): five cooking vessels (ECC*3*, *14*, 126, *180* and *186*), three jugs (ECC88, 92 and *185*), one pancheon (ECC116), one lid (ECC*4*) and a fuming pot (ECC*195*). The possible leech or fuming pot lid (ECC*197*) may have also been subject to some heat, as the exterior glaze is crazed and discoloured whilst there is slight discolouration on its interior. The pancheon (EC116) is sooted on the broken edges of its interior, suggesting it was burnt after use. As a result only jugs, cooking vessels and vessels associated with heating have definite evidence of sooting. The three jugs which are sooted suggest the heating of liquids for group consumption, a practice which may have had some longevity given the heavy sooting on one jug in particular, ECC88, which dated to the 13th/14th century. This is supported by the lack of sooting on smaller artefacts such as drinking vessels, a phenomenon in sharp contrast to the assemblages from the other two castles (see 7.4.4 for Sandal and 8.4.3 for Pontefract).

The medieval date of ECC88 is shared by a number of other sooted vessels as only three are of 17th century date; a brown glazed coarseware cooking vessel (ECC*186*), a lid (ECC*4*) and fuming pot (ECC*195*). The remaining vessels all date from the medieval period to the first half of the 16th century including two archaic vessels which have particularly heavy deposits: a 15th-century dripping pan (ECC*3*) and a late 15th/early 16th-century Dutch tripod cooking pot (ECC*180*). The dripping pan also has a thick deposit of food residue compatible with its primary function as a receptacle for the juices of roasting meat (MPRG 1998, 5.3.6). As all these vessels were over a century old at the time of deposition the longevity of use may explain the depth of sooting on these vessels, although they also highlight the use-life of such vessels extended into the 17th century despite forms such as the dripping pan no longer being produced.

The restricted range of sooted vessels indicates that Eccleshall was better equipped than Sandal as the garrison was not forced to improvise with cooking vessels, unlike the

[11] A further four ENV (ECC42 and 93) had evidence of sooting but as these were only small fragments were not included in detailed analysis. Pancheon ECC6 had slight sooting but as less than 5% of the vessel was present this vessel was also excluded.

other castle. This may be due to the nature of Eccleshall as an active elite residence which catered for mass consumption in the decades preceding the Civil War, unlike Sandal which was largely unoccupied. The wealth of the castle may also explain the paucity of 17th-century sooted vessels due to a preference for metal cooking vessels during this period which facilitated catering for large groups. As these rarely enter the archaeological record, the resultant assemblage suggests a lack of contemporary material rather than a preference for vessels which were both larger and, financially, more valuable.

Seven of the sooted vessels were recovered from the North Wall, six from the North-East Tower, one from the North-West Tower and another was a vessel with sherds joining between the North-East Tower and North Wall. All the sooted jugs originated from the North-East Tower whereas four of the five cooking vessels were recovered from the North Wall. The difference in sooting patterns alongside the difference in assemblage compositions between these two areas (see above, 6.3.3) suggests separate areas of social discourse within the site.

6.3.5 Local fabrics

Of 62 vessels at least 5% complete, 57 are manufactured from fabrics which are of probable midlands origin. Unlike Wrenthorpe vessels (see above, 3.5.1), there are no distinctive markings to identify local wares but many almost certainly originated from local potteries such as Penkhull, Tunstall and Burslem, whilst further afield Ticknall in Staffordshire had been a major producer of pottery since the medieval period (Spavold and Brown, 2005, 85).

The lack of drinking vessels and small or fine storage vessels is reflected in the paucity of local finewares which only represent ten out of the 57 vessels (17.54%). These consist of six Cistercian and blackware vessels (four drinking vessels, one fine handled jar and a candlestick) and three yellow ware vessels (one small storage vessel, one small drug jar and a possible leech jar lid). This contrasts strongly with other assemblages such as Sandal, Pontefract and Beeston where finewares, particularly drinking vessels, dominate (see 7.4.3 for Sandal and 8.4.7 for Pontefract. For Beeston see Noake 1993, 191). Instead, coarsewares dominate the assemblage with seventeen brown-glazed

coarseware vessels consisting of eleven food preparation vessels, two fine storage vessels, one cooking vessel and three unidentified vessels. The coarseware fabrics are of particular interest as they are all either of medieval date or have strong medieval precursors and thus merit further discussion (see below, 6.3.7).

6.3.6 Non-local vessels

Surprisingly, there was little or no Rhenish stoneware recoded at the site[12], despite being prominent at many other Civil War sites including Basing House (Moorhouse 1971a, 73-80), Montgomery (Knight 1982, 51-2) and Beeston (Noake 1993, 209). This is a phenomenon mirrored by the large assemblage from Dudley castle which, like Eccleshall, was a high-status residence prior to the conflict (Ratkai 2007, 110). However, the presence of Rhenish stoneware at other elite inland sites indicates that the status of this ceramic was complex and it cannot be automatically assumed that such vessels were objects for the 'middling sort' rather than the elite. Despite the lack of Rhenish stoneware there are nine non-local vessels, both from national and international sources (see also table 6.3):

- A Surrey/Hampshire borderware vessel (ECC*198*) retrieved from an unknown location. This is a double-handled necked cup manufactured within the Blackwater valley on the border of north-east Hampshire and west Surrey (Pearce 2007, 1, 68). Produced between 1480 and 1550, they have a wide distribution including Southampton, Monmouthshire, Nottingham and Reading (Pearce 2007, 71-2). Significantly a similar vessel was retrieved from the destruction deposits of Basing House and it has been suggested it was curated due to its high quality (Moorhouse 1970, 62; Pearce 2007, 72).

- Anglo-Dutch tin glazed earthenwares, all retrieved from the North Wall. One sherd (ECC70) is too fragmentary to identify but two other near complete vessels (ECC*193* and *194*) were also recovered, both of which originated from

[12] A single sherd of a Frechen flask was possibly recovered by the Keele Summer School (Wilcock unpublished.) and further sherds are mentioned within the site diary but these are absent from the site archive.

the Netherlands. ECC*193* is a drug jar manufactured in the Netherlands during the mid-late 16th century and ECC*194* is a Dutch drinking vessel dated 1632.

The profile of many Dutch drinking vessels, such as that exemplified by ECC*194*, is paralleled in some blackwares and the manganese mottled wares present at Sandal and Pontefract (see 7.4.5 and 8.4.5). Their presence emphasises the cosmopolitan nature of consumption during this period, other Dutch imports including beer which went rapidly from distrusted resource to national drink (McBride 2004, 183), although there were still social groups who identified it with a foreign identity (see above, 3.4.4). However, it should be noted that their adoption was not due to emulation, as demonstrated below.

- A Dutch redware tripod cooking pot (ECC*180*) recovered from the North Wall. One-handled cooking pots or *grape* were manufactured in smaller quantities than double-handled cooking pots or *grapen*; however, it was the latter which were more commonly imported into England (Baart 1994, 26) and appear at many port sites including Southampton (Brown 2002, 32-3), Norwich (Jennings 1981, 137-8) and Lincoln (Young and Vince 2005, 228-229). The example from Eccleshall dates from the late 15th to early 16th centuries (e.g. Baart 1994, 22, fig. 1; Hurst *et al.* 1986, 131, fig. 59.181).

- The rim of a Saintonge polychrome chafing dish (ECC*199*) retrieved from the North Wall. The realistic full-length female figure applied to the vessel suggests a date between 1550 and 1600 (Hurst 1974, 234). Unusually there is no evidence for vertical knobs or horizontal roundels above the figure, the vessel instead having a flattened, slightly clubbed, rim. Despite not being included in the form analysis, being less than 5% complete, the presence of another cooking vessel emphasises the number of cooking vessels from this location.

- One Chinese porcelain bowl (ECC*200*) retrieved from the North Wall and two saucer dishes (ECC*201, 202*) from the North-East Tower. A brief report included within the Eccleshall Castle archive includes at least two other teabowl sherds from trench C and an unknown location and two saucer sherds also from

trench C, but these are missing from the excavation archive (Eccleshall Archive unpublished.). All three vessels date from the latter phases of Ming dynasty, which ended in 1644. The bowl (ECC*200*) was probably produced in the first quarter of the 17th century during the Wanli period (1575-1620). Although extremely fragmentary, the zoomorphic motif on its exterior may be a phoenix, with similar designs appearing on dishes of this period (e.g. Harrison-Hall 2001, 273).

The two dishes, also dating from the Wanli period, are produced within the *Kraak* tradition. Deriving from the word *caracca*, a type of merchant ship used during the late 16th-early 17th centuries, these vessels were mass produced for exportation by the Dutch (Jörg 1997, 54). Both ECC*201* and *202* are typical examples of a Border VIII dish (Rinaldi 1989, 109), comprising of a central, multipointed medallion surrounded by a series of smaller roundels containing floral imagery (Vinhais and Walsh 2008, 108). The exterior, consisting of a series of roundels with five dots in the centre of each, is also typical. A similar example to those at Eccleshall has been more closely dated to 1600-1615 (Vinhais and Walsh 2008, 108).

Such vessels are extremely rare in the archaeological record and are absent from other elite sites both in Staffordshire, including Tutbury and Stafford (Barker 2011, 223-4; Ratkai 2007, 77-78), and further afield (for example Nonsuch Palace (Biddle 2005)). Only three sherds, from a bowl and a vase, or ewer, were recovered from the extensive excavations at Basing House (Moorhouse 1970, 82-3). Their rarity in the archaeological record may be slightly misleading as it is estimated a quarter of early/mid-17th-century Exeter inventories contain references to china ware and this is supported by thirteen vessels excavated from the city, representing 'the largest series of Ming porcelain identified in Britain' (Allan 1984, 105; Peck 2005, 50). Despite this, the vessels were still extremely desirable with metal often being used to embellish the items to enhance their social value; for example in December 1638 Brilliana Harley wrote to her son concerning 'two cruets of china, with silluer [silver] and gilt couers, and bars and feete' (Lewis 1854, 15). Such mountings usually bear English rather than

> continental markings, indicating their importance in drinking rituals particular to this country (Lunsingh Scheurleer 1974, 51).

The range of imported pottery at Eccleshall is remarkable and indicates the cosmopolitan nature of social discourse at the castle, a feature of elite households who could afford to indulge in goods imported from the Continent and further afield (Peck 2005, 18). As other Civil War storage sites such as Beeston do not have the same range of material (Noake 1993) the range of pottery retrieved from the castle can be attributed to its status as an active elite residence during the early 17th century. In addition, the range of imports reflects the cosmopolitan nature of warfare during the period, with officers and infantry from many different countries, and the Low Countries in particular, participating in the conflict. Danish Captain Eball, who surrendered the castle, was not alone, at least 105 foreign officers served in the Parliamentarian and Royalist armies (Stoyle 2005, 97), including the Royalist 'Dutchman' responsible for the great gun at Pontefract (Walker 1997, 44) and the German John Rosworm who was responsible for the Parliamentarian defences at Manchester (Stoyle 2005, 93). Although the total number of foreign soldiers within the two armies may never have numbered more than around two thousand (Stoyle 2005, 97), their presence was noteworthy. Despite the emphasis on local defenders at Sandal and Pontefract (see 7.4.5 for Sandal and 8.4.5 at Pontefract), at other sites the heterogeneity of the inhabitants was of greater importance. This is particularly notable at Eccleshall, a house fortified by a much-absent bishop, commanded by a Dane and occupied by a Cheshire knight. Therefore, the material culture consumed within the castle was as cosmopolitan, and in some cases as exotic, as its inhabitants.

Despite being only a small part of the overall assemblage, the use of imported vessels in several areas of discourse, including drinking and the presentation of small amounts of foodstuffs, is significant. The group of porcelain vessels are particularly important as these were associated with an aspirational style of living (Peck 2005, 50). When combined with an analysis of the glass vessels from the site they indicate clearly the high status of the site prior to the conflict.

6.3.7 Out-dated vessels

There is some difficulty in identifying vessels which were definitely out-dated by the 17th century as medieval traditions were continued within new fashions. This is demonstrated by vessel ECC*11*, a medium-sized storage jar whose fabric and glaze are unquestionably of post-medieval origin. However, its form is typically medieval, the rim being everted and bevelled with a slight external thickening. This piece demonstrates the complexities of medieval influences within pottery manufacture from this area and a continuation of tradition from the medieval period well into the 16th and 17th centuries means there is some difficulty in separating medieval and post-medieval vessels (Barker 2011, 210, 223).

Despite this, half of all vessels at least 5% complete (32 out of 64 vessels) were manufactured from fabrics pre-dating 17th century (see table 6.4). Many of these vessels are of fabrics which are unquestionably medieval in date and emphasise the use of antiquated vessels at this site. They include:

- Two Midlands purple jugs (ECC173 and *183*) that have their roots in the 14th-15th centuries and were produced alongside Cistercian wares during the 16th century. Despite being no longer being produced, their presence here indicates they were still in use until the mid-17th century (Barker 2011, 218).

- Two vessels manufactured from iron-rich sandy ware (irsw), ECC*14* and 15. ECC*14*, a cooking jar, is almost 50% complete so was almost certainly in use until the mid-17th century whilst ECC15 is a jug that is just over 13% complete. The medieval fabric was used in vessels manufactured from the 11th to 14th centuries (Ford 1995, 33).

- A dripping pan, ECC*3*, which is clearly of medieval form. This vessel probably dates from the 14th-15th centuries and is heavily sooted (see above, 6.3.4).

- ECC*198*, a Surrey/Hampshire borderware drinking vessel dating to the early to mid-16th century, which was a non-local import to the castle and has been discussed in greater detail above (see above, 6.3.6).

- A Midlands whiteware pipkin, ECC126. The fabric is ubiquitous on medieval sites in Staffordshire and dates from the 12th to 14th centuries (Ford 1995, 34-35).

- Seventeen coarseware vessels of unidentified fabrics are also probably of medieval origin. Several of these (for example ECC*73* and 74) are similar to vessels excavated from the post-medieval phases Burslem Art School Site (D. Klemperer *pers. comm.*) and suggest medieval traditions were long-lived.

- In addition to coarseware vessels there are three fine drinking vessels at least 5% complete with Cistercian ware influences, (ECC*189, 190* and *192*). ECC*189* is a transitional form but ECC*190* is a Cistercian Staffordshire type4d three-handled vessel (e.g. Barker 1986a, 55). ECC*192* is a clear example of a Cistercian ware type three drinking vessel with an elaborate decoration of a masculine face amongst foliage. The source of this vessel is unlikely to be Stoke-on-Trent as no decorated sherds have been retrieved from nearby kiln sites, although no parallels for this design have been seen elsewhere (Barker 1986a, 53; A. Irving *pers. comm.*).

Despite the significant number of outdated vessels, there were also recent innovations such as a press-moulded dish, first manufactured around 1640[13] (Barker 1999, 228). There is also one small body sherd of possible slipware (ECC130), a type which was produced increasingly during the 17th century and was first manufactured in Burslem and Hanley, Stoke-on-Trent, during the 1640s (Barker 1993, 14)[14]. However, these sherds are small and contrast strongly with the number of vessels with a pre-17th-century date or influence.

[13] This vessel is absent from the excavation archive, but is mentioned within Barker's report on Tutbury Castle (Barker 2011, 222).

[14] Five further Staffordshire slipware sherds were recovered by the Keele Summer School from the North-West Tower (Wilcock unpublished., n.p.) but these are absent from the archive and as a result are excluded from analysis.

Therefore, the pottery from the site shows strong links with the past both in terms of archaic vessels and vessels of 17th-century date with clear allusions to earlier periods. Although it has been suggested that the earlier pieces may be attributed to medieval dumping patterns (Ford 1996, 1), the presence of 17th-century material within all phases of the site, and the likelihood of the ditch being cleared prior to the defence of the castle as at other garrisons such as Great Chalfield, Wiltshire, (Pafford 1940, 72) makes it highly likely medieval vessels were being used during the 17th century.

Significantly the mid-17th century is seen as a turning point for many of the studies of the Staffordshire potteries, with the increase in production around Burslem and Hanley marking the rise of the regional industry. After this period the use of older wares such as Midlands purple ware declined (Barker 2011, 221), and slipware products rose to prominence alongside the development of the black ware and brown-glazed coarseware industries. The clearance of so many out-dated vessels at this point must be seen in this context, namely the opportunity to dispose of many unwanted artefacts and replace them with more modern examples. Although this provides one explanation for their disposal, it does little to explain the social mechanism behind the action and the impact it would have. The pattern of antiquated forms deposited within a Civil War demolition context can also be seen when analysing the vessel glass from the site.

6.4 Vessel Glass

The vessel glass from the site has been the subject of an extensive report which forms the basis of this analysis (Sheale 1993). In total there are 351 separate vessel elements of which 70 are unidentified. A further 44 vessels were deposited after the demolition of the castle in a period spanning from 1675 until the present day. The fragmentation of glass vessels means it is difficult to ascertain an exact number of vessels, although a minimum number can be obtained through counting the individual elements of each vessel. Analysis suggests a minimum of 120 vessels were present at the site (see tables 6.5 and 6.6).

It has been suggested that the suspension of the glass industry in England during the Civil War and Interregnum would have resulted in the removal of glass vessels from the site as desirable and valuable objects (Sheale 1993, 14). However, contemporary

accounts suggest they were relatively cheap, an inventory of 1655 values urinals and biscuit moulds at a mere six shillings and, although copious lists of different types of ointments and unguents are made, the glass in which presumably some of them were contained is not deemed worthy of mention (Vaisey 1969, 101). Given the value of glass compared to goods within the castle, the bishop's wife's valuables alone being estimated at £5,000 (see above, 6.2), it is unlikely that fragile glass vessels were removed for sale due to the high effort required for a relatively low gain.

Glass vessels at Eccleshall were not only an indication of the inhabitants' conspicuous style of living but also the bishopric's patronage of the industry, as Bishop Wright's predecessor William Overton had probably established French glassworkers at Bishop's Wood, four miles from his palace at Eccleshall (Greenslade and Stuart 1965, 42; Sheale 1993, 10). This meant that until 1615, when a government proclamation banning the use of wood as a fuel in glassmaking forced the relocation of the industry to the coal-rich areas of Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Stourbridge, glass production was directly linked with the see of Coventry and Lichfield. Although this provides an explanation for the large number of forest green glass vessels of local manufacture (83 MNV), there are a significant number of imported green glass and *façon de Venise* vessels which were imported from both national and international sources.

6.4.1 Vessel form

Fifteen vessel forms were represented by the glass from Eccleshall, representing eight known categories of vessel use (see tables 6.5 and 6.6). The large number of drinking vessels, a minimum of 55 forming 46% of the glass assemblage, explains the low proportion of ceramic vessels within this category (see above, 6.3.3; figs. 6.7 and 6.8). Although there is some differentiation between goblets and beakers in contemporary literature, with beakers associated with ale and beer and goblets with wine, the similar number of vessels at Eccleshall (a minimum of 27 beakers and 28 goblets) indicates that in reality both were used in conjunction with each other. This is supported by contemporary literature, a woodcut of the Civil War displaying examples of each type of drinking vessel alongside other material culture including tobacco pipes (see fig. 6.10).

The significant number of flasks and one Germanic kuttrolf bottle (twelve MNV, 10% of the assemblage) complements the significant number of jugs deposited within the deposits and highlights the role played by the conspicuous consumption of alcohol, particularly as glass was often used to enhance the liquid it contained (see above, 3.5.2). In addition, the importance of glass in the serving of food is indicated by the number of dishes present (thirteen MNV, 10.83% of the assemblage). Previous research suggests this may have been of greater importance in elite, as opposed to urban, contexts, perhaps due to the fact that the vessels reflected the greater status of the food contained within them (Willmott 2002, 26).

When examined alongside assemblages such as Sandal and Pontefract, where pottery forms dominate, the comparative wealth of the assemblage at Eccleshall becomes apparent. Its presence in all fine vessel categories indicates its inclusion within all spheres of consumption at the castle. Although the relative economic value of glass may be overstated (e.g. Willmott 2002, 24-6), its abundance at Eccleshall serves not only as a demonstration of ecclesiastical patronage of local industry but also the wealth of Bishop Wright and his predecessors. The small but significant number of small storage vessels (eight MNV, 11% of the assemblage) suggests that, as with drinking vessels, glass was used in preference over ceramic wherever possible as only two ceramic small storage vessels were recovered. In addition the large number of urinals (twelve MNV, 10% of vessels) may also go some way to explaining the lack of fine handled storage vessels, as these are often interpreted as chamberpots (Cumberpatch 2002, 221). Although glass was the preferred material for uroscopy due to its translucent qualities (Willmott 2002, 103), the lack of possible ceramic alternatives at the castle is unusual given their concentration elsewhere.

6.4.2 Vessel Distribution

Despite some analysis of vessel distribution within the original report (Sheale 1993, 93-103) it is impossible to examine this in greater detail due to a lack of information on cross-joining fragments. However, broad trends of deposition can still be identified and these are discussed below (see also fig. 6.11).

The majority of glass was recovered from the North Wall, particularly trench K. Although vessels were deposited within all trenches along the North Wall fragments join between trenches K and J, complementing the ceramic evidence and suggesting vessels were already broken prior to deposition with all material originating from a single source (Sheale 1993, 101). The distribution of vessels suggests some degree of restriction to particular groups, as drinking paraphernalia is predominantly associated with the North Wall. Almost all beaker fragments were found along the North Wall (Sheale 1993, 95) and, although a number of goblet fragments were deposited outside the North-East Tower, the majority were also deposited along the North Wall, particularly within trench E.

Bowls and bottles were more widespread, although jars were largely restricted to the North Wall. The widespread distribution of bottles may be due to their predominantly medicinal purpose, despite a lack of urinals outside the North Wall. Glass bottles were an important container for medicines, the inventory of a Lichfield apothecary taken on the 7th March 1655 lists 'glasse bottles of all sortes', their value of £3 probably indicating they were full (Vaisey 1969, 101-102).

The glass assemblage from the North-East Tower had a more restricted number of forms, a characteristic it shares with the ceramic vessels from the area (see above, 6.3.3.2). However, despite ceramic jugs being present in significant numbers the majority of glass flasks were deposited along the North Wall, indicating ceramic vessels were used for liquid transportation in preference to glass. One exception to this trend is the kuttrolf, which was found largely near the North-East Tower, although some sherds were also retrieved from trench K(C) on the North Wall.

The preference for glass vessels on the North Wall compared to the North-East Tower suggests the assemblage from the North-East Tower was less concerned with conspicuous consumption and was instead the result of more utilitarian tasks. This is supported by a plan of the castle drawn in 1687, which shows the Great Hall being half-way along the East Wall and removed from the tower (MS Tanner 217, 45). Although a room nearer to the tower is identified as a dining room, this may be a misnomer and its size precludes it use for large communal consumption. The maintenance of divisions in material consumption between different areas of the castle even during the Civil War is

indicative of the need felt by garrisons to maintain ordinary life as much as possible, even within unusual times.

6.4.3 Dating

Unlike other castles such as Montgomery, where the majority of glass vessels date to the late 16th century, the vessels at Eccleshall predominantly date to the first half of the 17th century (Willmott 2002, 25). However, a significant number of vessels are forms which pre-date the 17th century with one flask neck dating between 1200 and 1500 (Sheale 1993, 67-68, no. 233). Although the fragmentation of vessels makes it difficult to gain an exact number of vessels, out of 231 identified vessels which could have been conceivably in use in 1650, 218 were produced before 1625 (see fig. 6.12). This date coincides with the virtual collapse of the domestic forest green glass industry due to monopolies and legislation (Godfrey 1975, 103-134), and a smaller number, 32 vessels, predate 1600. Given the domestic influences on glass production, the curation of a large number of vessels produced before 1625 is unsurprising as the cessation in production nearby meant the availability of glass fell, unlike pottery which continued to be produced throughout the period.

Perhaps of greater significance is the termination of several glass forms coinciding with the end of the Civil War, indicative of a national phenomenon of social change. Glass lion mask stems diminish rapidly after the Civil War and despite being found on sites demolished during the mid-17th century, including Basing, Baconsthorpe and Montgomery (Charleston 1971, 63; Charleston 2002, 72; Knight 1994, 156), their appearance in later deposits is extremely rare. One such exception is the four lion mask stems recovered from Nonsuch Palace (Charleston 2005, 242-3), although a further example from Berry Pomeroy Castle, Devon, is unfortunately unstratified (Allan 1996, 237). Therefore, the large-scale deposition of so many glass vessels indicates an alteration in social policy, particularly when their destruction is attributed not to the siege itself but the aftermath of the war and the politics this involved.

6.4.4 Origin of vessels

The majority of glass is of English manufacture, with many of the green glass vessels probably being produced in the local area due to the proximity of the glassworks in

north-west Staffordshire and their patronage by the bishops of Lichfield (Crossley 1967, 47). However, a number of clear glass vessels, including the lion mask and ladder stem goblets (Sheale 1993, 22-24, nos.1 and 2; see fig. 6.9), were products of the London glass industry and there is a single example of an unidentified vessel in black glass which is the product of Haughton Green near Manchester (Hurst Vose 1994). The variety of English sources for glass is to some extent unsurprising given the elevated social status for glass and the necessity of importing clear glass such as goblets from London or the Continent. However, a significant number of vessels were imported from continental sources, highlighting the status of Eccleshall as an episcopal residence.

A minimum of seventeen, and a possible maximum of 22, vessels were imported from countries including France, Germany and Italy (see table 6.7), with seven goblets, six beakers, two bowls, a goblet lid and a kuttrolf represented. All the goblets and a krautstrunk beaker (Sheale 1993, 109) date to the 16th century, when the English industry could not supply demand, although the presence of so many vessels is also indicative of the unsurpassable quality of imports compared to local products (Willmott 2002, 18). Some of the vessels, such as beaker 105/106, may have been indistinguishable to consumers, differing only in the quality of their execution. However others, such as the kuttrolf and two enamelled glass vessels, were clearly of higher quality (see fig. 6.13). The contents of the kuttrolf, used for storing spirits, was also more valuable than the wine or beer consumed in the majority of other vessels and the container itself was a great rarity as, apart from London, no other examples have yet been found in England (Sheale 1993, 78; Willmott 2002, 81). Although small, the assemblage of imports is unsurpassed by sites in the local area and rivals other elite sites in terms of status.

Unlike imported ceramic vessels, only one of which (a Surrey-Hampshire borderware vessel) was associated with drinking (see above, 6.3.6), the majority of continental imports are either drinking vessels (fourteen vessels including a goblet lid) or for liquid transportation (one vessel). The disparity between the two material types is indicative of the different roles held by the two material types at Eccleshall, with glass being preferentially used for the conspicuous consumption of liquids.

6.4.5 Comparison with other sites

Unlike Sandal and Pontefract, the glass assemblage at Eccleshall cannot be attributed to its wartime garrison. There are instead two possible sources for the glass deposited there: vessels already within the bishop's household at the outbreak of war or vessels deposited there for safety by local gentry. The latter suggestion is unlikely as Beeston in Cheshire, also used for the storage of valuables, has a far more restricted range of glass vessels with only a maximum of 30 identifiable fragments relating to a minimum of thirteen vessels (Charleston 1993). In addition, glass never had a very high value relative to other goods such as furniture or metal wares. Therefore, the abundance of glass vessels at Eccleshall compared to other residences such as Pontefract and Sandal is almost certainly due to its use as a permanent high-status residence immediately before the conflict.

Parallels with the assemblage at Eccleshall can be seen at a number of elite households active prior to the Civil War, including Montgomery Castle, Basing House and Dudley Castle (see table 6.8). At Montgomery 91 vessels were identified of which approximately 63 are recognizable vessels dating to the mid-17th century or earlier (Lewis 1968, 147; Knight 1994, 153-161) whereas at Basing 34 vessels were identified from the same period (Charleston 1971, 63-70). Although Dudley is unpublished, the assemblage recovered from there includes goblets, beakers, flasks, case bottles and urinals in addition to high decorative wrythen, latticino, coloured and painted vessels (K. Banks *pers. comm.)*.

The prevalence of drinking vessels at Eccleshall is supported by other sites, where they form between a third and a half of all assemblages. For example, the drinking vessels at Montgomery and Basing formed 41% and 38% of their respective assemblages (26 and thirteen vessels). Although not associated with the Civil War, the mid-17th century assemblage from Baconsthorpe Castle also shows striking similarities with Eccleshall, with 45% of the assemblage being either goblets or beakers (six and four vessels respectively). Like Eccleshall, a number of imports are also present, in particular a pouring vessel in the form of a bird which originated in Venice (Charleston 2002, 68-69).

Non-elite sites associated with the Civil War also show glass vessels were predominantly associated with drinking; at St Paul-in-the-Bail well, Lincoln, the entire assemblage was directly connected with drinking, comprising of at least thirteen beakers, 39 goblets, eight flasks or bottles, possible tazza fragments and a vase, although there was some contamination with later material (Henderson 2005, 291-2; Henderson and Mann 2008, 37)[15]. The dominance of drinking vessels at all sites where glass is present should not be ignored but this supports suggestions that the assemblages of urban sites tend to be focused on drinking equipment whereas elite sites have more varied assemblages including a significant amount of material associated with the presentation of food (Willmott 2002, 26).

Eccleshall is thus typical of many elite households dating to this period which contain large amounts of glass associated with the consumption of both food and drink. This is confirmed by a study of inventories and order books of the period. For example, the household books of Lord William Howard of Naworth Castle lists the purchase of glass vessels under 'utensils and necessaries', with four shillings being paid for 20 drinking glasses in 1625 (Hartshorne 1968, 467). The inventory of Dame Dorothy Shirley of Farringdon, Berkshire composed on 20th September 1620 listed four damask glass cloths, a glass cupboard in the buttery for the probable storage of glass vessels, and in her closet, 'one case of glasses…wth divers other glasses, purslin stuffe, Chinie stuffe'(Hartshorne 1968, 468). The combination of glasses with porcelain and china in the Dame Shirley's closet indicates that glass shared a similar social value with porcelain and Chinese imports.

The assemblage from Stafford Castle, another partially ruined castle reoccupied by Royalists, is comparative with the bishop's palace in terms of status (Darlington and Soden 2007, 223-225). The small assemblage contains a minimum of two goblets, one of medieval date, one narrow-necked jug, two urinals, three beakers, two bowls, two lids and a dish (Cocroft 2007)[16]. Significantly only five vessels (35% of the assemblage)

[15] The report conflates glass dating before 1650 with vessels from later periods, creating difficulties in definitive counts.

[16]The identification of some vessels varies from those in the report.

are identified as forest green glass, despite its dominance at nearby Eccleshall. This suggests the number of local vessels at Eccleshall may be due to the episcopal patronage of local industry rather than economic restrictions. Therefore, the consumption of glass at Eccleshall is complex, reflecting not just the wealth of its inhabitants but also their influence within the local community.

Significantly there are few examples of large-scale glass disposal not associated with the Civil War, notable exceptions being West Bromwich Manor, deposited when the moat was levelled around the end of the 17th century (Hodder 1988-1989, 38), Nonsuch Palace, largely deposited between 1665 and 1666 (Biddle 2005, 1; Charleston 2005) and Temple Balsall, an early 18th-century cellar deposit (Gooder 1984). Therefore, although West Bromwich is associated with the late rather than mid-17th century, the Eccleshall assemblage is part of a wider phase of mass glass disposal.

6.5 Other items associated with food and drink

Whilst it is highly likely material culture such as knives are present within the excavation archive, these have yet to be analysed. As a result, there are only two items which can be firmly associated with the consumption of food and drink at site: a cheese strainer and a wooden bowl.

The near-complete copper alloy strainer from an unknown location (fig. 6.14) was used in the production of cheese. Artefacts like these are relatively common, other examples include a copper alloy strainer retrieved Sandal (see below, 7.6) and a ceramic strainer from the non-Civil War site of West Bromwich Manor (Hodder 1991-1992, 23). Its presence at Eccleshall is hardly surprising given the sites pre-war status as an active household performing a whole range of domestic tasks, including cheese production.

A wooden bowl was also found in trench K (D) according the site notes (Eccleshall archive unpublished). The find indicates how even at a high status site such as Eccleshall, seemingly low status objects as wooden implements were still important.

6.6 Evidence of foodstuffs

Seeds and animal bone were retrieved by the excavators but, due to the unstratified nature of the deposits, it is impossible to link these with phases of occupation. A report on the faunal remains has been compiled and is contained within the excavation archive (Eccleshall archive unpublished). Although the majority of remains were retrieved from Trench K along the North Wall this may be due to selective sampling rather than deposition practices (Eccleshall archive unpublished). Trench J was of particular interest as it contained six pig mandibles and thirteen maxilla which had butchery marks interpreted as part of the production of brawn, a popular English dish during the early post-medieval period (Eccleshall archive unpublished). However, the lack of stratigraphy and sampling of the material means it is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions from this assemblage.

Documentary evidence indicates the importance of cheese to the garrison as in March 1645 John Buckley supplied 110 old cheeses belonging to Brereton from Eccleshall as part of a large shipment of 1141 cheeses intended for Parliamentarian use (Dore 1984, 71-72). The substantial amount of cheese conveyed to Eccleshall indicates the large amounts of food present within the castle. Furthermore, as the cheese is listed by Brereton as part of a select group of 495 cheeses labelled as ‘mine own’ (Dore 1984, 71), it is important to see the contents of the house as Brereton’s own personal belongings as opposed to the wider Parliamentarian community. Eccleshall’s role as a supplier of foodstuffs is confirmed by a note from Christmas Eve 1645 in which beef from the castle was sent to those besieging Chester (Dore 1990, 430-431). This evidence emphasises the need to see Eccleshall as a garrison embedded within a network of local and national alliances rather than as an isolated residence.

6.7 Holistic interpretation of material culture

The social importance of the destruction of material culture during the Civil War is clearly highlighted by the Eccleshall assemblage. As stated above (see above, 6.4.5), the quality and volume of the assemblage, particularly given the small area excavated, is demonstrative of Eccleshall’s wealth and symbolism as the palace of the Bishops of Lichfield and Coventry rather than its use as a store during the Civil War. In addition to desirable objects such as Dutch and Chinese ceramic imports, the large number of glass

vessels of national and Continental origin is indicative of the variety of exotic goods purchased by the bishops for their household. They formed part of the elite identity of the palace which Sir William Brereton was so eager to own, not only for its rich furnishings but as an important building in its own right.

The maintenance of Eccleshall as an elite residence throughout the conflict is visible in both the historical and archaeological record. The restriction in forms, with vessels predominantly associated with the preparation and serving of food and drink rather than its storage, suggests that unlike Sandal where traditional barriers between food tasks became blurred due to the necessities of siege warfare, at Eccleshall these were maintained with foodstuffs stored in areas completely separate from zones of consumption. The contrast between Eccleshall and the Yorkshire garrison suggests that, wherever possible, peacetime regimes of food preparation and consumption were maintained, only altering when placed under extreme pressure.

The importance of Eccleshall to Sir William Brereton is reflected in its adoption as his main residence, described as 'the only receptacle and refuge which I have in that county to secure the remainder of my goods and my children and servants' (Dore 1984, 187; see also Dore 1990, 126). The mention of children and servants indicates this was very much a family residence, unsurprising given the fact that two of his other residences had been captured by the Royalists and another was threatened by them (Dore 1990, 58). However, his attempt to retain Eccleshall at the end of the first Civil War and his subsequent purchase of the bishop's palace at Croydon (Morrill 1985, 319; Dore 1990, 58) also suggests a deliberate alignment with powerful symbols of religious authority. His maintenance of the residence, despite strong opposition by local commanders which culminated in their removal to Eccleshall in December 1644, indicates the importance Brereton placed upon Eccleshall as a symbol of his authority within the area (Hamilton 1890, 173; Dore 1984, 18).

Its status as an elite residence may be the reason why Eccleshall was chosen as the refuge for sympathetic nobility and upon its capture was deemed to be a suitable prison for prominent Royalists and their servants. A list of prisoners in Nantwich in March 1645 lists six men relocated to Eccleshall Castle: Lt. Col. Owen, Major Grey, Sir John Weld senior, Sir John Weld junior, Sir Thomas Whitmore and Sir Richard Lee (Dore

1984, 84). Significantly, unlike prisoners sent elsewhere or retained in Nantwich, all the above are either knighted or hold a senior military rank, suggesting Eccleshall was retained as a prison for the Royalist elite. A list of prisoners within the castle on 26th March 1645 lists these men along with nine others, only one of which, Corporal John Rubone, is neither a knight nor possessing a rank higher than captain. The list also includes 'the servants of Lord Brereton[17], Sir Tho. Tyldesley, Sir Rich. Lee, Sir Tho. Whitmore, Sir John Wylde' and others are recording as having a servant, indicating that some level of gentility was still maintained (Dore 1984, 121-2; Greenslade 2006, 99, 103).

Despite the protestations of some prisoners who complained that 'our accommodation is soe untoward at present that we have scarce philosophy enough to undergoe it' (HMC 4th Report, 70), in comparison to other prisons captives at Eccleshall were held in comparative luxury. For example, during the siege of Lichfield its Royalist commander Sir Thomas Tyldesley, imprisoned at Eccleshall from November 1644 until October 1645, passed on his regards to the Parliamentarian lawyer John Birch and thanked him 'for his civil visits to me when I was in Eccleshall' (Carr and Atherton 2007, 257). Furthermore, when referring to Captain Henry Stone, the commander of the garrison at Eccleshall, Tyldesey writes 'I wish it were in my power to declare my love to you, which should be performed in the highest way to dissuade you from the course you are in. But as you told me in Eccleshall Castle we have fought too long now to dispute' (Carr and Atherton 2007, 126). The comparative amicability from an erstwhile captive to his captor strongly suggests that strict rules of hospitality were observed. Not all prisoners were treated in such luxury. For example, Nathaniel Grey was held at Eccleshall from March 1645 and claimed that Brereton had starved him with near-fatal results (Carr and Atherton 2007, 205). Despite this isolated example, the documentation associated with Eccleshall suggests that the material culture present within the castle is indicative of the role it played in the maintenance of social etiquette even between supposed enemies.

[17] Not to be confused with Sir William Brereton, William, Lord Brereton was the head of the senior Brereton line and fought for the Royalists (Dore 1984, 122).

If the material culture present at the site is suggestive of an elite residence which enjoyed a peacetime environment, even in the midst of war, the destruction of this assemblage in what appears to be a single catastrophic event requires an explanation. It would be easy to conflate the destruction of material culture with the puritanical beliefs of Sir William Brereton, known for his suppression of alehouses and his campaign for religious reform in the years immediately preceding the war (Morrill 1985, 312, 315). He spoke in favour of the iconoclasm at Lichfield Cathedral, seeing it as the symbol of previous superstitions beliefs (Morrill 1985, 319), and his wife was personally responsible for the destruction of windows in the church at Weston-under-Lizard (Carr and Atherton 2007, 13). Having been denied Eccleshall, Brereton also occupied the archiepiscopal palace at Croydon from the late 1640s (Morrill 1985, 319), supposedly converting the bishop's chapel into a kitchen (Anon 1660, 3). However, although Brereton was a puritan, his beliefs did not evidently extend to all aspects of material culture. Amongst the goods retained for his use following the seizure of Lady Grosvenor's House during the fall of Royalist Chester are '16 Venice glasses' valued at 10*s* 6*d* and 'four bottles with syrup of gillyflowers and several glasses' (Carr and Atherton 2007, 295). Furthermore, during his travels in the Netherlands between 1634 and 1635 he made purchases of 200 stove tiles, paintings and gilt, and painted door knobs, demonstrating he was partial to the luxuries of life (Brereton 1844, 59-60). Therefore, the destruction of material culture at Eccleshall cannot be attributed to puritanical beliefs alone, but is instead part of a more complex pattern of destruction practiced at many sites after the conflict.

One explanation for the material deposited can be seen through the significant number of antiquated glass and ceramic vessels present. Although both ceramic and glass vessels produced before 1625 had been curated until the Civil War, the period after the conflict witnessed their large-scale destruction. Although many styles of glass may not have been considered antiquated, their disposal at this point of time suggests a change in social discourse marked by the Civil War which is not restricted to Eccleshall castle. As a phenomenon at many castle sites, this is a feature which deserves greater examination (see below, 9.6).

6.8 Conclusion

The assemblage at Eccleshall encapsulates the material culture of an elite household during the mid-17th century. The emphasis on conspicuous consumption, particularly in the form of exotic imports and high quality glassware, indicates the important role it played both before and during the Civil War. The differentiation of assemblages from the North Wall and North-East Tower indicates how separate areas of consumption were successfully maintained at Eccleshall, unlike other castles such as Sandal where such divisions broke down partially or completely. However, its maintenance throughout the Civil War is in sharp contrast to its destruction immediately after the conflict, a process which demands further investigation.

As noted above (see 6.7), it is not enough to draw simplistic conclusions concerning the mass destruction of wealth. It has been suggested that the Puritans conflated glass with Royalists and Catholic extravagance (Thorpe 1961, 135). Certainly Bishop Wren was the antithesis of the puritan ideal of a church leader, approving of bear-baiting and the sale of meat on a Sunday (Davies 1992, 203). However, the destruction of the Eccleshall assemblage cannot be seen as a puritanical act; Cromwell was well-known for stating that the notion of preventing drunkenness by banning the import of wine was ridiculous (Hill 1970, 198). Drinking cultures may have been adopted as part of the identity of a particular group, such as the stereotypical Cavalier (see below, 9.5.1.1), but the flexibility of material culture means its meaning changes according to the different social discourse in which it participates. By considering the assemblages at all sites during the conflict it is possible to appreciate the complexities which lay behind the use and destruction of vessels.

7 Sandal

7.1 Introduction

Located above a crossing of the river Calder, four miles south-west of Wakefield (OS Grid reference SE3362618190), Sandal was fortified for the King during the Civil War and withstood periodic sieges until sustained bombardment forced the garrison to surrender on 30th September 1645. The material culture from the castle represents one of the largest assemblages directly associated with the Civil War and an unparalleled opportunity to evaluate the social discourse of conflict over an entire site.

From a purely militaristic standpoint, the strength of Sandal as a fortification is questionable. It was virtually uninhabited prior to the conflict, its crumbling fabric made a prolonged defence impossible and it was not located near a strategic settlement or route of communication. Only through understanding the biography of the castle is it possible to appreciate the reasons for its fortification, demonstrating the important role played by the past during the conflict. Analysing the artefacts deposited at this site within this social context leads to important insights into the role tradition played in maintaining a precarious garrison in the face of inevitable defeat.

7.2 Brief history of the site and excavations

Originally a motte-and-bailey constructed during the 12th century, Sandal was modified throughout the medieval period, including extensive renovations ordered by Richard III as part of a plan to use the castle as the seat of the Council of the North. The castle was sparsely occupied throughout the 16th century and after 1603, when the records of the castle were moved to Wakefield, the castle had no major political role (Butler 1983a, 3-6).

At the outbreak of war the castle was garrisoned for the king by Major Thomas Beaumount, although the first commander of the castle broke his neck whilst descending from 'the house of office' (Walker 1895, 181). The garrison was subsequently encircled for several months during 1645 until April, when the garrison attacked the besieging Parliamentarians and caused them to retreat (Heylyn 1645b,

1557-1558). After this event, the castle was unthreatened until the surrender of Pontefract on July 20th 1645. This left Sandal as the sole surviving Royalist garrison in the area until it too capitulated to the Parliamentarians the following September.

Limited investigations in the late 19th century were followed by an extensive excavation from 1964 to 1973 conducted by the Sandal Excavation Committee and volunteers, concentrating on a different area each season (Walker 1895; Mayes and Butler 1983, 1; see fig. 7.2). The excavations were subsequently published (Mayes and Butler 1983) and the site archive is now stored with Wakefield Museums Service.

7.3 Sandal Castle: a social stronghold

Sandal Castle was described by royal surveyors in 1562 as the principal defence against a possible Yorkshire rebellion (Colvin 1968, 232). However, several surveys conducted between 1538 and 1566 into the condition of the castle and its fabric suggest that whilst the Constable's Lodgings and Kitchens were in good condition the rest of the castle was in decline, with several buildings missing both roof and floors (see table 7.1). The buildings surrounding the Great Hall in the east of the castle suffered the most, by 1538 these were largely decayed and one corner of the building suffered from subsidence. Therefore, it is unsurprising that it was this area which was reinforced by a Royalist battery, albeit one lacking 'sophisticated planning' (Butler 1983b, 80).

The New Tower, rebuilt as part of the 1484-5 renovations, is typical of much of the castle at the beginning of the conflict, possessing upstanding walls but no surviving internal partitions. The recording of a large breach in the Keep wall in the 1564 survey, and the fact that the 1545-6 survey mentions that only three of the towers were inhabitable, with 'the leade of one of them being allredy downe and the others standing untiled' suggests that by the late 16th century much of the Keep was in serious decline. This dilapidation is supported by a thin wall running north-west to south-east within the interior of the Keep, associated with the infilling of nearby areas MF and MH and originally dated to the renovations of 1484 (Mayes 1983, 45-6). However, the material deposited within MF and MH proved date from the 17th, rather than the 15th, century including several blackware vessels with Wrenthorpe handles (e.g. SAND*809, 810, 844*). The Keep was described in 1564 as being 'in good repayre saviunge that there is a

great rifte or breache in the wall' and it is conceivable that this wall was constructed as an emergency barricade during the Civil War as a response to this gap in the castle's defences (PRO, DL 44/114 cited in Mayes and Butler 1983, 20).

Given the state of these buildings, it is surprising that the castle was given such strategic importance. In addition to its description in 1562 as being the mainstay of the county's defence the castle was described in 1565 as having 'no refuge nere adjoining to the same', despite the far stronger Pontefract being within ten miles (PRO, DL 44/114 cited in Mayes and Butler 1983, 21). By 1592 the castle was described as being 'very ruynous and in greater decay than th'other of our castles are' (PRO, DL42/98 f.207 cited in Colvin *et al*. 1975, 181) and its relative weakness can be seen through the delay taken in bringing it under serious siege as, apart from minor incursions, the Parliamentarian forces concentrated on seizing the greater threat of Pontefract before focussing on the minor concern of Sandal (Walker 1895, 184). Its proximity to Wakefield did not prevent the seizing of the town in May 1643 in an event described as 'the greatest losse that hath befallen His Majestie in the North' (Heylyn 1643d). Therefore, military strength alone cannot be used as a reason for the adoption of the castle as a Royalist garrison.

However, the importance of Sandal becomes more apparent when the history of the site is considered, particularly its role during the Wars of the Roses. On the 30th December 1460, Richard, Duke of York, having been surrounded for several days by Lancastrian forces, led his troops out of the castle to fight the opposition in the Battle of Wakefield. In the ensuing battle, the Yorkist forces were routed and the duke and his son Edmund, Earl of Rutland were killed (Haigh 1995, 31-37). 24 years later the duke's son, Richard III, acceded to the throne and in June 1484 ordered the construction of a new tower in the Keep, with a bakehouse and brewhouse subsequently authorised in October 1484 (Ross 1981, 182). This renovation is clearly linked to Richard's selection of Sandal as the base for the Council of the North, responsible for the administration of a significant area of the country (Ross 1981, 143). Although the Council continued to hold its sessions at York, the use of Sandal as the symbolic northern seat of power cannot be ignored, particularly as its neighbour Pontefract, along with many other castles in Yorkshire, overshadowed it in terms of both size and grandeur.

As a result, the selection of the castle as a Civil War fortification must be associated with its past history as the site of the death of Richard's father and brother, which permanently associated the castle both as a Yorkist icon and symbol of the struggle for the crown. The event was further memorialised by Richard's brother and predecessor Edward IV, who erected a memorial cross at the site of their father's death. The lasting impression the battle had on the local population is further demonstrated by the maintenance of this memorial by nearby inhabitants until its destruction by the Parliamentarian army during the English Civil War (Haigh 1995, 39).

The period 1641-43 saw fifteen large published works dedicated to the Wars of the Roses (Adamson 1990, 95), and the events of the battle were recounted by William Shakespeare in *Henry VI, Part 3*. These publications, along with the subsequent destruction of the monument by Parliamentary forces, inextricably linked Sandal with the crown in the national consciousness. Consequently, when the history of the site is taken into consideration, the selection of Sandal as a Royalist garrison is logical as an iconic site of great significance. The soldiers who fortified Sandal were not fortifying a crumbling ruin of dubious strength. They were instead fortifying a building synonymous with the struggle for the crown and, moreover, one which had been endowed by one king and memorialised by another. Although not a stronghold in a military sense, Sandal can be seen as a social stronghold which encapsulated the struggle which was now to be relived inside its walls. It is within this context that the material culture consumed at the site should be analysed.

7.4 The pottery

In total 5,552 sherds were analysed representing an estimated 3,023 vessels and weighing a total of 10,4387g (see table 7.2). An estimated 2,028 vessels are not residual from pre-Civil War contexts and of these 384 vessels are at least 5% complete. The extensive excavations conducted at the castle are reflected in these 384 being on average 24% complete. Factors preventing an even higher vessel completion figure include the shallow depth of some deposits, Victorian excavations and the emptying of the inner and outer ditches by mechanical excavator (Stubbes and Butler 1971, 2). Although shallow deposits and the lack of single contexts prevent the vertical analysis of material, the comprehensive nature of the excavation enables a two dimensional

distribution analysis to be undertaken focussing on the different locales of social discourse within the castle. However, before this can be achieved it is first necessary to address difficulties arising from the original interpretation of the site.

7.4.1 The original analysis: reconfiguring the figures.

The distribution of vessels at Sandal castle as presented within the original report is confusing (Brears 1983). Although there is a plan of vessel distribution (Brears 1983, 223, fig. 98) this does not correlate with the list of vessels identified within the excavation (Brears 1983, 219, Table 15). Comparing the original figure (fig. 7.3) with the distribution of vessels as presented in this table (fig. 7.4) demonstrates the difficulties of interpreting the original material as there are clear disparities between the two. Even allowing for fourteen vessels which are not illustrated, and thus impossible to identify, this leaves a disparity of 127 vessels listed in the original table compared to 116 illustrated on the original plan.

Furthermore, although some of the areas show a broadly similar number of vessels in both calculations, for example the kitchen and Great Hall (areas D and K), in other areas there is a greater disparity. For example, building AA near the main drawbridge contains two small storage vessels and a drinking vessel on Brears' plan, yet the illustrated examples consists of two dishes, a fine handled jar, a jug, a costrel and one unillustrated vessel. The motte had a similar discrepancy, with no vessels listed within the slit trench MK, although the vessels from MW, currently with no location, may in fact be from this area. The problems in interpretation are compounded by the fact that many of the illustrated examples are not always from the areas stated within the original table. For example, the vessel depicted as figure 95.81 (Brears 1983, 220) is listed as originating from building C (the stable) but the illustrated vessel (SAND*1*) is marked with BDA1. In total, out of 31 possible comparisons, fourteen vessels are from areas which differ from those identified in the original analysis. With limited documentation it is impossible to resolve this conflict satisfactorily and as a result the markings on the vessels are used instead of their location as given within the original report. These are likely to be more accurate, being taken directly from the vessels themselves rather than from secondary analysis.

In addition to difficulties in identifying the location of vessels there are also problems with the original phasing of the site, as the abolition of contexts and the consequent use of phases has created divisions that may not reflect the archaeology accurately. For example, BDA1 is assigned to phase 1, as opposed to phase +; thereby supposedly dating to the 16th-century occupation of the castle rather than the Civil War. However, at least one vessel from this phase illustrated within the original report (Brears 1983, 220, fig. 95.81) is clearly a blackware vessel dating to the 17th century and is thus associated with the Civil War occupation. As a result, a new distribution of vessels has been produced which utilises all material contemporary with the Civil War and analyses it on the basis of the location marked on the vessels themselves, the first time this approach has been undertaken.

7.4.1.1 Distribution of vessels, a reinterpretation

The new plan utilises all vessels more than 15% complete in order to produce a plan comparable to those in the original report (fig. 7.5). Although the original plan selected vessels through an estimate of completion rather than a fixed percentage (P. Brears *pers. comm.)* this figure was chosen as a method of selecting a comparable number of vessels to the original distribution whilst at the same time negating bias towards a particular vessel type.

The distribution of the 132 vessels selected[18] highlight many areas in which the assemblage diverges from that portrayed in the original report, the key differences being:

1. Compared to previous plans, pancheons are underrepresented. This is partially due to the omission of six vessels that were from more than one context. However, only one of these (SAND*1441*) originates from the areas surrounding AA, Q, P and R, an area where these vessels were concentrated previously, so the absence of vessels from this area is genuine. Similarly only one pancheon

[18] Although 166 vessels are more than 15% complete, 13 were omitted as unidentified vessels and a further 21 vessels which matched across contexts were also omitted.

more than 15% complete was recovered from the barbican ditch (SAND*1445*), despite four vessels being depicted here in the original distribution plans.

One possible reason for this might be the general underrepresentation of larger vessels due to fragmentation. The size of vessel such as pancheons means they produce more fragments when broken than smaller vessels such as drinking vessels. This means a much larger number of fragments are required to gain a given percentage and large vessels are thus more likely to be more incomplete than smaller vessels. However, when the figures are adjusted to make allowances for this, with the addition of 20 bowl or pancheons and larger storage vessels which are at least 5% complete[19] (fig. 7.6), the resultant plan demonstrates that bowl/pancheons are still absent from many of the areas where they were originally depicted. In addition, largely complete vessels, such as small storage jar SAND*1097*, are omitted from the original plan, suggesting that this was highly selective of the material depicted.

2. Several areas not shown on the original plans have a substantial amount of material worthy of discussion, most notably the area outside the northern tower of the Keep, MDX. These areas have a large amount of material which, despite being omitted from the original plans, is highly informative of the discard patterns at the site. The external concentration of vessels was also noted at Dudley, where the assemblage was interpreted as material thrown out of the windows and top of the motte (Ratkai 1985, n.p.), and it would appear a similar practice was conducted at Sandal. The amount of material deposited within these areas indicates the quantity of artefacts which might have been lost during excavation, when areas such as the inner ditch were subject to "rapid clearance by bulldozer…[to]…enable the Civil War destruction to be removed without any loss of archaeological levels" (Stubbes and Butler 1971, 2). The classification of the Civil War as archaeologically irrelevant has caused significant omissions that need to be noted when considering the assemblage. As a result the claim of '87 identifiable cups, 15 costrels, 16 cooking vessels, 31

[19] A further two were omitted as they were joined across areas.

bowls, 19 storage jars, 3 skillets, 22 small alborellos [sic] or ointment/preserve jars and 16 chamber pots' (Brears 1983, 219) is far from definitive, as the fragmentation and distribution of vessels means that only an estimate can be used when analysing the assemblage.

3. The new distribution plan also highlights the presence of small storage jars at the site with high densities in most areas, particularly the motte. This number is in sharp contrast to other castles such as the Constable Tower at Pontefract (see below, 8.4.7.1). Despite being absent from area AA, where they were present in Brears' original distribution (fig. 7.3), a similar number of small storage jars were present in area AB, supporting the conclusion this area is located in the vicinity of AA and AC.

Despite these differences there are some similarities between the original and revised distributions, especially the concentration of vessels within the southern area of the castle surrounding the workshop (code SC65). Unfortunately less definition could be given to the distribution of these vessels in the revised plan as, rather than possessing a specific area code, almost all vessels from the area were labelled SC65.

7.4.1.2 Lack of material within the Barbican ditch

One feature of all plans, which contrasts strongly with the concentration of vessels deposited there during the medieval period, is the paucity of vessels within the barbican ditch (Moorhouse 1983a, 172, fig. 64). An examination of the section across occupied levels, most notably the section across the workshop and barbican ditch (Mayes 1983, facing p.64 (1), fig. 32.20), indicates that the depth of deposits is approximately equivalent across the site. This means that the lack of finds in the barbican ditch compared to other areas is genuine, particularly as levelling the site would result in a reduction in the vessel count of the raised areas, as opposed to the ditch.

A possible explanation for this is vessels represent individual companies of men eating at their posts around the walls, rather than being stationed within the centre of the castle (Brears 1983, 224). However, this assumes that the castle was in a permanent state of alert and this is unlikely as Sandal was not threatened until the final few months of

occupation (see above, 7.2). An alternative explanation is the shallow nature of the ditch by 1645, having been filled by debris over previous centuries. This would have resulted in a shallow depression unsuitable for large deposits of material when compared to the foundations and floors of the buildings due for demolition. The extent to which demolition practices spread material throughout the castle can be judged through an analysis of joining sherds which are deposited in different contexts.

7.4.2 Cross-matching sherds

44 vessels at Sandal could be matched across non-adjacent contexts although one, SAND914, cannot be linked to a specific area as the location of MA is unrecorded. A further seven vessels originated from adjoining areas, for example SAND*134* was recovered from barbican ditch areas BDB and BDC. As these probably resulted from variations in excavation practice, as opposed to a genuine dispersal of the vessel, these were discounted from analysis.

The resulting distribution (fig. 7.7) demonstrates that the majority of cross-matching sherds join with sherds in nearby areas. This is most evident in the area surrounding the Great Hall (area K[20]) and adjoining lodging chamber (area J). The number of sherds that cross-match across the site is relatively small given the extent of the excavations and suggests that the vast majority of vessels were deposited in the same area with little transportation of material around the site. This is particularly evident in the area surrounding the workshop (SC65), where there are only two sherds which join to sherds anywhere on the site: SAND*1613*, matching a sherd from near the motte drawbridge (MJ) and SAND*1615*, which joins a sherd from the barbican ditch (KDN). Therefore, this assemblage appears to be a closely related deposit, although it should be noted that the different buildings within this area were all given the same code during post-excavation.

[20]This identification is contrary to other reports which identify K as being the 'Keep' (Boyle 2006, 185). However, all material from the motte is preceded by 'M' and the correlation of K with the Great Hall coincides with the area codes for the site. No other codes can be identified with this area, despite the original analysis clearly showing vessels originating from this area (see fig.7.1).

Compared to other areas, the motte has a much higher number of cross-matching sherds, both within the building and on the northern slopes of the motte (MDX). However, within the Keep there does appear to be some separation of vessels, with no vessel from the south-west area of the Keep (MF) joining with the northern tower and surrounding area (MD and MDX). This would suggest that the deposits overlying the motte were not homogenous and are instead related to the destruction of vessels within the vicinity of each area.

The low number of sherds which join across the site (rather than between adjacent areas) supports the supposition that artefacts at Sandal were deposited close to where they were broken, with little transportation of vessels. As a result assemblages from different areas of the castle can be compared with each other to allow greater insight into the social discourse of the Civil War.

7.4.3 Vessel analysis by form

The original analysis of the ceramics suggested that assemblages within Sandal were uniform, comprising of drinking vessels, a costrel, storage vessels, small storage vessels, a bowl 'and always the inevitable chamber pot' (Brears 1983, 224). However, analysis of the distribution of identifiable vessels suggests that there is a large degree of differentiation between each of the areas. Across the entire castle (fig. 7.8) there are a high number of drinking vessels with 127 vessels (43% of the assemblage) represented. There are also a surprisingly large number of small storage vessels, (42 vessels forming 14% of the assemblage) and a comparatively small number of heavy duty storage vessels (27, 9%). This ratio of small storage vessels to heavy duty storage vessels is surprisingly high as at a number of other sites, including Pontefract and Beeston Castle, the latter heavily outnumbers the former (see below, 8.4.7.1 for Pontefract; Noake 1993, 191 for Beeston). This has important implications when considering the role the garrison played during the course of the Civil War.

Given the nature of the castle's capitulation and subsequent analysis by Brears it might be assumed that Sandal was fully prepared for long-term occupation. However, although there is some evidence of this at the site, with the use of the forge and presence

of cheese-producing equipment such as a strainer (see below, 6.5), the proportion of small to heavy duty storage vessels means there is little evidence of the garrison being prepared for a protracted siege. Although the castle was so ruinous that it surrendered as soon as the full force of the Parliamentarian arsenal was employed, the previous lack of artillery meant it still had the potential to survive a protracted period of encirclement in which few shots were fired. However, the lack of large storage vessels containing the substantial volume of stores needed to sustain a long-term garrison suggest the castle was never intended to survive a siege for a long-period of time. Although contemporary accounts of the castle suggest there were plentiful supplies of both food and shot when the garrison surrendered (Coe 1645) this may simply have been Parliamentarian propaganda and the role of Sandal was probably one of support rather than major long-term threat.

Despite this general trend within the site there are significant differences between various areas, reflecting the diversity of social discourse at the castle. These are discussed in detail below in conjunction with the rest of the material culture from the site (see below, 7.8).

7.4.4 Sooted vessels

A total of 60 vessels display evidence of sooting, although of these 20 were burnt after use, as indicated by sooting across the breaks of individual sherds. 32 vessels were at least 5% complete and despite the difficulties in identifying sooted vessels (see above, 5.3.10) they give some indication of the range of vessels employed in cooking. Initial analysis of the 22 identifiable vessels which were at least 5% complete and had been sooted before disposal (fig. 7.9) suggests a large range of vessels were exposed to heat during their lifetime, although there is a particular concentration of food preparation and cooking vessels. Analysing the vessels by area (fig. 7.10) indicates that across the site the range of vessels used varied. Sooted cooking vessels are distributed throughout the site apart from the Great Hall and Constable's Lodgings and the motte is particularly remarkable for the variability of sooted vessels; these include two vessels found with the remains of a meal (SAND*1710* and *1711*).

This dining assemblage is described in the report as a 'pair of cooking vessels, their bases lightly burnt...found by the side of a number of bones and a small fire built amid the bombardment rubble in the centre of the Keep (area MH). Here they had been crushed by falling masonry, the defenders apparently being unable to remove their meal in the heat of action' (Brears 1983, 224). On closer examination the two 'cooking vessels' are almost certainly a fine handled jar (SAND*1710*) and a fineware jug (SAND*1711*) with the spout missing which have been used as improvised containers[21]. Although animal remains were also found alongside the ceramics these are not unidentified within the report and, as all bones from the castle have since been disposed of, their identification may forever remain a mystery[22]. However, the presence of animal bones alongside these two vessels in particular, is indicative of the shortage of metal and ceramic cooking vessels during the siege and the appropriation of suitably large vessels for the preparation of meals. Although there is evidence for larger cooking vessels, such as cauldrons, being employed elsewhere in the castle (see below, 6.5), the improvised use of fineware vessels in this particular location, isolated as it is from the rest of the garrison, suggests that the men stationed on the motte were separated from the main cooking facilities within the castle during the final days of the bombardment. In addition, the reduced size of these vessels in comparison to far larger artefacts such as cauldrons highlights the compact inhabitation within the Keep, with only a small number of men being able to participate in the communal consumption facilitated by this dining assemblage. As well as presenting a unique insight into dining amidst the ruins of combat, it also demonstrates the claustrophobic nature of consumption within this part of the castle, with a low number of people inhabiting an extremely stressful environment.

7.4.5 Local identities

It has been suggested that when the castle was reoccupied for the Civil War the pottery required for the garrison was purchased in bulk from the local production site at

[21] There is a distinct difference between this jug and the medieval jug from Eccleshall which also displays evidence of sooting (ECC88). This is of a much coarser fabric than SAND*1710* and thus was more suited for culinary purposes.

[22] An education resource pack for Sandal identifies the bones as chicken, but this is unsubstantiated.

Wrenthorpe, (Brears 1983, 219). However, of the 127 drinking vessels which are at least 5% complete only two thirds are blackware, 27 (21%) being Cistercian ware and a further eleven (34.2%) are transitional Cistercian to blackware forms (see fig. 7.11). Transitional forms were produced at Wrenthorpe until the first quarter of the 17th century at the very latest (Boyle 2006, 211-212) and, as the vessels from Sandal are on average 34% complete, compared to 22.31% for blackware vessels, the presence of these vessels is not due to residuality (see table 7.3). Although Cistercian wares are on average only 16% complete, this is still relatively high and includes early decorated forms such as a type 4 cup, SAND*1313*, recovered from the kitchen area (D). However, there are no Midlands purple vessels which are contemporary with Cistercian wares and, unlike Pontefract (see below, 8.4.4), late Humberwares and other late medieval forms are also absent. Some early yellow wares are present, not least two salts (SAND*647* and 648), although other vessels can only be tentatively identified as separating early and fully developed yellow wares is notoriously difficult (Moorhouse and Slowikowski 1992, 95). The presence of Cistercian and transitional vessels alongside the absence of other outmoded fabrics suggests their presence within the Civil War assemblage is far from accidental. Their prominence in social drinking highlights the significance tradition played in such practices, a phenomenon which will be discussed in greater detail below (see below, 9.5.1). The absence of tin-glazed earthenware, with only one small sherd of manganese mottled ware (SAND151), and fragments of just three slipware vessels, two from the motte (area MA, SAND*917* and *1601*) and one from the barbican ditch (SAND*1600*), emphasises the lack of contemporary fashionable materials. Slipware was in common production by the mid-17th century and tin-glazed earthenware had a flourishing production in continental Europe and certain English towns, including London and Norwich (Barker 1993, 11; Draper 2001, 26). Although they comprise only a small element of other assemblages, including Pontefract and Eccleshall, the lack of these artefacts at Sandal is significant. It suggests that either those responsible for the removal of goods from the castle placed a greater importance on slipware and tin-glazed artefacts than those at other castles, or that they were never present in significant numbers in the first place. The presence of other unusual objects, such as a limited number of imported vessels (see below, 7.4.6), suggests the latter explanation is more likely. Therefore, the Sandal assemblage suggests a garrison both physically and psychologically firmly embedded within a local, rather than national, identity.

The diversity in both date and type within the assemblage at Sandal suggests the procurement of ceramics at the castle was far more complex than a single bulk order. This is confirmed by historical evidence elsewhere; at Great Chalfield, for example, ceramic purchases were made piecemeal, such as an individual jug or a few dishes, rather than as a bulk order (Pafford 1940, 72; see table 3.1). Although garrisons often fared better than marching armies the local area and its inhabitants were required to supplement their diet as supply trains, particularly those belonging to the King towards the end of the war, were notoriously unreliable (Edwards 1998, 250-251). Given the short-term nature of those provisions, in which soldiers carried no more than a week's rations in their snapsacks[23] (Edwards 1998, 256), it is highly unlikely that wholesale purchases would have been made for basic items such as pottery.

Despite this, it is likely that the majority of vessels came from local sources, both due to similarities in fabric (Bears 1983, 219) and the distinctive Wrenthorpe fingermarks which are present on 30 of the selected vessels (24 drinking vessels, four fine handled jars, one handled pancheon and a costrel). This mark, linked to only a small number of kiln sites at Wrenthorpe (Brears 1971b, 21-22; Moorhouse and Slowikowski 1992, 97), is directly associated with the local area and therefore has the potential to play a significant role in group identity. Unlike Pontefract, we know only a few names of those who garrisoned the castle. However, a declaration of intent to hold the castle issued on July 22nd 1645 (Whalley 1645a, 118) is signed by the following individuals:

- George Bonivant	- Tobias Swinden	-Henry Gascoigne	-Richard Horsfall
- Roger Portington	- Henry Ramsden	-John Benson	-Robert Benson
	- William Paulden	-Timothy Paulden	

Of these several were local men of significance. A declaration of allegiance to the king signed by the Pontefract garrison signed on 20th July 1648 includes the names of George Bonevant, John Benson and Timothy Paulden along with John Horsfall of Stonehall (Fox 1827, 170, 241). Lieutenant Colonel Roger Portington was a local Justice of the Peace, being from Barnby Dun, just over 20 miles from Sandal and also appears as one

[23] It is from this word that the more familiar term knapsack is derived.

of the original members of the Pontefract garrison (Boothroyd 1807, 152; Walker 1997, 5). A 'Mr Gascone' and 'Capt Romsden' are also mentioned in reference to Pontefract, as is Sir John Ramsden, a possible relation and a 'Captain Benson' of Wakefield (Fox 1827,172; Walker 1997, 5-6, 20) whilst William and Timothy Paulden played a significant role in the recapture of Pontefract to instigate the third siege (Paulden 1702; Boothroyd 1807, 274, 284). In addition to shared officers, there was also communication between the two, as on the 8th May 1645, 'this night Captin Horsfold (wth his man) went forth to Sandoll Castle' from Pontefract (Walker 1997, 29)[24]. The number of identical names within both garrisons suggests there was frequent movement of individuals between the two castles prior to the surrender of Pontefract and some of the garrison may have made their way to Sandal after the surrender despite being ordered to march to Newark (Fox 1827, 226). As many of the officers garrisoning Pontefract were local it is highly likely that a high proportion of the infantry also had local ties.

The garrisoning of Sandal by a local population provides an explanation for the presence of local products at the castle, with those inhabiting the castle providing whatever they felt they could expose to the risk of loss. This also lends a particular emphasis to vessels that could be easily identified with the castle's vicinity, as their use can be seen to reaffirm the links a local community had with their surrounding area. The declaration of garrison that 'for the preservation…of our allegiance we are intrusted with this hold as it [sic] Sanctuarie' (Whalley 1645a) is noteworthy in this context, as the sanctuary was not just for a group of loyal men but also a sanctuary for a group of people for whom this was one of the few places in their homeland which was still recognisable.

7.4.6 Imported vessels

The local character of Sandal is highlighted by the lack of imported material, most notably the absence of Rhenish stoneware vessels which are present at a large number of mid-17th century sites (Gaimster 1997, 94). Only two types of imported vessel types

[24] Previously translations of this interpret Horsfold as Horsfall (Fox 1827, 195) and this man is likely to be the same Richard Horsfall who signed the declaration of intent in July 1645.

are represented. The first are a group of six small storage jars of unknown provenance, but likely to be Mediterranean in origin (A. Irving, *pers. comm.*) whilst the second type are eight Martincamp flasks. These are supposedly made in France (Hurst *et al.* 1986, 103-104) but there is evidence that such flasks were also produced at English production sites such as Ticknall, Staffordshire. At least two of the vessels from Sandal (SAND*1617* and 1619) may have been produced within the Humber region as they are manufactured from a fabric that is both softer and more oxidised than Martincamp vessels (A. Irving, *pers. comm*.).

Imported vessels are concentrated within two areas of the castle. Of the eight Martincamp flasks found, six (SAND*1616*, *1618*, 1619, 1620, 1621 and 1622) are located on the motte and the other two (SAND*1617* and 1623) were deposited within the larder (SCL) and the Barbican Ditch (BDA). The Mediterranean small storage jars (SAND*1625*, *1626*, *1627*, *1628*, *1629* and 1630) all have the code SC65, although these were recovered from the kitchen (area D or SCK) according to the original report (Moorhouse 1983d, 213). Their limited area of consumption suggests they had a specific social use restricted to the areas in which they were consumed. The small storage jars are particularly unusual as there are no parallels in the region and their restriction to a single context indicates they may have been the property of a single person.

7.5 Vessel Glass

The re-evaluation of the vessel glass from the castle revealed several discrepancies with the original report. Vessel 74, originally identified as a small bottle, was composed of 18th-century lead glass and thus is a later intrusion. Other vessels revised include vessel 73, too small to be identifiable, and vessel 45, which is too small to positively identify as a urinal but is of medieval date (H. Willmott, *pers. comm.*). Three other vessels were also too fragmentary for identification. As a result 31 identifiable vessels were recovered from Civil War phases, including six from supposedly earlier phases that were reassigned after analysis of the pottery (table 7.4).

The distribution of these vessels (fig. 7.12) shows that the largest group, sixteen items consisting predominantly of small bottles, were found outside the kitchen (building D).

Despite assertions that ‘little glass was found on the motte’ (Moorhouse 1983c, 226), ten vessels were found within this area, the majority from the area outside the north-west tower (MDX, see below). Only two identified vessels, a dish retrieved from both the barbican ditch (BDX) and an uncertain location, and a goblet from the outer drawbridge (AD) were found elsewhere. This restriction to certain areas of the castle suggests their role was highly specialised and related to specific social discourse within the garrison.

It has been suggested that the kitchen was a dispensary during the Civil War (Moorhouse 1983c, 226) and this is supported by the number of small bottles and small storage jars within this area. Whilst they will be discussed in more detail below (see below, 7.8.2), they indicate the unique nature of the assemblage within this area of the castle. A rare surgeon’s bill from the Civil War indicates the medicines used within this period for the treatment of three severely wounded soldiers, and it is likely that many of these may have been contained within glass bottles of the form recovered from Sandal:

	£	s	d
Imprs. A Cordiall potion	0	2	4
It. A vulnerary drinke	0	3	8
It. 2 suppositories	0	0	6
It. A sanative pectorall drinke	0	3	4
It. A pectoral trochiske	0	0	4
It. An opening electuary	0	1	4
It. A pectoral Lincture	0	2	1
It. A Cordiall potion for 2	0	4	8

(SP 28/248 cited in Tennant 1992, 145)

The assemblage on the motte is also interesting, consisting as it does of three cucurbits, a flask, a goblet and four bottles. The cucurbits are of particular note, as other alchemical equipment, including both cucurbits and alembics, were recovered from an earlier phase of the Barbican Ditch (BDE) on the other side of the castle (Moorhouse 1983c, 225). Although distilling was used primarily in the production of medicines (Willmott 2002, 101) the removal of these three vessels may indicate another use, as it

is unlikely occurred in this corner of the motte when the bulk of medicines were dispensed from the kitchen. As the ceramic assemblage supports the suggestion that material within the castle was often adapted for different purposes during the siege (see above, 6.3.4), distillation may have been intentionally used to produce strong alcohol, which was deemed to have medicinal properties as well as satisfying the appetite (Moorhouse 1972, 84). Clarendon, in his history of the Civil War, noted that the Parliamentary garrison of Gloucester 'behaved themselves with great Courage and Resolution' but when they were captured on their sallies they 'were always drunk; and, after they are recover'd, they confes'd, "that the Governour always gave the Party that made the Sally, as much Wine and strong Water as they desired to drink: so that it seems their mettle was not purely natural"' (Clarendon 1705, 341). There are interesting parallels between this and the Sandal defenders, who 'were not (as I remember) above fourscore in number but a pack of as bold and desperate fellows as were in all that Country' (Bishop 1645) and, along with the flask and goblet found within the same area, this indicates that the cucurbits on the motte may have had an alcoholic rather than medicinal use. When associated with the ceramic vessels found in the same area, they provide a comprehensive picture of the social discourse on the motte, which is explored in greater depth below (see below, 7.8.1).

7.6 Other items associated with food and drink

There are fourteen metal objects associated with the consumption of food and drink (table 7.5), the distribution of which can be seen in figure 7.12. These are primarily knives, although a tankard, skillet or cauldron rim, a dish and a cheese strainer are also represented.

The distribution of knives around the castle is to be expected, as knives were a personal item possessed by everyone during this period. The cheese strainer found within the workshop (SC65) is of particular interest as it indicates the garrison produced their own food within the castle. This is supported by the sickles and pitchforks retrieved from the site, although the latter could also have been used as improvised weapons, Prince Rupert's troops being reportedly equipped with pitch-forks, clubs, scythes and chopping knives (Tennant 1992, 93). Nevertheless, the range of domestic metalwork suggests the garrison was self-sufficient, which given the erratic nature of the Royalist supply chain

is to be expected. The other vessels, including the tankard, skillet/cauldron and dish are all located in the south of the castle and serve as an indication of the types of vessels which were in use by the garrison but which have been lost from the archaeological record.

7.7 Evidence of foodstuffs

The inferences for the foodstuffs consumed at the castle have been taken from contemporary accounts and the faunal analysis within the original excavation report (Griffith *et al.* 1983). However, it should be noted that most of the faunal remains were retrieved from one area of the Barbican ditch (Griffith *et al.* 1983, 341), an area noted for its comparative paucity of other material dating to the Civil War period (see above 7.4.1.2). This suggests that the material recovered from here may not be entirely indicative of the composition of the meals consumed at the castle. In addition, unlike the artefacts from the castle, no effort was made to retain detailed contextual information for the faunal remains and, as they have subsequently been destroyed, further reanalysis of the material is impossible.

Compared to Pontefract, (see fig. 3.5), the assemblage at Sandal is dominated by sheep as opposed to cattle (see fig. 7.13). Given the role of Sandal as a provider of cattle for Pontefract, this is slightly surprising but may reflect the nature of Sandal as a garrison designed to supply Pontefract rather than sustain itself. As a result, cattle, which could be easily driven, were supplied to Pontefract whereas the less mobile pigs and sheep were retained for use by the garrison resulting in large proportions of both animals at Sandal. Despite this cattle were still important, as the three foodstuffs held by the garrison at the surrender and specifically mentioned by contemporary accounts were ‘beere, corne, beefe, and other provisions good store, for so few a number’ (Coe 1645). As previously mentioned (see above, 3.4.3), there was a hierarchy in terms of meat consumed and this is maintained by the mention of beef in the accounts of surrender, despite sheep being more prevalent in the archaeological record.

There is a similar slaughter pattern to Pontefract in terms of a larger number of juveniles being killed compared to adults (Richardson 2002, 374: Griffith *et al.* 1983, 345), although this may also reflect cultural preferences (see above, 3.4.3). This is almost

certainly the case at Sandal, where the garrison was only fully besieged for the last few weeks of its fortification. Although there is mention in June 1645 that the garrison were 'in some distress for horse-meat' (Whalley 1645b, 77), it is likely this was Parliamentarian propaganda or a temporary problem which was quickly resolved. Significantly this also corresponds with the death of Sir Gervaise Cutler at Pontefract Castle on 29th June during a period of deprivation when he was only allowed a chicken and a 'poore joint of meat' (Walker 1997, 49). On the same day two bonfires, rather than the usual one, was visible from the top of Sandal Castle (Walker 1997, 50). This indicates that food deprivation, whilst being present for short periods of time, only served as a means of strengthening garrison identity rather than weakening it.

The faunal assemblage also has a high proportion of deer, representing 14% of the total bone assemblage. Of this the majority (11.5% of the total) are fallow deer, with 2.5% being red deer. The presence of a deer park surrounding Sandal provides a likely explanation for these animals being present, and Sandal would not be the first garrison to raid the local park for their own purpose. Parliamentarians are recorded as plundering the park at Pontefract of all its deer (Fox 1987, 14) and there are frequent references to similar activities elsewhere, most notably at the siege of Warwick where:

'the besiegers did breake downe the pale of Wedgnocke Parke, and daylie made havocke of the Lord Brookes Deare, killing red and fallow, male and rascal, young and old, fat and leane without distinction, and made Venison as plentifull among them as the meanest Mutton.'

(Unknown cited in Tennant 1992, 38)

The stealing of deer was conducted by both sides, Parliamentarian troops stealing the deer from the Royalist Alexander Denton (Ellis 1853, 315) whilst the Royalists pillaged the park at Broughton Castle, Oxfordshire (Tennant 1992, 75). Significantly all these acts were carried out by soldiers on parks belonging to their enemy, unlike Sandal where the garrison, loyal to the king, dined off his deer (although this bias is probably due to propaganda by both sides rather than a notable anomaly). Nevertheless, there was a great social significance in dining off venison, the meat being compared with mutton at Warwick (see above) and at Newnham Regis 'venison is almost as comman with us as beefe with you' (Ellis 1853, 317). Such extracts demonstrate how the war impacted

on social discourse, as foodstuffs normally unavailable to only the richest in society were suddenly available to all who could procure it, and at minimal cost. At Sandal this may have been an additional significance as the consumption of the king's deer would have highlighted the role of the garrison in asserting the rights of their legitimate king, mirroring the castle's role during the Wars of the Roses.

Not all food was freshly slaughtered, as indicated by the presence of cod, probably imported as preserved stockfish from the coast (Griffith *et al.* 1983, 341; Nicholson 2002, 394). In addition, food was also processed on the site, as indicated by the cheese strainer and the mention of unrefined crops such as corn in the report of surrender. Evidence of the processing of oats was found at the castle in the form of a bakestone, although this may have been from an earlier period and has been omitted from the final report (Brears 1974, 58). The range of foodstuffs evident at Sandal highlights the social difficulties faced by the garrison. Although Sandal was prepared for everyday peacetime activities such as agriculture and food preparation, these were increasingly put under pressure by the demands of the conflict and exposure to foodstuffs such as venison which may have been unfamiliar to many of the castle's inhabitants. It is in this atmosphere of the mundane experienced within the extraordinary that social discourse at the castle must be considered.

7.8 Holistic interpretation of material culture

Having analysed the different materials comprising of the assemblages at Sandal it is essential to study them holistically within the context of their consumption in order to examine the social discourse across the site. As the cross-matching sherds indicate distinct areas of activity (see above, 7.4.2) material culture will be discussed in the context of these discrete zones, namely the motte, the workshop, the kitchen and larder, the Great Hall, the constable's lodgings and the drawbridge.

7.8.1 The motte (area codes preceded by M)

The ceramic assemblage from the motte (fig. 7.14) follows many of the broad trends visible across the site (see above, 6.3.3). Nonetheless, there are three notable exceptions: a large number of liquid transportation vessels (eleven, 15% of the assemblage); very few food preparation and serving vessels (two, 3% of the

assemblage) and a comparatively large number of albarellos (fourteen, 20% of the assemblage).

The presence of a large number of small storage vessels, along with the increased number of fineware vessels used for cooking (see above, 6.3.4), demonstrates the short-term nature of provisioning in the castle. Unlike Sandal, where small storage vessels outnumber heavy duty storage vessels by two to one (fourteen vessels compared to seven), other castles, such as Pontefract and Beeston (for Pontefract see 8.4.7.1; for Beeston, Noake 1993, D2) have far more cisterns or large storage jars which were used to store large amounts of liquid and foodstuffs. Although small storage vessels are seen as ointment pots, they also held small amounts of food such as paste. Their presence is perhaps indicative that the small garrison at Sandal was an impermanent one, without the permanency given to Pontefract. Analysis of Nathan Drake's diary and other contemporary documents would support this, as armies usually lived off the land rather than exploring long-term storage options. For example, at Coventry the population only made provision for producing and rationing foodstuffs when it became evident that the King might besiege the town (Tennant 1992, 124). Rather than retaining foodstuffs, Sandal appears to have taken on the role of forager for Pontefract, at one point driving a herd of cattle towards the castle to prevent the garrison from starving (Walker 1997, 36). Therefore, the number of small storage jars on the motte suggests the troops stationed here only intended to be there for a short period of time, and accordingly took the appropriate amount of foodstuffs. Such characteristics are noted at Pontefract, where troops fortifying the church for 24 hours took with them drink and food as well as ammunition (Walker 1997, 42).

The large number of liquid transportation vessels, including six costrels, two jugs and three flasks, may be related to the presence of the well in tower MD, the only well within the castle which was useable during the 16th-century visitations of the site (see table 7.1). Although water was far from the drink of choice it was resorted to during times of crisis, as attested by the diary of Nathan Drake during the siege at Pontefract (Walker 1997, 30; see 8.8.1). Further evidence of the motte being a focus for drinking is the concentration of Martincamp flasks within this area. Within a context of consumption their distinct form is important. Often covered in wicker (Allan 1984, 113), it is probably these which are depicted as bandoleers in the *English Irish Souldier*

(fig. 3.1). The reference to the flasks as 'canary bottles' demonstrates their association with alcohol, and their presence in this area highlights the important role played by alcohol during the final days of the siege. The presence of glass vessels associated with alcohol (see above, 7.5) also reinforces the notion of this area as a focus for drinking.

The concentration of drinking paraphernalia in this area can be associated with its position as the highest point of the castle. The motte was used as a means of communicating with the garrison at Pontefract through the use of bonfires, the presence of which are frequently noted in Drake's diary (Walker 1997). Bonfires were important as a means of strengthening group cohesion, and were used at times of stress to suggest the appearance of good news to the garrison at Pontefract. For example on 10th July 1645, just over a week before Pontefract surrendered, four bonfires on Sandal were used to signify the escape of a boy and two men from Pontefract to ascertain the proximity of a possible relief force (Walker 1997, 55). As subsequent events demonstrate, no such help was forthcoming but the incident serves to show the important role Sandal played as both logistical and psychological support to the larger and stronger garrison at Pontefract. The important role the motte played in the maintenance of social discourse both within and between garrisons is also indicated by other material culture found here, including a tobacco box deposited outside the North tower (area MDX; A. Goodall 1983, 234). Unfortunately there is insufficient detail in the clay pipe report (Lawrence 1983) to consider this artefact alongside the distribution of clay pipes within the castle.

The lighting of bonfires and similar social activities was often associated with the consumption of alcohol or a suitable substitute such as water, a subject that will be explored in greater detail below (see below, 9.5.2). As a result, the presence of transportation vessels alongside a large proportion of drinking vessels may indicate the important role played by the highest, and most natural focal point, of the castle in the social discourse of the site.

The assemblage on the motte is thus indicative of a social discourse of drinking and short-term consumption of food. The presence of costrels and jugs is illustrative of communal aspects focused on the tower from which bonfires were lit to boost the morale of the garrisons at both Sandal and Pontefract. The use of the northern tower (MD) for this purpose is particularly relevant as it is the 'New Tower' constructed by

Richard III as part of his programme of renovations for the castle (Butler *et al.* 1983, 28). The use of a building with direct links to past rulers underlines the importance of the past in garrison cohesion, serving as a physical reminder of the cause which they were desperately fighting for.

Although not associated with the consumption of food and drink, elements of the armour found on the mount should be briefly discussed as they represent a further continuation of the past in the present. Area MF produced two elements of a jack of plate dating to the mid-16th century whilst two arrowheads were also recovered from area MG (Credland 1983, 265-266). Jacks of plate are not unusual finds at Civil War sites, having also been recovered from Beeston (Eaves 1989), Pontefract (Eaves 2002, 339-341) and St. Paul-in-the-Bail well, Lincoln (Egan 2008, 70). The significance of these will be discussed in greater detail below (see 9.4), but they should be mentioned in this context as this is the only area of the castle which produced archaic militaria. The association of the past with a specific place is of particular interest here, serving as a clear demonstration of the interaction between group identity and the maintenance of tradition.

7.8.2 The workshop, kitchen and larder (SC65, SCK/D and SCL/L)

Although the workshop can be distinguished from the kitchen and larder both in terms of location and archaeological assemblages within the original excavation report, there may be significant overlap between ceramics with the code SC65 and those labelled SCK/D or SCL/L. This is demonstrated by the small storage jars from the kitchen labelled as SC65 (see above, 7.4.6). As a result, the assemblages from these locations are discussed together alongside area SCL/K.

The assemblage from the workshop, kitchen and larder consists primarily of drinking vessels (31 vessels representing 41% of the assemblage). It also contains a large number of small storage vessels (eighteen vessels, 24% of the assemblage) and an even smaller number of large storage vessels than the assemblage from the motte (five vessels, 7% of the assemblage; see fig. 7.15). However, unlike the motte it includes only two liquid transportation vessels: one tiny costrel (SAND*1709*) and a jug (SAND*1609*). The small capacity of the costrel is unusual and suggests it was for individual rather than group

consumption and may have contained spirits rather than wine or beer. This area is also remarkable for the large collection of metal vessels; three knives, a tankard and the cheese strainer (table 7.5).

The workshop was a specialised area within the garrison, unfinished castings and an extensive number of ironworking tools indicating its use as a forge (I. Goodall 1983, 240). The range of implements, including masonry, woodworking and agricultural tools, indicates the wide range of tasks conducted by the garrison aside from their military role. This specialization also explains why the area possesses a low number of vessels apart from drinking vessels and small storage vessels, as the area was put to an industrial as opposed to a domestic purpose. The high number of agricultural tools may indicate this area was also used as a storage area for items that were only used sporadically.

The large number of small storage vessels, at least five of which can be specifically assigned to the kitchen or larder (SAND*1013*, *1073*, *1074*, 1290 and *1603*), is complemented by the large glass assemblage from the same area, leading to the suggestion that the kitchen was used for medicinal purposes (see above, 7.5; Moorhouse 1983c 213). This may also explain the large number of fine storage jars from this area, particularly if some of these objects were employed as chamberpots (eleven vessels, 14% of the assemblage). Surgeons were important members of any garrison and performed an important role tending the wounded and treating the infections and fever which were rife within most garrisons, four ‘chirugions’ and one ‘phisition’ are listed by Drake at Pontefract (Walker 1997, 15). The bodies of nine individuals were uncovered in the inner courtyard immediately outside the Great Hall (see fig. 7.1), of which three had wounds and artefacts consistent with shrapnel, whilst one, an individual with difficulty in walking due to bilateral hip dysplasia, had evidence of a broken arm which had been set to a satisfactory standard, suggesting there was at least one surgeon present at the siege (Manchester 1983, 337-338).

Although the surgeon could also fight if required, the presence of a man with hip dysplasia raises important questions regarding the role of apparent non-combatants during the conflict. The tale of the deaf, dumb mute, John Dyott who shot the Parliamentarian commander Lord Brooke at the siege of Lichfield may well be

apocryphal (Ellis and Atherton 2009, 237); nevertheless there is little doubt that individuals such as Dyott and the man from Sandal still played an active role during the Civil War. It has been suggested that the individual at Sandal, despite his muscular build, his 'abnormality would almost certainly preclude this man from active combat duties' and as a result he may have been a smith (Manchester 1983, 337). Whatever his occupation, his presence within the garrison highlights the way in which the conflict affected all sections of society with everyone having the potential to play an active role.

The use of the kitchen as a surgery represents a clear continuity with the past as earlier phases of this building and the nearby barbican ditch also contained medieval ceramic and glass distillation vessels (Mayes 1983, 49; Moorhouse 1983a, 191-194; 1983c, 225). To some extent this parallel is unsurprising given the long-term association of food with medicine within medieval and early post-medieval healthcare (see above, 3.4). In addition, and despite its dilapidated state (see above, 7.3), the building was probably the safest area of the castle, protected through the construction of a Royalist outwork. However, the continuation of healthcare between the medieval and post-medieval phases is still significant, indicating that whilst social discourse in some areas of the castle, such as the motte, may have changed, in others it very much reflected continuity with the past.

7.8.3 The Great Hall (areas K and J)

Although the assemblage from this area is small, due to the fact that only the foundations of the building survived (Mayes 1983, 56), the largest single category of vessels here is food preparation, accounting for 26% of the assemblage (six vessels), compared with an average of just 11% from across the rest of the castle (fig. 7.16). This contrasts with the activities on the motte (see above, 7.8.1), where drinking activities dominated, and would suggest the Great Hall was primarily used for the preparation and serving of food. The unique nature of this area is also indicated by the high proportion of yellow ware vessels, comprising of fourteen out of the twenty-five vessels. The significance of colour has already been discussed (see above, 3.3), with yellow in particular being linked to the preparation and consumption of food (Yentsch 1991, 193-195; Cumberpatch 2002, 222; 2003, n.p.). These vessels include heavy duty storage vessels, SAND1589 and *1591*, in a yellow ware fabric, which is particularly unusual as

this category of vessel is more usually found in a brown glazed fabric. One of these, 1591, is a heavily sooted coarseware vessel in a fabric (Yw6) which is similar to many saggar fabrics, containing large amounts of shale and with a frequently sooted exterior. This, like the distinctive Wrenthorpe mark (see above, 7.4.5), is closely associated with West Yorkshire including Pontefract, Huddersfield and Leeds (Cumberpatch 2002, 189) and thus serves as a further demonstration of the physical embodiment of local loyalties.

The fact that this area has a relatively low number of sooted vessels (see fig. 7.10) does not preclude the use of the Great Hall for cooking, as sizeable cooking vessels would be made from metal and therefore are unlikely to survive archaeologically. As has been previously noted (see above, 3.6.2), communal dining played an important part in social discourse amongst the infantry. Estimates of the garrison at the surrender of Sandal Castle range from eighty to one hundred individuals (Coe 1645; Bishop 1645), and the Great Hall was the only room large enough to accommodate this number of men. It also benefitted, along with the kitchen, with the extra protection provided by the Royalist outwork. Sandal was not alone in having a large communal dining area, for example at Great Chalfield, Wiltshire, wages were paid to a soldier 'for making clean the hall and tables where the soldiers dine' (Pafford 1940, 77). The composition of the assemblage highlights the specialised role played by this building in terms of both the physical appearance of the vessels consumed and their form. Although there is evidence of communal consumption taking place in other areas, such as the motte, this is clearly linked to active bombardment rather than the long periods in which the garrison was not under attack (see above, 7.8.1). Under normal circumstances, the assemblage from the Great Hall suggests men did not dine in individual groups around the wall, but instead prepared and consumed food communally within a single room (*contra* Brears 1983, 224).

The role of the Great Hall as the symbolic heart of the community, in which food was prepared and consumed, places particular significance on the positioning of the Civil War burials immediately outside this building (see fig. 7.1). Their position here, rather than outside the kitchen where they presumably had been treated (see above, 7.8.2), is particularly unusual as they are orientated approximately northeast-southwest rather than east-west. This means the graves, rather than being orientated for conventional Christian burial, respect the orientation of the Great Hall and lie almost parallel to it. As

a result, their location serves as a highly visible reminder of group identity through forming a physical reminder of past comrades. Therefore, the Great Hall served to cement communal identity and loyalty not only through the consumption of food within its walls but also in the location of burials which the garrison would pass daily when entering and exiting the building.

7.8.4 The Constable's Lodgings (areas P, R, Q, T and AK)

The assemblage from this area is small, largely because the Constable's Lodgings were timber-framed and, as a result, its foundations and associated deposits are insubstantial when compared with the rest of the castle (Butler 1983b, 79). Therefore, any conclusions made from the 32 identifiable vessels must be tentative, but there are still significant observations to be made regarding social discourse in this area. The majority of vessels (eleven objects) originate from building R, but there is a wide spread of vessels throughout the area and the composition of assemblages is fairly uniform given the low quantity of vessels present.

Analysis of the assemblage suggests a large bias towards drinking vessels, with these comprising 66% of the total assemblage (21 vessels, see fig. 7.17). This percentage is higher than the proportion of drinking vessels from the motte and is compounded by the high level of archaic material, consisting of six Cistercian ware vessels and one vessel in a transitional Cistercian ware to blackware form (SAND651). This is unsurprising, as this was the only area in good repair when the castle was surveyed in the 16th century and it was inhabited until 1564 at the earliest (see table 7.1). Unlike other areas, which were largely unoccupied during this period, the continued occupation within the lodgings may have meant drinking vessels such as those deposited within this area were still present in the building when it was acquisitioned by the Royalist garrison. Nevertheless, the continued presence of antiquated vessels within the drinking assemblages is a further reminder of the importance of tradition at the castle as, like the motte, the Constable's Lodgings were one of the key areas modified by Richard III (Butler 1983b, 79).

The presence of a single food preparation vessel and one unsooted cooking vessel is unsurprising as, compared to the Great Hall, the Constable's Lodgings offered only a

small degree of protection to its inhabitants and even when under bombardment the stone construction of the former was infinitely preferable to the timber construction of the latter. The difference in function is emphasized by the fact that only three, unidentified vessels out of the total assemblage are yellow glazed, the rest being glazed brown or black. There are also no small storage vessels, despite these being numerous elsewhere in the castle.

The restricted assemblage within this area may suggest that, unlike other areas such as the motte and Great Hall, it played only a minor social role in the garrison. Given the construction of the building this is unsurprising, but it highlights how the occupation of Sandal was not homogenous but instead was comprised of discrete areas of social discourse, each with their own distinct significance to the castle's inhabitants.

7.8.5 The drawbridge area (Areas AA, AC and AD, YY and areas preceded by DB)

Like the majority of the site, the assemblage from the area surrounding the drawbridge is characterised by a large volume of drinking vessels constituting 48% of the assemblage (eighteen vessels) (see fig. 7.18). Significantly, the four food preparation vessels from this assemblage all originate from a single building just inside the main entrance to the castle (building AA), an area described by the original excavation as being unoccupied by 1600 (Butler 1983b, 79). The base of another vessel associated with the serving of food, a glass dish (see above, 7.5), was also found near here. This timber-framed building was constructed during the rebuild of Richard III (Butler 1983b, 79) and is described as having no internal floor levels within the original excavation report (Mayes 1983, 54). It is also located within the area which apparently witnessed the heaviest Parliamentarian bombardment as indicated by the distribution of lead shot and cannon balls within the castle (Butler 1983b, 80; Credland 1983, 260-263).

The concentration of military activity around this area suggests the need for a smaller company of men here and this is confirmed by the separate area of food preparation and the two cooking vessels, one from building AA and another from YY, the courtyard near to the outer drawbridge (SAND*1450* and 1590). Three small storage jars found in nearby area AB may also relate to the preparation of food. The distinct nature of this

area, with a garrison housed within a wooden building maintaining one of the most vulnerable areas of the castle, may have created a different group identity of exposed individuals removed from the mass consumption of the Great Hall. Indeed, there are strong comparisons to be drawn between the occupation of this building and the dining assemblage from the motte (see above, 6.3.4). The presence of small assemblages such as these suggests that, whilst communal consumption between the whole garrison was preferred, in the final days of the siege this became increasingly impossible due to Parliamentarian bombardment and the need to defend specific areas of the castle. As a result, the assemblages from this area serves as a demonstration of the physical and psychological strain of the besieged garrison as communal ties came under increasing pressure.

7.9 Conclusion

The analysis of social discourse at Sandal relies on an understanding of the biography of the site and the significance this had on the garrison in the brutal reality of the Civil War. Although this will be discussed further with reference to Eccleshall and Pontefract Castles, the role of tradition in the maintenance of the Sandal garrison cannot be under-estimated. The continuity of use for many of the buildings, including communal dining in the Great Hall and the medicinal use of the kitchen, is indicative of the strong sense of tradition endorsed by the use of outmoded drinking vessels and other equipment such as armour. In addition, a Parliamentarian report suggests that the garrison, 'were desperate fellowes. I remember that not long since when they made a needlesse salley, only to fetch in May, and May flowers' (Walbancke 1645). The celebration of May Day through the collection of flowers was a long-standing tradition noted in particular for sexual promiscuity and frivolity (Cressy 1989, 21-22), and it is likely that the garrison made such a sally to rile its besiegers who stereotypically disapproved of an event with such pagan aspersions.

A close examination of Sandal demonstrates how the occupation of the site was not homogenous but instead consisted of several separate zones of social discourse. In particular, the use of the Great Hall for dining and the motte for drinking rituals indicates how different areas of the castle were utilized for various activities dependent on their physical attributes. The motte, due to its height, was a place of communication

and reinforcing the bonds of loyalty not only between the garrison at Sandal, but also that at Pontefract. Ultimately this is how the occupation of Sandal should be viewed, not as the typical Civil War siege site but instead of a castle playing an important role in the maintenance of morale and social discourse both within the local inhabitants but also its more powerful neighbour. It is this neighbour which forms the focus of the next chapter.

8 Pontefract

8.1 Introduction

Considered by some near contemporaries to be 'the Greatest and Strongest Castle in England' (Paulden 1702, 5), it is perhaps unsurprising that from 1642 until 1649 Pontefract played a major role in the Civil War. Situated within the town of Pontefract to the east of the Great North Road (SE4595722373), the royal stronghold was of great strategic importance due to its position on main routes leading north-south and east-west. It already had an infamous reputation, having been witness to the suspicious death of Richard II and the execution site for several prominent figures during the Wars of the Roses.

The fifteen months of Royalist occupation, details of which have been outlined above (see 2.8.3) have created a rich documentary record that includes Nathan Drake's siege diary for the first and second sieges, and a first-hand account of the occupation of the castle during the third siege (Walker 1997; Paulden 1702). The presence of other evidence, including the demolition accounts (see above, 4.6.3) and several siege diagrams, means Pontefract is one of the most well documented sieges of the conflict. The siege and associated documents have been summarised thoroughly by subsequent authors, including Fox (1987), Holmes (1887) and the slightly inaccurate Boothroyd (1807; Quinn 1992, 6). Modern summaries of these accounts are offered both within the excavation report for the castle (Roberts 2002a) and an evaluation produced for the 350th anniversary of the siege (Quinn 1992). These, combined with analysis of material from excavations from the castle, reveal a complex social discourse in which communality and tradition played a prominent role.

8.2 Fortification

The royal status of Pontefract meant it had been subject to repairs throughout the preceding century and a half, including a new chapel built during the mid-late 16th century (Colvin *et al.* 1975, 287; Roberts 2002c, 410). Like Sandal it had also played a prominent part in the Wars of the Roses, although, unlike Sandal, Pontefract was originally under Lancastrian rather than Yorkist control. Fifty years later, in 1536, it

was surrendered to the rebels during the Pilgrimage of Grace without a shot being fired. Despite the castle being in some need of repair and lacking weaponry including guns, bows and arrows, the governor was subsequently executed for treason (Colvin *et al.* 1975, 288). By 1618 an estimated £3,000 was required for restoration and, despite only £750 being advanced in the subsequent two years, it was in good repair by 1640 (Colvin *et al*. 1975, 290). An oil painting completed during this period (fig. 8.1) depicts a castle which was still largely intact, although with some decay on the walls of the outer courtyards. Significantly John Taylor in 1622 stated that:

> ‘To dinner I to *Pomfret* quickly rode,
> Where good hot Venison staid for my abode,
> I thanke the worshipfull *George Shillito*,
> He fill'd my men and me, and let us goe.
> There did I well view ouer twice or thrice,
> A strong, a faire, and ancient Edifice:
> Reedifi'd, where it was ruin'd most,
> At th'high and hopefull Prince of *Wales* his cost.’

(Taylor 1630, 15. Extract from *A very Merrie Wherrie-Ferry-Voyage* lines 828-835).

The poem suggests that during the years preceding the Civil Wars the popular perception of the castle was a stronghold in good repair with close links to Charles I, the Prince of Wales in Taylor’s work. Charles himself was impressed by the castle when he visited in 1633, although the Church and outbuildings including the stable were in need of some repair (Colvin *et al.* 1975, 290). The close links the town had with the crown cemented the allegiance of many of the local inhabitants, as indicated by the large number of townspeople who garrisoned the castle during the first and second sieges (Quinn 1992, 44; see below, 8.4.5). Although George Shillito himself did not participate in the conflict, Jarvis and George Shillito, probably his son and grandson, were both part of the original garrison (Fox 1987, 171).

8.2.1 Building Function

The presence of so many documents relating to the siege means that, unlike Sandal and Eccleshall, the archaeology can be compared with fragmentary accounts of the function of individual buildings before and during the conflict, although these primarily relate to their military function. These include a description of the castle from 1643 which gives some illustration of the perceived uses of the castle in the year before the first siege began in earnest (SRO GD 34/900, reproduced in Roberts 2002a, 440). The account includes one entry pertaining to the Constable Tower, 'the lower storie beinge two dungeons for Prisoners and three Chambers above' (Roberts 2002a, 440). Given that as many as 240 Parliamentarians were imprisoned at the castle during this period (Fox 1987, 5-6; Roberts 2002d, 413) this remark is probably more than supposition. As a result plaster graffiti found in the cellar deposits of the Constable Tower deemed by some to be Royalist (Bostwick and Roberts 2002, 293) is more likely to be due to Parliamentarian prisoners, thus demonstrating the difficulty in drawing clear divisions between Parliamentarian and Royalist deposits in the archaeological record.

The only rooms described as fair in the 1643 report are those within the King's and Queen's Towers. That these rooms were reserved for the use of officers during the siege is subject to conjecture, but when the Royalists seized in the castle in 1648, the Parliamentarian soldiers 'retreated to the Queen's Tower' (Glemham 1648, 2) suggesting this was thought to be either the strongest point of the castle or its symbolic heart. It is extremely likely that the Great Hall, adjacent to the Queen's Tower, was the communal centre of the garrison during the first and second sieges, as this was where the governor consulted with the garrison over a possible surrender on the 16th July 1645 (Walker 1997, 58). Drake's diary also suggests the separation of officers and men, with set rooms assigned as 'Gentlemen's Chambers' (Walker 1997, 58) and some of the lower classes sleeping in the open on the top of towers (Walker 1997, 38; Holmes 1887, 109). The importance of the King's Tower is further emphasised by the placement of one of the two flags of defiance on its roof on 17th July 1645, the other being placed on the Keep (Walker 1997, 59), and this is also supported archaeologically, in particular by the plasterwork. Plaster from the Constable Tower and bakehouse/brewhouse was comprised predominantly of gypsum rather than lime, which was used in the King's Tower and Elizabethan Chapel. The presence of the latter indicates plastered ceilings

'as would be expected from their [the King's Tower and Chapel's] relative polite status as compared with the Constable Tower and Brewhouse' (Bostwick 2002, 163). Therefore, the lack of plastered ceilings in the Constable Tower suggests that the surroundings were less fine than those in the eastern range and, although the Constable Tower produced the largest assemblage from the castle, this may not be representative of elite occupation during the Civil War. Unfortunately the King's Tower was only partially sampled and the surrounding rooms, including the Queen's Tower and Great Hall, were unexcavated so a full comparison between these two areas is impossible.

Despite its occupation during the three sieges it should be remembered that for large periods of the war the main garrison of Pontefract did not inhabit the castle. From 1642 until the first siege the Royalist garrison, consisting of 200 infantry and 50 cavalry, were billeted within the town, and whilst under Parliamentarian control in 1645-6 this probably increased to 600 infantry and 200 Parliamentarian cavalry (Quinn 1992, 19). It was the movement of men from the town to the castle which allowed Pontefract to be seized by Royalists in 1648, as the Royalists disguised themselves as townspeople to gain entry to the castle (Paulden 1702, 7). As a result the material deposited at the site is probably more representative of a garrison under siege, when the inhabitants were forced to inhabit the castle.

8.3 Archaeological Excavations

The first excavations at Pontefract were directed by Richard Holmes in the late 19th century (Holmes 1882b; 1883; 1887) and concentrated on the north-western quadrant of the castle, particularly the kitchen and brewhouse/bakehouse area (Roberts 2002b, 34). Further excavations coordinated by West Yorkshire Archaeology Service were conducted at the castle between 1982 and 1986 in advance of conservation and preservation of the upstanding remains (Roberts 2002e, 4-5). The results of these excavations were fully published (Roberts 2002a) and the site archive is now stored with Wakefield Museums Service.

A glance at a plan of Pontefract castle at the time of the siege (fig. 8.2) emphasises the limited nature of the excavations, which were conducted for conservation rather than research purposes (Roberts 2002e, 5). Amongst those areas receiving limited attention

were the Queen's Tower, the Keep and the Barbican, all mentioned frequently within Drake's diary (Walker 1997; Roberts 2002b, 17, 130-133[25]). The five areas which contained substantial amounts of material relating to the Civil War were:

1) The Constable Tower. Fully excavated, revealing a large depth of material due in part to its deep basement and countermine shaft (Roberts 2002b, 99-112).

2) The Elizabethan Chapel. Fully excavated, including a countermine shaft, although there was some disturbance due to Victorian excavations (Roberts 2002b, 89-99).

3) The King's Tower. Upper deposits only sampled due to instability of material (Roberts 2002b, 65-70).

4) The Bakehouse/Brewhouse. Fully excavated, including a countermine shaft, although due to Victorian excavations the deposits were only shallow (Roberts 2002b, 34-41).

5) The Kitchen. Fully excavated, although partially truncated by Victorian excavations (Gomersall and Roberts 2002).

8.4 The pottery

The ceramic assemblage from Pontefract has been subjected to previous study (Cumberpatch 2002), but has been fully reassessed to take advantage of recent development in ceramic studies and facilitate a suitable comparison with material from Sandal and Eccleshall Castles. An estimated 2,010 vessels were analysed from the five principal areas excavated, weighing in total just over 104 kg; 1,327 vessels from the

[25] The excavation report differentiates between the 'outer bailey' and the 'barbican' which has also been referred to as the 'Main Guard' (Roberts 2002b, 133). However, this differentiation does not appear to be historical, and there is no distinction made by contemporaries such as Nathan Drake. As a result the barbican refers within this study to the southern portion of the castle beyond the main gatehouse.

Constable Tower, 407 from the kitchen, 132 from the King's Tower, 78 from the Elizabethan Chapel and 65 from the brewhouse/bakehouse[26].

8.4.1 Assemblage fragmentation

Analysis of the ceramic assemblage from Pontefract (see table 8.1) indicates a high degree of fragmentation, with non-residual vessels being on average only 4.31% complete. Within the entire assemblage, only 314 out of a total of 2,010 vessels (15.62%) are at least 5% complete, the vast majority of these (261 vessels) being from the Constable Tower. This area also has the highest proportion of non-residual vessels (84.25%), suggesting the deposits here were less contaminated than other areas. The King's Tower shows a similar fragmentation profile, despite the limited excavations within this area.

It may be argued that the differences in fragmentation represent the nature of the deposits, with the deeper features of the Constable Tower being less subject to taphonomic processes and later investigations. To some extent this is true, as Victorian excavations and landscapers heavily truncated deposits in many areas (Roberts 2002d, 423). However the Elizabethan Chapel, despite containing a deep countermine shaft which was protected from later truncation, has the second lowest proportion of non-residual vessels with only 41.03% of vessels being non-residual (32 out of an estimated 78 vessels). Furthermore, the paucity of finds from this area in general (see below, 8.4.7.2) is indicative of complex social practices within the site that require further investigation.

The bakehouse/brewhouse and kitchen deposits are close to each other and share a very low proportion of vessels at least 5% complete (6.15% and 5.16% respectively). This may in part be due to Victorian excavations, with the kitchen in particular having thin deposits which were partially disturbed (Roberts 2002b, 43-6) and this is supported by the relatively low percentage of non-residual artefacts from the area (37.35% compared to an average across the site of 71.54%).

[26] An additional vessel joined between the Constable Tower and King's Tower.

Given the large size of the castle, the extent of the area destroyed, and the partial excavation of the remaining interior, it is not surprising that the fragmentation rates at Pontefract are high. Even so, the fragmentation of vessels found in deep deposits such as the Constable Tower is of interest, as these are features which may be assumed to contain largely complete vessels. The fact that they do not suggests the deposits within these features derive not from primary contexts relating to the occupation of specific buildings, but rather from later demolition practices. This is supported by sherds which join between contexts and, in one case, across the site.

8.4.2 Cross-matching sherds

As previously stated (see above, 5.4.1) only a selected number of sherds were cross-matched, although the low number of new matches resulting from this suggests that vessels were largely confined to a single context. Out of an estimated 2,010 vessels, at least 88 of these have sherds which join across contexts (see table 8.2). Only one vessel, a Frechen drinking flask (PONT407), was deposited between two areas, with a single sherd from the Constable Tower (context [83]) joining with one from the King's Tower (context [150]). Due to the limited nature of the excavations and the truncation by earlier investigations it is difficult to ascertain the significance of this. However, as [83] is a primary, as opposed to secondary, fill this cannot be attributed to later levelling activities and instead suggests material was moved around the castle during demolition. This offers an additional explanation of the high fragmentation rates found within the castle as a whole, as vessels might have been deposited in a number of different locations. This is not an unusual occurrence, having been previously identified at Sandal Castle and Kirkstall Abbey (Moorhouse 1986, 88; Moorhouse and Slowikowski 1987, 102-107), but it does suggest fills cannot be directly assigned to the buildings they originated from. This is of particular importance when establishing the phasing of contexts within the Constable Tower.

8.4.2.1 Cross-matching sherds within the Constable Tower: a reassessment of phasing

Out of an estimated 1,327 vessels from the Constable Tower, 76 had sherds with cross-context joins. As noted in the original analysis of the ceramic assemblage from the Constable Tower, analysis of these challenges the original phasing of the tower

(Cumberpatch 2002, 216). This phasing, derived principally from the clay tobacco pipes recovered from the site, identified five different sub-phases, four of which could be distinguished archaeologically:

Phase	Description	Date
5A/B	First and second sieges	1644-45
5C	Occupation of the castle by Parliament	1645
5D	Third siege	1648-49
5E	Demolition of the castle	1649

(Roberts 2002b, 108, see fig. 8.3 and table 8.3)

However, of 76 cross-joining vessels from the Constable Tower, 37 join between these phases (see table 8.2). A further 32 join within the same phase as assigned by the original excavation team and seven join between phases 5A/B and phase 5C, which excavators suggested was a levelling deposit containing residual material from earlier phases and therefore does not challenge the original phasing. However, the fact that almost half of all cross-joining sherds join between phases suggests something more complex is occurring within the deposits than suggested by the original excavation.

The 37 vessels which joined across phases were plotted, showing a wide variation of deposits (fig. 8.4). As noted by previous studies, of greatest significance is the high number of sherds joining between [99] and [103], suggesting these fills, despite being placed in phases 5D and 5A/B respectively, originated from the same source (Cumberpatch 2002, 216). Alongside cross-joins of other sherds between contexts below [82], these cross-joins suggest these contexts are the result of a single phase of deposition as opposed to several phases. There are very few joins between these contexts and those including and overlying [82], which instead form their own discrete episode of deposition linked to the levelling of the tower. Despite this, the phases are not completely distinct, as demonstrated by three anomalies:

- PONT*386*. One sherd from context [82] joins with thirteen from [83], one from [90] and three from [92]
- PONT*723*. One sherd from context [31] joins with four from [98], three from [115], two from [110] and [113] and one from [83] and [92]
- PONT*790*. Four sherds from context [28] join with one from [99]

In addition context [83], despite having more sherds joining with deposits below rather than above it, contains the large level of masonry characteristic of later deposits interpreted as demolition debris (Roberts 2002b, 111). However, [83] contained nineteen architectural fragments, compared to 108 in context [82] directly above it and three and seven fragments from contexts [90] and [98] immediately below it (Roberts 2002d, 426). Given the relative sizes of the deposits (see fig. 8.4) nineteen is more comparable with the deposits below rather than those above it. Although there is a visible trend towards increased quantities of architectural stonework in upper deposits, there is no distinct division between demolition deposits with masonry and earlier deposits without stonework. Moreover, the cross-joining sherds suggests that [82] is characteristically part of the initial phase of looting, albeit with influences indicating a transition towards the demolition of the tower.

Although these anomalies indicate the phases of deposition were far from pristine, there is enough evidence to suggest there were two, closely linked, phases of activity within the Constable Tower as opposed to several phases over the course of five years. The main arguments against this, as laid out in the original report, are outlined below along with their counterargument:

1) The dating of tobacco pipes within the deposits of the Constable Tower has been cited as the principal evidence for five separate phases (Roberts 2002b, 108). However, although there is a general trend towards later pipes in later contexts, it is only vague and is not substantial enough to justify the identification of individual events. Analysis of pipe fragments from the countermine shaft, originally attributed to phase 5A/B and 5C, suggested it did not contain any fragments dating from 1650-70 (Davey and White 2002, 229) but this covers the

entirety of the Civil War rather than the initial occupation and still contains fragments which date from 1640-1660. Only the demolition deposits, from [83] upwards, contained significant number of pipes dating from 1640-1670 and these can still be attributed to the period the tower was occupied. In addition, the alternative explanation of two separate but related phases would still agree with the analysis of pipe fragments, with earlier deposits relating to the disposal of occupation waste relating to the siege and later deposits relating to continued disposal alongside the demolition of buildings.

2) The distinct appearance of a number of deposits. Context [108/110] is described as sandy and attributed to 'the final reinstatement of the basement floor' during the Parliamentarian occupation, contrasting strongly with the 'charcoal and ash-rich deposits' of the third siege (Roberts 2002b, 111). However, these different deposits appear to be have accumulated rapidly with material from shared sources, suggesting they instead represent levelling deposits during the dismantling of the tower as opposed to an attempt to make the basement serviceable for another siege.

3) The infilling of the countermine. The excavators suggest that the countermines were filled between the second and third sieges, perhaps even towards the end of the second siege when the castle was still under Royalist control. Evidence to suggest this includes the lack of architectural material deposited within the Constable Tower shaft and the reinstatement of floors, including the laying of cobbles on the Brewhouse floor (Roberts 2002d, 427). However, the primary fills of the Constable Tower contained large amounts of lime wall plaster, indicative of an internal clearance of walls prior to the demolition of masonry and the wider fabric of the building (Bostwick 2002, 166; Roberts 2002d, 427).

If the proposed new phasing is accepted it has important implications for understanding the vessels deposited at the site, particular when understanding the differing composition of the assemblages from the two initial deposits and subsequent backfill. Significantly it also complements the contemporary sources, as reports of the final days of the second siege report that little damage was done to the castle in the bombardment, 'saving the ruining of some Rooms', with only one storey destroyed 'so extreme strong

is the castle timber' (Holmes 1887, 223). Other evidence also supports this reinterpretation, for example fragmentation analysis (see table 8.4) indicates a disparity between the two phases of deposition, with a higher percentage of non-residual vessels at least 5% complete present in the secondary as opposed to the primary phase (26.43% compared to 20.73 respectively). Vessels in the secondary phase are also more fragmented, with vessels at least 5% complete being, on average, 12.71% complete, compared to 19.83% for the primary phase.

8.4.3 Sooted vessels

A total of 55 vessels displayed evidence of sooting or burning, of which 24 were at least 5% complete. Eleven were probably burnt after disposal (six of which are at least 5% complete), including PONT58, a vessel with two joining sherds from two different contexts, [98] and [116], only one of which had been burnt[27]. Evidence of burning is entirely consistent with the aftermath of a siege (e.g. Moorhouse 1970, 36), although, as demonstrated by PONT58, its application to Civil War contexts is complex (Rakoczy 2007, 69).

The 44 vessels sooted before disposal are more restricted in form than those at Sandal and originate from all areas of the castle (see fig. 8.5a[28]). There is no evidence of sooted storage vessels and only six drinking vessels have evidence of sooting, all originating from the Constable Tower, and all of which are at least 5% complete (see fig. 8.5b). The largest proportion of sooted vessels is associated with food preparation, particularly within the Constable Tower (ten out of a total of 34 vessels, five of which are at least 5% complete). Sooting on these vessels is not unusual and may indicate the use of these vessels when warming milk or dough, stages in the production of butter and bread respectively (Anderson 1971, 125, 168). Of the unidentified finewares, only one is a blackware with the others being yellow ware or redware, both fabrics associated with food preparation rather than drinking.

[27] A further five vessels burnt after breakage were less than 5% complete.

[28] Unlike the other two sites, the high fragmentation rate at Pontefract necessitated an approach which initially included all sooted vessels, as opposed to those at least 5% complete.

The majority of sooted vessels at least 5% complete are located within the primary deposits of the Constable Tower, particularly contexts [98] (three drinking vessels and one food preparation vessel) and [116] (four cooking vessels, one drinking vessel; see fig. 8.5 and table 8.7). Four of the five remaining sooted vessels from these deposits also join with one of these contexts, one (PONT84) is a cooking vessel which joins with [116] and the remaining three (two food preparation vessels, PONT*327* and 1484, and one drinking vessel, PONT1486) join with [98]. The predominance of these two contexts suggests some specialisation in the area from which these contexts originated, a feature which, in the case of [116], will be investigated in greater detail below (see 8.4.7.1.1.1)

The restricted number of forms subject to sooting suggests that vessels were not adapted for cooking purposes, unlike those at Sandal (see above, 7.4.4). This reinforces the possibility that Pontefract was better equipped for a siege and reflects the status of the castle as a large, highly organised garrison. Furthermore, unlike the isolated Sandal, Pontefract was located within a town where a market was still held throughout the siege with frequent opportunities to procure goods required by the inhabitants. However, despite this access to supplies, examination of non-residual vessels reveals a significant number of vessels that are much older than the context in which they are deposited.

8.4.4 Outdated material

As at Sandal, a significant number of the drinking vessels at Pontefract are either Cistercian ware or transitional Cistercian/blackware (see fig. 8.6), although there are also a large number of other outmoded vessels represented within the Constable Tower which are discussed in greater detail below. Out of 77 non-residual drinking vessels, ten (13%) are Cistercian ware and seven (9%) are of a transitional blackware/Cistercian ware form (see table 8.5). These vessels are more than 15% complete on average, indicating their presence within the siege deposits is not anomalous. Cistercian and transitional ware vessels are distributed throughout the castle with the exception of the kitchen (see table 8.6). The Constable Tower is of particular interest, with almost every context containing at least one archaic vessel and one context [116] having a particularly large concentration (Cumberpatch 2002, 216).

Within the Constable Tower, eighteen other non-residual vessels were manufactured in the 16th century or earlier (see table 8.8). Three vessels are particularly significant due to their early date, two are South Yorkshire Gritty ware B vessels (SYGb) dating from the 13th-14th centuries (PONT98 and 100) and another is a Skipton-on-Swale vessel dating to the 14th-15th centuries (PONT285). Eight vessels are unidentified, the rest consisting of three cooking jars, four jugs, one large storage vessel, one costrel and one drinking vessel. The bias towards cooking jars and jugs probably reflects preferences in earlier pottery forms rather than the deliberate selection of those particular vessels, as these vessels dominate medieval assemblages (Brown 2002, 155).

Although outmoded vessels are distributed throughout the tower, there is a concentration of vessels from adjacent contexts [116] and [133] (see tables 8.7 and 8.9). As [116] is also noted for the concentration of Cistercian ware vessels, this would suggest that the deposit originated from an area where an unusually high volume of outmoded vessels were used. This is further demonstrated when considering all Cistercian ware vessels present within this context, as an additional 32 vessels are less than 5% complete, mostly represented by single body sherd. To a certain extent the presence of outmoded vessels within the assemblage is to be expected as, unlike Sandal, Pontefract was occupied throughout the 16th century. The proximity of the town also suggests a possible source, as it is likely those occupying the castle supplied themselves with material culture from the surrounding area where it was available. After the battle of Hopton Heath the house of Lord Aston of Forfar was raided with the soldiers 'carrying away everything portable including all the food. That night, Aston's wife & daughter had to beg milk from one of their neighbours & a skillet to boil it in' (Band 1985, 18). This incident was far from isolated and it is likely that all necessary utensils were carried into the castle regardless of age. However, rather than being employed throughout the castle, the concentration of vessels within context [116] suggests that these vessels were only employed in specific areas. This will be discussed in greater detail below, as it is also reflected by a high proportion of other antiquated material culture, including armour (see below, 8.8.2).

8.4.5 Local identities

As previously noted at Sandal (see above, 7.4.5) it is highly unlikely garrisons made bulk orders of ceramics to local manufacturers, commanders instead relying on looting and the soldiers own possessions to fulfil their requirements. However, the siege at Pontefract also had a significant number of participants who were prominent members of the town, as attested by the number of gentlemen volunteers listed within Drake's diary (Walker 1997, 5-6). The local middling classes were particularly well represented, at the beginning of the first siege ten out of Pontefract's thirteen Aldermen entered the castle, two of the men remaining being Parliamentarian supporters and the other was probably too old (Holmes 1882a, 9). Local inhabitants also featured prominently in the third siege; for example one of the six men excepted from the terms of surrender was Allan Austwick, the son of a volunteer defender during the first siege (Holmes 1878, 233).

The number of local defenders reflects the loyalty of the town to the royal cause, and as a result it is unsurprising that there are 31 vessels with Wrenthorpe handles, produced less than ten miles from the castle, although only eight of these are at least 5% complete (see table 8.9). However, even allowing for the high fragmentation rate at the castle, this is far lower than Sandal, which had, in total, 74 ENV with Wrenthorpe handles. Six of these vessels are located within the Constable Tower (four drinking vessels, one fine storage vessel, one identified) and two drinking vessels are located within the Elizabethan Chapel and Kitchen.

As at Sandal, the presence of these vessels supports a pattern of social discourse focussed on civic identity. The siege coins produced by the garrison during the third siege all depict Pontefract castle on the reverse (Wright 2002, 282) and the consumption of local ceramics at a site, which represented the town as a whole, served to reaffirm local identities through the communion of familiar vessels by people who had lived together for most of their lives. However, the incidence of these vessels at Pontefract is lower than that of its neighbour, suggesting a more cosmopolitan social discourse. This is supported by the substantial number of imported vessels at the site.

8.4.6 Imported vessels

Despite the large number of local ceramics, at Pontefract a wide range of recognisably non-local vessels are also present. This provides a contrast to Sandal, where non-local forms were restricted to Martincamp flasks and a small group of drug jars (see above, 7.4.6). In total 57 non-residual vessels can be positively identified as vessels which were produced outside West Yorkshire, including Dutch and London tin-glazed wares, two sherds of a Martincamp flask and a range of Rhenish stonewares including vessels from the Westerwald, Raeren and Frechen traditions. A number of these, such as a Raeren drinking flask dating from 1475-1550 (PONT*77*), demonstrate the way in which the castle and town were embedded in national and international trade networks long before the Civil War.

28 vessels of non-local manufacture were at least 5% complete (see table 8.10); six drinking vessels, six drinking flasks, three small storage jars, one decorated Delft bowl and one Dutch cooking vessel. A further eleven vessels remain unidentified. Although most of these non-local vessels originate from the Constable Tower (Cumberpatch 2002, 194), this probably reflects the depth of deposits here rather than the nature of the tower itself. The only area without imported wares is the Bakehouse/Brewhouse, an area which produced just one identifiable drinking vessel. The presence of imported vessels in almost all areas of the castle indicates how embedded they were within contemporary society, although it should be noted that the range of imports present at the castle is still small in comparison to other sites (Cumberpatch 2002, 220). However, inland sites often have a limited number of non-local wares due to the restricted circulation of imported goods, so this may not be a remarkable phenomenon (Brown 1997, 91).

Close parallels can be drawn between Pontefract and the composition of the assemblage from Beeston castle in Cheshire (Cumberpatch 2002, 194; Noake 1993). Originally used to store goods belonging to wealthy Parliamentarians (Dore 1965-1966, 107), once the castle had been captured by Royalists it was subject to a sustained siege from November 1643 until November 1645 (Keen 1993, 98). As noted by previous studies, imports cannot be automatically equated with increased status (Courtney 1997a, 102). However, the presence, number and variety of non-local wares at Pontefract are significant in their contrast to Sandal, where the range of vessels were more restricted.

The non-local wares present at Pontefract can be interpreted as a tangible evidence of the cosmopolitan nature of the non-volunteer garrison. Although they included some local inhabitants, the Royalist armies who were sent to Pontefract were drawn more broadly from the rest of England as well as other countries, including the Netherlands. Nathan Drake mentions 'the Dutchman' responsible for one of the principal guns of the castle (Walker 1997, 57) and although this epithet suggests the gunner's nationality was unusual enough to be a source of comment, at the same time he is representative of the heterogeneous nature of the Royalist army (Stoyle 2005, 91).

Due to the complexity of trade during this period, non-local wares cannot be directly linked to the consumer (Allan 1983, 37-39). However, the diversity of the assemblage from the castle is representative of the wide background of its inhabitants. Of particular note are three manganese mottled tin-glazed earthenware vessels (PONT*1480, 1481* and *1482*) produced in London c.1625-1650 (Garner and Archer 1972, 6; Cumberpatch 2002, 193)[29] and a press-moulded slipware dish (PONT*1476*).

The manganese mottled drinking vessels were found within the Constable Tower garderobe distributed between contexts [98], [99] and [103]. The close association of these three vessels suggests a discrete group of drinking vessels visibly different from the dominant blackware drinking vessels. The presence of assemblages such as this suggests that although drinking rituals within the castle were often aimed at increasing group cohesion, other material culture served to differentiate participants. This may have been through the adoption of local drinking vessels such as those with the Wrenthorpe mark or through the use of more exotic vessels such as these drinking mugs from London.

PONT*1476* originates from context [40], one of the upper deposits from the Constable Tower and is a press-moulded slipware dish produced in the Potteries. These vessels, also recovered from Tutbury and Dudley Castles, were first produced in the mid-17th century (Barker 2011, 222). Although only representing less than 5% of the vessel, the

[29] Examples are also stored within the Museum of London, for example accession nos. 21881 and 25262.

presence of these sherds is further evidence that, alongside outdated material, more modern artefacts were incorporated within social discourse at the castle.

8.4.7 Vessel form

Given the low number of vessels at least 5% complete from any area apart from the Constable Tower (see table 8.1), only the 261 vessels from this area can be analysed in great detail. The other areas are also summarised here but the findings are only tentative due to the low number of vessels represented, with the Bakehouse and Elizabethan Chapel producing less than ten vessels at least 5% complete and the Kitchen and King's Tower only twenty one and eighteen respectively.

8.4.7.1 The Constable Tower

Analysis of the assemblage from the Constable Tower shows the same dominance of drinking vessels as at Sandal, with 39% of the assemblage (74 vessels) consisting of this form (see fig. 8.7). However, there are significant differences to Sandal, in particular a higher number of heavy duty storage vessels (21% of vessels at Pontefract compared to 9% at Sandal) and a far lower number of small storage vessels (3% compared to 14%).

The large number of heavy duty of storage vessels is suggestive of Pontefract's role as long-term garrison and stronghold, with plenty of stored provisions to feed its inhabitants. Nathan Drake lists the original garrison as being 183 strong but this is only a list of the gentlemen and volunteers of the siege and does not include women, children or temporary troops, such as the 140 which marched to Newark on 8th January 1645 (Walker 1997, 5-6, 11). The casualties from disease alone during the first and second sieges totalled 99 individuals, the approximate population of the Sandal garrison (Walker 1997, 4). Accounts of the third siege suggest around 600 inhabitants, of which 120 to 140 individuals survived (Holmes 1887, 319). Unlike Sandal, which was never intended to withstand a long, drawn-out siege, Pontefract required sufficient stored foodstuffs to withstand the months of sieges it endured and therefore had a far greater number of cisterns and large storage jars. This also explains the lack of small storage vessels (just five), as these were insufficient for the needs of the large groups of people inhabiting Pontefract during this period.

The need for large-scale consumption is also demonstrated through a comparison of the number of jugs and costrels at both Pontefract and Sandal. At the latter, three jugs and nine costrels or flasks were identified compared to thirteen jugs and eight costrel or flasks identified at Pontefract. This bias towards liquid transportation vessels more suited to group consumption supports the hypothesis that the assemblage at Pontefract reflects the need to equip the castle with ceramics more suited to large group consumption as opposed to the far smaller groups at Sandal. However, a similar proportion of cooking vessels at both castles suggests some consumption within small groups still occurred at Pontefract, as pipkins have a far smaller capacity when compared to larger metal vessels such as cauldrons.

In addition to these broad trends, once the assemblage is separated into the two phases of looting and clearance as identified by cross-matching sherds (see 8.4.2.1), there are observable distinctions.

8.4.7.1.1 Initial looting

The most significant feature of the initial deposits within the Constable Tower (see fig. 8.8) is the large proportion of drinking vessels, comprising 50% of the total assemblage (thirteen vessels). This is associated with a decrease in heavy duty storage vessels, which represent just 13% of the assemblage (five vessels) and there is also a slight decrease in fine storage vessels to 7% of the assemblage (two vessels). This suggests the use of the Constable Tower for communal drinking, a feature shared by the motte at Sandal (see above, 7.8.1). However, the presence of all forms apart from food serving vessels within these deposits suggests that the area around the tower was a multipurpose site, albeit with drinking playing a major role.

8.4.7.1.1.1 Context 116

Context 116 has previously been noted for its significant number of archaic wares, including Cistercian ware (see above, 8.4.4). It also represents the greatest concentration of vessels on the site, containing 176 ENV, 28 of which are at least 5% complete. This represents 10.62% of the total assemblage from the tower, a considerable percentage given its comparatively small size (see fig. 8.3). However, the proportion of drinking vessels at least 5% complete (48% of the total assemblage, thirteen vessels) is

comparable to the primary phase of deposition of which [116] is a part (see fig. 8.9). Of greater significance is the high proportion of cooking vessels, as five of the six cooking vessels from the Constable Tower were found within this context (this includes PONT84, a vessel which joins across several contexts including [116]). Therefore, this deposit would appear to represent an area of concentrated communal consumption, albeit one which represents activities occurring in the vicinity of the tower rather than a phenomenon restricted to this particular context. This is supported by the high density of animal bone in this deposit, and as a result the context is discussed in greater detail below (see 8.8.1).

8.4.7.1.2 Subsequent clearance and demolition

The demolition deposits from the Constable Tower are markedly different from those that precede them (see fig. 8.10). Heavy duty storage vessels comprise one third of the total assemblage (27 vessels), with drinking vessels representing only 26% of the total in contrast to their domination of deposits elsewhere (21 vessels). Fine storage vessels are also present in a greater proportion, 14 vessels forming 17% of the assemblage. The dominance of storage vessels and disparate profiles between the two sets of deposits suggests a spatial separation of storage and consumption of foodstuffs. The use of these deposits to level the Constable Tower suggests goods were stored in the vicinity rather than within the tower, which was instead the focus of consumption. Separate storage areas are alluded to by Drake's diary as the provisions for officers were stored in individual chambers (Walker 1997, 58) and it is likely that this was a trend shared throughout the castle as a means of allotting food and drink amongst the garrison.

8.4.7.2 Other areas: the King's Tower, Kitchen, Elizabethan Tower and Brewhouse/Bakehouse

86 non-residual vessels were recovered from the King's Tower, of which eighteen were at least 5% complete. Six of these were unidentified and drinking vessels form the bulk of the remainder (seven vessels, 59% of the total assemblage, see fig. 8.11), a percentage comparable with the primary deposits within the Constable Tower. This is unusual, as the King's Tower, like the upper deposits of the Constable Tower, contains significant amounts of masonry but the assemblage profiles of the two areas are very different. It may be argued that this may be due to the sampling of the King's Tower,

resulting in a higher degree of fragmentation which, as seen in earlier chapters, results in a bias towards smaller vessels (see above, 7.4.1.1). However, even when vessels more than 3% complete are included in the analysis heavy duty storage vessels, despite increasing in numbers, only form 19% of the assemblage, far less than the 33% seen within secondary deposits of the Constable Tower (see fig. 8.12). This suggests that the King's Tower had less of a storage role than the area surrounding the Constable, a conclusions supported by documentary evidence that suggests the King's Tower was the residence for the principal officers within the castle and thus was a focus for entertaining rather than storage (see above, 8.2.1).

Within the kitchen 152 vessels were non-residual, of which 21 were at least 5% complete. Fourteen identifiable vessels were at least 5% complete: three drinking vessels, five heavy duty storage vessels, one fine storage vessel, two food serving vessels and three liquid transportation vessels (see table 8.11). Only two heavy duty storage vessels, PONT1074 and 1112, are from secure Civil War contexts with the remaining vessels recovered from the Victorian excavations or later gardening activity (Gomersall and Roberts 2002, 54-55). As a result any conclusions from this area are tentative but the number of heavy duty storage vessels supports the use of the building for industrial purposes (Gomersall and Roberts 2002, 53).

Only 32 non-residual vessels were recovered from an estimated 78 vessels deposited within the Elizabethan Chapel, of which only eleven could be positively identified (see table 8.12). Given the presence of a countermine shaft within this area, the low number of vessels (only four identified vessels originated from the shaft) is indicative of a low density of occupation within the area during the Civil War. As the area was used for burials during the sieges, with three still containing human remains when excavated (Roberts 2002b, 95), this low density is to be expected, as the chapel was reserved as a place of worship. This preservation of use is in sharp contrast to the occupation of other sanctified buildings during this period, such as the use of Lichfield Cathedral as a stables and the iconoclasm that took place at Lincoln Cathedral (Ellis and Atherton 2009, 238; Graves 2008a, 83). There was a high level of fragmentation (see above, 8.4.1) and only seven vessels were at least 5% complete with a drinking vessel, two liquid transportation vessels, a food preparation vessel, a small storage vessel and a cooking vessel all represented (three further vessels were unidentified). The lack of

drinking vessels is apparent in all identified vessels from the area, with food preparation vessels being dominant and comprising six out of the eleven vessels recovered (54.55%). Although the number of vessels is small, this would suggest food was prepared near the Chapel, particularly as four of these vessels form a discrete assemblage within the countermine shaft suggesting a discrete assemblage. This is supported by the low number of ceramic vessels when compared with the large quantity of armour and animal bone, as cooking vessels were predominantly manufactured from metal such as copper alloy (Roberts 2002b, 96). As the kitchen was probably converted into an industrial workshop (see above), the privy kitchen, near the Chapel, was probably adopted for culinary purposes and this is supported by the archaeological evidence.

Of the 49 non-residual vessels recovered from the brewhouse/bakehouse, just nine could be identified and only one of these originated from the countermine shaft (PONT1053 which joins with a sherd from levelling deposit [3161], see table 8.13). The area was disturbed and truncated by later activity and although the area was excavated during the late 19th century there is little record of the finds (Holmes 1883, 49; Roberts 2002b, 33). All other pottery vessels recovered from the area are associated with the installation of a new cobbled floor within the building incorporating fragments of 17th-century date (Roberts 2002b, 40-41). However, this may be in preparation for the Civil War rather than related to the occupation itself.

Although these assemblages are small their study suggests that different activities were conducted within different areas of the castle. This is comparable with Royalist activity at Sandal (see above, 7.8) and suggests that even during a siege, peace-time segregation of activities and social roles were maintained. This is supported by Drake's diary in the final days of the second siege, as the gentlemen of the castle were only required to surrender their own personal supply of food three days before the surrender of the castle (Walker 1997, 58).

8.5 Vessel Glass

A total of eighteen glass vessels were recovered from Civil War contexts of which sixteen can be identified (see table 8.14). These were found within the Constable Tower,

the Elizabethan Chapel and the Kitchen, with no vessels recovered from either the King's Tower or Bakehouse/Brewhouse. Given the difficulties in glass preservation, the lack of glass vessels from these areas and the secondary phase of deposition within the Constable Tower may not be significant.

Although the fragmentary nature of glass means residuality is a potential problem (Ratkai 2002, 288), the concentration of material within particular contexts suggests their presence here is not accidental. Context [116] is of particular note as half of the total glass assemblage (nine vessels) originates from this deposit. Consisting of five drinking vessels, two urinals, one case bottle and one unidentified vessel, this assemblage highlights the unusual nature of this context, particularly when considered alongside the archaic ceramics also deposited here as at least one glass (Ratkai 2002, 288, fig. 117.7) is of probable 16th-century date (H. Willmott, *pers. comm.*; see above, 8.4.7.1.1.1). The assemblage also contains two urinals (Ratkai 2002, 288, figs. 117.10 and 117.11) which date from the 16th century at the latest and thus were decidedly outdated by the Civil War (Willmott 2002, 103). Similar vessels are present around the motte at Sandal castle (see above, 7.8.1) and may have been associated with alcohol production and consumption rather than medicinal purposes. Therefore, the glass assemblage from [116] highlights the significance of communal consumption within this context.

The assemblages from other areas of the castle are too small to be conclusive but the case bottles from the Elizabethan Chapel (one from grave fill [118] and one from upper countermine fill [269]) may suggest some medical aid was offered in the vicinity, as these bottles were often used as containers for medicine (see above, 7.5). As at Sandal (see above, 7.8.3), the location of burial is closely linked with the location of treatment and the preparation of food. Although the link between medicine and food has already been discussed (see above, 3.3), at Pontefract this area also highlights the presence and role of women within the garrison. Nathan Drake includes several references to women within his diary, including the wife of Gervaise Cutler who entered the castle to support her dying husband and an individual shot during the second siege whilst 'gathring of pott hearbes' (Walker 1997, 49, 34). This is supported by archaeological evidence, as a probable female was interred in the Chapel during the conflict (Burgess and Winfield 2002, 398), but whilst the presence of women within the theatre of war should be noted,

it should not be overstated. Although women played a role in food preparation and the treatment of the sick and wounded, men also fulfilled these roles as cooks and surgeons and as a result it is impossible to draw a distinction in this context between strictly male and female roles (*contra* Yentsch 1991). However, this does not mean the presence of women in warfare should be completely ignored, as a study of their role reveals important insights into the maintenance of traditional social discourse during a time of conflict (see below, 9.3).

8.6 Other items associated with food and drink

22 other objects associated with the consumption of food and drink were identified: thirteen knife handles, five spoons, two plates or bowls, one cauldron or skillet and a small wooden bung which may be related to use with a cistern (see table 8.15). This number excludes a number of bone and wooden handles which were not positively associated with knives as these may have been related to other artefacts such as tools (e.g. Morris 2002, 323, fig. 130.7). The majority of objects, 20, were found within the Constable Tower, with the remaining two retrieved from the Elizabethan Chapel. The lack of objects from the kitchen, an area which produced the second highest assemblage of pottery, supports archaeological evidence which suggests the kitchen was used as an industrial workshop during the Civil War and thus was not the focus of food and drink consumption (Gomersall and Roberts 2002, 52-5).

Non-ceramic and glass tablewares were distributed throughout the Constable Tower regardless of phasing, including the garderobe and countermine shaft. There is no particular preference for single contexts, although the presence of a cauldron or skillet in [116] complements the high proportion of ceramic cooking vessels found within this context (8.4.7.1). Whilst consumption practices are prevalent throughout the deposit, [116] is strongly associated with cooking and drinking practices.

Three spoons, (Duncan 2002, 258, figs. 106.40, 106.41 and 106.42) are of particular note due to the crudeness of their construction. Spoons were conventionally manufactured through casting and subsequent hammer-hardening. However, these objects were formed by cutting the spoon shape from a flat sheet of lead, which was then hammered to shape the bowl, the stemmed being formed by rolling the sheet into a

flattened tube (Duncan 2002, 255). This method has been noted at other Civil War castles including Bolingbroke and Montgomery (Goodall 1976, 32, figs. 16.81 and 16.82; Knight 1993, 205) and suggests Civil War garrisons were forced to improvise during times of crisis. This is supported by the two plates, which were not finished on a lathe like most contemporary items and one may have even been beaten rather than cast (Duncan 2002, 255). It has been suggested that the spoons were manufactured to replace utensils donated to the king's cause (Duncan 2002, 255), although this would appear to be unlikely as lead was in high demand to create bullets and the metal contained within a spoon would be of negligible benefit to the royalist coffers. However, the creation of such vessels may have fulfilled the same social need as the adoption of recycled and archaic vessels creates a group identity focused on personal loss for the greater good. This mood is encapsulated in the statement by the garrison at the end of the third siege that they were 'not ashamed to live, nor afraid to die' (Holmes 1887, 217).

8.7 The faunal evidence

The recovered faunal assemblage was published as part of the original excavation report (Davies 2002; Nicholson 2002; Richardson 2002). However, the assemblage from the Constable Tower was analysed within the five historical phases, which have been re-evaluated in the light of the ceramic assemblage (see 8.4.2.1), making the faunal evidence difficult to interpret in its present form. As a result, the original data for remains more than 50% complete (Richardson unpublished.) has been reanalysed by context to gain a better understanding of consumption practices within the tower[30].

Analysis of contexts within the Constable Tower containing significant amounts of animal bone (see fig. 8.13) shows a broad shift from a high proportion of sheep within the lower deposits to a dominance of cattle in the upper deposits. For example, cattle form a third of faunal remains in context [209] but half of all remains in context [82]. In particular, deposits above context [98] show an increased proportion of cattle coinciding with the decreased importance of sheep. Apart from the increased consumption of cattle there is little to differentiate between primary and secondary deposits within the Constable Tower, as the elevated proportion of cattle within these contexts are shared

[30] The author is indebted to Jane Richardson for the provision of this database.

by contexts such as [98] and [90], which are associated with immediate deposition within the tower. In addition, the seven contexts with more than 50 representative bones (see fig. 8.14), show only a slight rise in the amount of cattle consumed. Instead there is a marked contrast between [98] and deeper deposits [99], [104/114] and [116]. The variation between these three deposits, [99] with an elevated proportion of cattle (50.98% of the total), [104/114] with an elevated proportion of pig (34.48%), and [116] with an elevated proportion of sheep (59.13%), highlights the individual nature of each deposit which, until this reanalysis, had been masked by attempts to study them by historical phases. Rather than representing differing procurement strategies as the siege progressed (Richardson 2002, 366) the differing animals consumed may instead represent separate zones or episodes of communal consumption within the castle.

When considering faunal assemblages as representative of zones of consumption, rather than different phases of the siege, other fauna deposited within the castle become significant. Amongst these animals is deer, comprising of 2.7% of the total animal assemblage. Although not as prevalent as Sandal (see above, 7.7), the same social importance can still be seen in terms of social prestige. Most notably deer are largely present within context [116] which contains 36.43% of the total bone from the Constable Tower (588 out of 1614 within the archive database), but 76.19% (32 out of 42 bones) of the total deer assemblage. The concentration of deer within a single deposit highlights the important nature of this context and suggests that this foodstuff was either confined to a single event during the siege or was not universally available to all the inhabitants of the castle. Contexts 104/114 and 116 also include six turkey bones (two from [104/114] and four from [116]) which were a rare delicacy probably associated with elite households (Davies 2002, 385; Fothergill 2013; J. Richardson *pers. comm.*). [116] contributed a significant number of the faunal remains, 389 out of 1224 animal bones, (31.78%) including a large amount of fish, although the exact amount cannot be established due to the lack of wet-sieving taking place during the excavation (Nicholson 2002, 390,392).

Significantly, a number of horse bones also had evidence of butchery (Richardson 2002, 279-380). This includes three bones from context [116], one from [99], two from [82] and three from context [116], which also contained bones from a cat and a dog with evidence of butchery. As a result, context [116] is highly unusual as it consists of foods

such as deer and turkey which can be classified as high status alongside animals not normally considered as foodstuffs such as cat, dog and horse. There is some supporting evidence for the consumption of horses at Pontefract, Drake hinting that a mare shot by Parliamentarians was 'fetcht...[and] made very good use of' over two months before the garrison surrendered, although his ambiguous statement possibly indicates his discomfort at the consumption of the animal (Walker 1997, 28). The combination of food within this context, whilst making it extremely unlikely that it was the result of a single dining event, highlights the complexity of dining in a garrison where one might enjoy venison on one occasion and be forced to consume horse a few days later.

Deprivation certainly played a significant role in the first and second siege; however, during the third siege its role was more complex. A contemporary report attests that at the time of the Pontefract's surrender in March 1649 the castle had two months provisions left, with disease and no prospect of relief playing a bigger role than starvation in its surrender (Holmes 1887, 232, 319). Paulden also notes that the castle was provided for by 'several Parties almost every Night, [which] enabled us to keep the Castle above nine Months, though we had not one Months Provision, when we were first Beleaguer'd' (Paulden 1702, 12). This provisioning caused much concern to the Parliamentarians, one of whom wrote on October 28th 1648, 'they have since I came from London taken at least 200 head of cattle, above 100 oxen from grasiers. They sound a parley for a cessation, & make a fair of their horses near the castle, sell them to Sir Henry Chomley's troopers...They have & do take much salt, corn, beasts, & horses from the country' (Holmes 1887, 187-188). The laxity of the Parliamentarian troops highlights a phenomenon that will be discussed further below, namely the fraternity that could exist both within and between the two competing sides (see below, 8.8.2).

Although the amount of animal bone deposited with the countermine shaft of the Elizabethan Chapel has been described as 'relatively large' (Roberts 2002b, 96), the 261 bones recovered from shaft contexts (context [271] and [269]) is comparable with the 241 bones recovered from the countermine shaft contexts of the Constable Tower (contexts [209], [115] and [113] (Richardson 2002, 364). When analysing the bones more than 50% complete, there are differences between the two fills, with the Elizabethan Chapel dominated by cattle and the Constable Tower by sheep/goat despite similar numbers of elements analysed (41 compared with 40, see fig. 8.15). As the

shafts were probably backfilled around the same time, the different assemblages in the countermine shafts would appear to represent different consumption strategies within the garrison. The comparative size of cattle compared to sheep or goats may suggest cattle were more predominant around the Elizabethan Chapel as they were a source of food for large communal groups as opposed to sheep or goats which being smaller were reserved for smaller groups which may have been of higher status. This is supported by the absence of deer in the Elizabethan Chapel despite their presence in the Constable Tower, particularly context [116]. Although the fill of the bakehouse/brewhouse countermine shaft is similar to the Elizabethan Chapel, only nine bones more than 50% complete were present, representing five cattle, two sheep/goat, a rabbit and a dog. As a result, the assemblage is too small for comprehensive analysis.

8.8 Discussion

The analysis of the consumption of food and drink at Pontefract Castle reveals the complexity of social discourse within a large Civil War garrison. Superficially men and officers alike were meant to share in the deprivations of conflict, but in reality the use of separate areas of consumption and the availability of different foodstuffs meant hierarchies were just as strictly maintained during the conflict as in peacetime. However, Drake's diary and other contemporary accounts demonstrate that various mechanisms were employed to encapsulate a community spirit amongst those who garrisoned the castle, including the need for all to agree on continued resistance at the end of the second siege and the provision of a commemorative medal to all who were involved in the seizing of the castle at the beginning of the third siege (Walker 1997, 58-59; Wright 2002, 285).

The development and maintenance of communality amongst the garrison was clearly important and manifests itself within the archaeological record in many ways, but there are two features in particular which require further discussion. These are the communal consumption of food and drink as encapsulated within context [116] and the maintenance of peacetime social hierarchies within all aspects of material culture throughout the sieges.

8.8.1 Communality and conviviality, the case of context [116]

In terms of vessel form, there is little to differentiate context [116] from other primary fills within the Constable Tower apart from the relatively high number of cooking vessels (see above, 8.4.7.1.1.1). However, the context has a high proportion of vessel glass as well as a higher than average number of archaic vessels (see above, 8.5, 8.4.4). There are also a large proportion of deer bones within the assemblage, far more than all the other Civil War contexts combined (see above, 8.7). The group when considered in its entirety is indicative of an assemblage resulting primarily from the communal consumption of food and drink, some of which may have been considered as high status.

Although hierarchy was maintained throughout the three sieges, efforts were made to engender a feeling of communality between all members of the garrison. The large number of drinking vessels in the primary contexts of the Constable Tower and their comparatively low density in other contexts indicates that communal drinking played an important role within the garrison, only occurring within specific areas. The importance of communal drinking has been identified elsewhere (see above, 3.6.2), but is particularly pertinent to the Pontefract garrison, where it formed not only a bond between disparate social groups but also between members of opposing garrisons within all the sieges.

Drake mentions communal drinking on several occasions, most notably on 12th May 1645 when:

'this night, about 9 a Clock, our Gentlemen and Souldyers being merily disposed, did drinke (whole…) heallthes (of the New well water) to tho King & all his good friends, pledging one another with such hallowes and Showtes, as the e'emy, vondring what should be the Cause of such sudden Joy, Tooks an allarum, drew out all theire horse into the feild and dobled all theire gaurdes (wch pleased us well)'

(Walker 1997, 30)

This extract is important for several reasons. Firstly it highlights the important role played by communal drinking within the garrison, to the extent that water was used as a substitute for alcohol in drinking rituals when the latter was unavailable. Secondly the participation of both gentlemen and soldiers within the same experience is indicative of the important role played by drink in engendering a shared identity. The use of pledges within the garrison is particularly important as it lent a veneer of civility to the siege, being commonly associated with consumption amongst the middling classes and elite, with treatises specifying their correct usage (O'Callaghan 2004, 44; for a further exploration of this see below, 9.5.1). This can clearly be seen during the third siege, when both Parliamentarians and Royalists met sporadically and 'in the cessation [of hostilities] they drink to one another, 'here is to thee, Brother Roundhead' and 'I thank thee, Brother Cavalier'' (Holmes 1887, 188). Even though besiegers and besieged employed derogatory sobriquets for their opponents, the use of alcohol in the shared experience of two sides highlights an important aspect to the conflict, namely that apart from their allegiance there was little to differentiate the two sides. Certainly when there was an excuse for fraternisation between the two sides it was seized upon, for example soldiers on both sides robbed an orchard together during the second siege (Walker 1997, 50).

The important role played by the past within these acts of conviviality is indicated by the high concentration of archaic ceramic and glass vessel forms, including Cistercian ware, transitional blackware/Cistercian ware and urinals, all found within context [116]. Unlike other contexts, [116] also contains a large number of sooted vessels alongside a moderately large number of deer bones, indicating communal consumption of food as well as drink. The deer almost certainly originated from the nearby royal deer park despite reports these were removed by Parliamentarian troops before the commencement of the first siege (Fox 1987, 14). The presence of a royal foodstuff amongst archaic forms, some of which were identifiable as local products (see above, 8.4.5), indicates the importance the past played within the garrison.

8.8.2 The preservation of tradition

The archaic material deposited within the castle was not restricted to ceramics and glass, but also included a substantial amount of obsolete armour. This was predominantly

deposited within the garderobe and countermine fills of all buildings apart from the King's Tower, although this omission is probably due to the limited excavations here. Amongst the militaria deposited were a jack of plate from the Constable Tower, dating from the mid to late 16th century and a collar from the Constable Tower dating from 1550-1575. Other outdated armour included two early-17th century helmets called morions recovered from the Elizabethan Chapel and Bakehouse, which were based on a late 16th-century design (Eaves 2002, 325-326, 341). In addition two bolt-heads and a limestone ball were also recovered within 17th century deposits but were ascribed as residual finds rather than archaic weapons used during the siege (Eaves 2002, 324-325). However, accounts of the third siege at Pontefract state that the defenders used limestone balls due to a shortage of metal cannonballs culminating in the death of a besieger (Holmes 1887, 210). As a result, although one of the bolts has been firmly assigned as an example of a 12th-14th century siege-engine bolt, it may be that either or both were also utilised within the 17th-century sieges. The employment of archaic armour alongside archaic pottery forms within a building supposedly obsolete by the Civil War raises important questions about the impact of using such items within this particular social context.

The symbolic use of the castle as the embodiment of the wider community was not a new phenomenon, its status as a royal residence meaning the town had the potential to become the 'Windsor of the North' (Quinn 1992, 55). However, the adoption of this symbolism by the inhabitants of the castle alongside archaic material culture is of particular note. Although representative of a garrison forced to extremes, inhabiting a building and utilising armour and pottery which were hardly the height of fashion, their adoption within the castle was used to form a unique identity which endured throughout the conflict. In many ways the garrison saw themselves as upholding the kingdom, is it significant that the Parliamentarians are described by Drake as being 'p'tners wth Guydo Faulkes to dive downewardes to the divell' (Walker 1997, 13). The Parliamentarian besiegers were thus aligned with previous threats to the kingdom with the besieged Royalists attempting to preserve age-old tradition.

If the adoption of an outdated institution was highly symbolic, then the destruction of the material culture alongside the castle itself must have the same importance. Although previous investigations surrounding the destruction of Pontefract have highlighted the

political significance of this act (Rakoczy 2008b), the social significance must also be considered. As much of the armour is present in the lowest deposits within the castle, their abandonment must have been a deliberate act of discard, abandoning unwanted and outmoded equipment before a more careful selection of other material. The destruction of archaic forms is paralleled by other fortifications such as Eccleshall (see above, 6.7) and as a result requires further investigation in the following chapter.

8.9 Conclusion

The archaeological record at Pontefract, although fragmentary, demonstrates the complexity of a garrison in which peacetime roles were maintained as much as possible. There are striking similarities with the nearby garrison at Sandal in terms of the material culture used, although this is to be expected given the proximity of the two garrisons in terms of geography and cultural affinity. The differences between the two can be attributed to the different roles they played within Royalist strategy, Sandal being in effect a small outpost and supplier of material to its larger and stronger neighbour.

However, the predominant theme throughout Pontefract is the role tradition played in the formation of a communal identity reinforced through the communal consumption of food and drink. The presence of social rituals such as toasting alongside archaic material culture from drinking vessels to armour emphasised the precarious position held by the Royalists as well as highlighting the threat of change should the Parliamentarians persevere. As will be demonstrated in the next chapter, Pontefract is not an isolated example and tradition played an important role not only in the maintenance of Civil War garrisons but also their eventual destruction.

9 Tradition and Conviviality: social discourse within castles during the English Civil War

'It is Historie...that hath given us life in our understanding since the World it self had life and beginning, even to this day' (Dugdale 1656, preface)

9.1 Introduction

Despite the disparate roles played by the three castles in this thesis, one phenomenon is present at all of them. Tradition was of paramount importance to the garrisons of Eccleshall, Pontefract and Sandal, as can be seen through the adoption of archaic material, the maintenance of group identity and the importance placed on drinking rituals. The assemblages from other strongholds that participated within the conflict, such as Beeston, Montgomery and Basing House, demonstrate that these sites are not isolated examples of the importance of tradition, and as a result this trend needs to be examined in greater detail.

Just as it is impossible to analyse castles in temporal isolation, so the past played a vital role in shaping and determining the social discourse of Civil War garrisons. This chapter will explore the importance of traditional practice within the Civil War and demonstrate how these were crucial in the maintenance of group identity during the conflict. In addition, it will discuss how the reaction against traditional practice resulted in the destruction of the same material culture after the Civil War alongside the slighting of the buildings in which they were consumed.

9.2 The importance of tradition in the Civil War

The importance of tradition within the Civil War is demonstrated by events both before and during the conflict. Although there are strong parallels between the conflict and the 30 Years War in Central Europe (Roy 1978), there are also many differences including the reduced level of atrocities and the emphasis on command by birth rather than by merit (Donagan 1988, 66; Manning 2007, 673). Despite the employment by both sides

of continental weaponry, tactics and men trained in continental warfare (Roy 1978, 130-132), there are many instances, particularly during the first Civil War, which indicate traits that are essentially medieval in nature.

Tradition played a strong role in the way in which the Civil War was initially conducted, with both sides choosing weaponry and tactics which were throwbacks to the past. Even before the Civil War, Charles I's reaction against social mobility led to a number of families producing extensive genealogies to prove their ancestry, and in 1640 the Great Council, a medieval institution, met to advise Charles on the aftermath of the Bishops' Wars in Scotland (Stone 1972, 125).

In addition to an increased interest in past conflicts (Adamson 1990, 95), literature on contemporary tactics emphasised the importance of the pitched battle, eschewing other forms of warfare which were seen as medieval and unimaginative (Parker 1996, 6). However, medieval style skirmishes and sieges predominate during the Civil War, despite the fact that 'in eschewing battle commanders were following medieval precedent' (Tullett 1992, 52). Aside from the employment of medieval weaponry and siege tactics (see below, 9.4), the importance of tradition can also be seen in the way in which military bodies, particularly officers, conducted themselves during the period. This is most notable in an exchange between the Earl of Newcastle and Ferdinando, Lord Fairfax[31] in February 1643, when they were both fighting for control of the north of the kingdom. In order to bring the conflict to a swift conclusion, the Royalist Newcastle suggested a trial by combat which was 'more conformable to the examples of our heroicke ancestors, who used not to spend their time in scratching one another out of holes, but in pitched Fields determined their doubts' (Newcastle 1643, 9). Fairfax's derogatory reply to Newcastle mocked him for emulating 'the Knight of the Sun, which the language [of the] Declaration seemes to affect in appointing pitch'd [bat]tells' and was 'couched in terms of a disdain for the empty gestures of the knights of chivalric romance' (Fairfax 1643; Adamson 1994, 185).

[31] Ferdinando, Lord Fairfax was the father of Sir Thomas Fairfax, Captain-General of the New Model Army.

In addition to shaping the tactics and weaponry employed during the fighting itself, local traditions played a large part in dictating people's loyalties, far more indeed than national concerns about constitution and religion (Morrill 1993, 181). For example, Yorkshire had a long-standing tradition of rebelling against any reforming force; a significant portion of the gentry had taken part in the Pilgrimage of Grace against the reforms of Henry VIII, and many of them again rebelled against what they saw as the southern interference of Parliament (Hill 1991, 4). Rather than view the Civil War as a conflict between the upper classes and the 'middling' sort (Johnson 2002, 174-175), the Civil War was far more complex, reflecting the nuances of both past and present concerns. Even after the Civil War the shift of power was not from elite to middling classes, but from greater to lesser landowners (Morrill 1993, 211). Political and social change was not uniform across the kingdom and Wales and England's north and west proved particularly stagnant.

The study of siege sites during this period indicates that tradition was not only maintained, but was actively constructed through the use of ancient sites. An unfinished well and two inhumations at the Neolithic Maumbury Rings, Dorset testify to the fact that its Parliamentarian forces were earnest in their efforts to refortify the historical location, despite its lack of heavy defences (Bradley 1976, 82-3). Iron Age hilllforts such as Hambledon Hill, Dorset were also used as defensive positions during the course of the conflict,[32] and medieval walls were strengthened at many towns including Chester, Bristol and Oxford (Underdown 1979, 32; Ward 1987, 18-19; Cox 1997; Durham *et al*. 1983, 14). Despite the fact that the military merit of many of these locations was at best dubious, their fortification indicates that these sites, traditionally viewed as defensible, were actively interpreted as such by those who occupied them.

Alongside other historic institutions, tradition also played a role in the fortification of castles. Although some, like Pontefract, were defensively viable the same cannot be said for less fortified buildings such as Eccleshall or largely ruined castles such as Sandal. The fact that the king ordered the fortification of Eccleshall rather than the Bishop of

[32] Hambledon Hill was occupied in August 1645 by Clubmen opposing Oliver Cromwell's soldiers rather than a troop of Royalists (Underdown 1979, 32).

Lichfield (see above, 2.8.1), indicates that even when fortification protected a person's dwelling this may not have been the main reason behinds its fortification. On the contrary, it can be demonstrated that the occupation of many castles, particularly those that were ruined, was influenced by the events that had occurred there in the past. This is certainly the case for Sandal (see above, 7.3), but can also be argued for other fortifications such as Stafford Castle, which was described as ruinous in 1634, but was occupied, albeit briefly, by the Royalist Lady Isabel Stafford in 1643 (Darlington and Soden 2007, 223). Although it might be argued that their occupation was due to necessity, as England did not possess the modern fortifications of the continent (Hutton and Reeves 1998, 202), this is negating the impact they had on contemporary social discourse.

9.3 The maintenance of tradition

The maintenance of tradition can be seen in the differentiated zones of activity identifiable within the composition of assemblages at excavated sites. Due to the nature of the excavation this is particularly apparent at Sandal, where clear differentiation can be seen in areas specialising in the consumption of drink and others focussing on the preparation of foodstuffs (see above, 7.8). Similar patterns can also be observed at Pontefract (see above, 8.4.7), Eccleshall (6.3.3) and at other excavated sites such as Beeston.

The excavations at Beeston show distinct differences between the two principal areas of the castle; the Outer Gateway and Inner Ward (see fig. 9.1). Although drinking vessels predominate within both areas, the assemblage within the outer ward produced all the food preparation vessels and a high concentration of slipware dishes and bowls (131 vessels in total, 25.5% of the total assemblage). This suggests the preparation and consumption of food took place in the Outer Ward and the area near the Outer Gateway rather than the Inner Ward, which may have been used for storage (Noake 1993, 3:C14). This is supported by the Royalist account of their capture of the castle on 13th December 1643, when they 'assaulted the castle and presently fell upon the river ward (where the greatest part of their provision and all their ammunition was stored up) and very couragiously soone made themselves masters of it, which caused the Rebells to betake themselves to the severall Towers of the Castle, where having little provision and no

Ammunition they desired a treaty' (Heylyn 1643e, 716). The 'river ward' is almost certainly the inner ward, which as the most protected area of the castle was the most suitable place for the storage of goods and foodstuffs. The concentration of provisions within this area contrasts with consumption patterns, suggesting the consumption of food took place in a large area where communal dining was more practicable. This is supported by the tin-glazed vessels which are present in the Outer Gateway, the only location in the castle where they occur. Unlike other sites such as Sandal and Pontefract where tin-glazed vessels are present as small storage jars or drinking vessels, here dishes predominate; of eight identified vessels five are dishes or bowls, one is a jug and two are drinking vessels. The presence of relatively rare fabrics such as tin-glazed wares within an area with a high percentage of food preparation and serving vessels suggests communal consumption between both officers and men, a theme which will be explored in further detail below (see below, 9.5).

Contemporary documentation also supports the communal role of the outer ward, as the Parliamentarian governor of the castle, Captain Steele, was executed after he entertained the Royalist Thomas Sandford in 'his Lodginge in the Lower Warde' (Malbon 1889, 91; Barratt 1995, 5). The location of this incident coincides with the deposition of glass vessels around the Outer Gatehouse, representing the entire glass assemblage recovered from the castle with the exception of a single glass handle (Ellis 1993b, 121-126). However, whilst eating and drinking may have been communal, other activities were strictly segregated. For example, the concentration of fashionable spurs and other equipment around the Inner Ward contrasts with deposits of antiquated armour around the Outer Gateway (Ellis 1993c, 213). This highlights the possibility that the officers were quartered within the Inner Ward, similar to Pontefract where officers may have had separate quarters in the towers (see above, 3.6.1; Noake 1993, 3:C14).

Although any identification of women and children in the archaeological record is at best tenuous (Harrington 2004, 116), the maintenance of separate zones of activity around the site also hints at the involvement of women, who also usually occupied traditional roles despite the unusual times. Even when they defended their home, women such as Brilliana Harley and Charlotte, Countess of Derby at Brampton Bryan Castle and Lathom House respectively, were described as fulfilling a man's role; Brilliana Harley making clear that her defence of Brampton Bryan was due to the trust

placed in her by her absent husband, whilst the Countess of Derby's defence was apparently all the more remarkable for her sex (Bath 1904, 12; Hughes 2012, 38). Although such 'heroic' defences by women were often highlighted in the Royalist newspapers, chivalric elements in which feeble women defied an evil opponent, were usually heavily emphasised, whilst Parliamentarians and Royalists alike heavily criticised women of the opposite side who were perceived to be too masculine (Hutton and Reeves 1998, 200; Hughes 2012, 39).

Women during the conflict occupied traditional roles; their role as carer can clearly be seen at Pontefract where Sir Gervaise Cutler's wife entered the garrison to tend him on his deathbed and other forms of comfort were offered at Dudley, as evidenced by the condoms found there (Walker 1997, 49; Gaimster *et al*. 1996). In addition, several women gave birth during or shortly after a Civil War siege, including Dorothy Beaumont at Dudley Castle, Lady Anne Savile at Sheffield and the wife of Governor Morris at Pontefract Castle (Gaimster *et al*. 1996, 132; Holmes 1887, 217). The baby from Dudley died without being named, but the babies from Sheffield and Pontefract were baptised Talbot and Castilian respectively. These names are significant as they demonstrate the paramount importance placed on tradition.

Lady Anne Savile, who oversaw the last days of the Royalist garrison at Sheffield castle before being forced to surrender to Parliament on 11th August 1644, gave birth to her son Talbot shortly afterwards, her husband Sir William having been killed near York in the previous January. The name of her son, Talbot, is an adoption of the family name of the Earls of Shrewsbury who were prominent landholders in the early post-medieval period, owning extensive tracts of land including Sheffield Castle and Sheffield Manor (Bernard 1985, 163). The 10th Earl, John Talbot, sided with the King on the outbreak of war and played a role in the Worcester garrison when it was besieged by Parliament. Sir William Savile was directly related to the Earls of Shrewsbury, being the great grandson of the 6th Earl, and the choice of name for his last son indicates strongly a need to demonstrate dynastic lineage at a time when they appeared to be threatened by the victory of a Parliamentarian army in a town which was synonymous with the power of the Shrewsbury line. William Morris' son Castilian was born during the third siege of Pontefract and was baptised with a name with recognisable links to the place in which his father, if not his mother, was confined (Holmes 1887, 217). The adoption of these

names at a time of great crisis indicated the importance placed on tradition in legitimising the threatened garrisons beliefs and rights.

Examples such as these demonstrate how tradition was maintained within Civil War garrisons through peacetime rituals, zones of discourse and the naming of children. This fitted into a broader social pattern, where formerly frivolous masques and balls now served to idealise the Carolingian influence by reflecting on the halcyon days of the king's reign (Smuts 1987, 287-8). The adoption of courtly rituals to create a specifically royalist identity is clearly demonstrated through the use of drinking in the creation of the Cavalier persona (see below, 9.5.1.1).

9.4 The construction of tradition

The influence tradition had on the garrisons is encapsulated by the siege coinage from Scarborough, Pontefract and Colchester. All three types of currency prominently feature a castle on the reverse of coinage produced by the Royalist garrisons besieged within them. Their presence on coins, which were lead or, in the case of Scarborough, no more than strips of silver plate (Firth 1917, 585), emphasises the importance the castle played in symbolising the resolution and loyalty the various garrisons possessed. During the medieval period the castle had long been a symbol steeped in ideology (Wheatley 2004, 146), but its adoption alongside such sentiments as those displayed on the Pontefract coinage, which replaced Charles I with Charles II following the former's execution in January 1649[33], demonstrates it was still a potent symbol (Wright 2002, 286). However, it should be noted that siege coinage from Newark and Carlisle, both besieged by Parliamentarians during the first Civil War, omitted the castle as it was predominantly the town, albeit incorporating the castle, which was under attack (RCHM 1964, 73; Tullie 1988, 13). This makes the coinage from Colchester all the more remarkable as the castle was adopted as the symbol of the besieged garrison despite the whole town being surrounded. The castle had long been the symbol of Colchester, its presence on a civil seal from the 15th century seen as a representation of 'continuity between the ancient past and medieval present (Wheatley 2004, 41) and the same can be said for the siege coinage.

[33] The coins are dated 1648 due to the difference in the Julian and Gregorian calendars

The presence of castles on the siege coinage of Pontefract and Colchester is particularly significant as the two sieges were during the second, rather than first, Civil War. At a time when feudal practices and beliefs are meant to have become obsolete (Adamson 1990, 117-118), their adoption as the emblem of two of the besieged garrisons from this conflict is particularly important. This sentiment is echoed by the 'broaken Castle' depicted on the Scarborough Castle Civil War coins along with the motto '*Caroli fortuna resurgam*' (the fortunes of Charles will rise again) (Firth 1917, 585). Although issued during the first Civil War, the celebration of the Keep at Scarborough, shattered in half during the siege (Rakoczy 2007, 180), demonstrates how the castle came to symbolise resistance in the desperate, and futile, struggle that marked the final attempts of the Royalists to place Charles I back on the throne. The adoption of tradition by Royalists in the face of defeat is also seen through the use of drinking rituals, as will be seen below (see below, 9.5.1).

It is in this context, in which the castle was a key symbol of the maintenance of traditional ways of life, that the social discourse which occurred within its walls needs to be discussed. Studies of all three castles have revealed a surprisingly high proportion of anachronistic material culture deposited at these sites, not only in the form of material culture associated with dining practices but also armour and other militaria. Armour such as jacks of plate was used in the late medieval period but 'were old-fashioned to the point of ridicule' by the Civil War (Eaves 1989, 91). Aside from Pontefract and Sandal, their presence at sites including Beeston (Eaves 1989) and St. Paul-in-the-Bail well, Lincoln (Egan 2008, 70) suggests their use was widespread during the conflict. Amongst the 17th-century debris in the well at Taunton Castle was a brown bill dating to the 16th century (Ralegh Radford and Hallam 1953, 79), whilst at Montgomery castle 600 fragments of armour were recovered, most of which dated from the mid-16th century and which may have been seized from captured Royalists following the battle of Montgomery (Knight 1993, 223-225). Given the relative lack of experience of a substantial number of combatants and the difficulties in supplying them with arms and armour, the adoption of anachronistic militaria is unsurprising, particularly as men had been responsible for their own armour since the late 16th century and were unlikely to update their protection on a regular basis (Eaves 2002, 325).

However, in some contexts such weaponry and armour was actively embraced. Bows and arrows, despite being archaic, were still employed, most notably at the siege of Colchester where the Parliamentarian demands to surrender were returned to their hosts on arrows covered with faeces (Brady 2006, 15). Arrowheads and crossbow bolts have also been recovered from Civil War contexts at Montgomery (Knight 1993, 228) and at the sieges of Basing and Corfe medieval-style sows were employed to protect the Parliamentarian defenders, although with little success at the latter as they were not musket proof (Godwin 1904, 241).

It should be noted that antiquated armour was not just restricted to the Civil War, with jacks of plate also appearing in North American colonial contexts such as James Fort, relating to a gift from King James I in 1622 including 400 bows and 40 jacks. However, rather than being a gift of unwanted and outdated material, this consignment was put to good use in warfare uniquely designed to combat the lightly-armed skirmish tactics of the native Americans (Straube 2006, 33-34). In a similar way, outdated castles and outdated armour were adopted in England in a system of warfare which, whilst having many similarities with the war on the Continent, was less professional and thus could include more unusual selections of weaponry and defences. Nevertheless, the embracing of medieval weaponry at times of crisis highlights the important link they formed between past conflicts and the present.

The presence of antiquated drinking vessels of both ceramic and glass at all three sites has already been seen as validating the viewpoint of the castles' occupants and, in many cases, defining the identity for which they were fighting for (see above, 6.3.7, 7.4.5 and 8.4.4). However, there are difficulties in distinguishing wares actively used during the Civil War and vessels which are residual. The similarity of later Cistercian ware with early blackwares can lead to difficulties in distinguishing the two and doubt has been cast on the interpretations of some Civil War sites. For example, supposedly Civil War contexts at Bolingbroke Castle containing Cistercian ware have been queried by more recent research suggesting these contexts are from an earlier period and were merely dated to the Civil War through the need to associate archaeological phases with historical events (Coppack 1976, 15; Boyle 2006, 201). Furthermore, antiquated ceramic vessels do not appear at all sites, at Dudley for example no Cistercian ware was

present within 17th-century contexts (S. Ratkai *pers. comm.*). Nevertheless, where present they demonstrate a clear continuation of past traditions in the present.

Whether it was in the material culture used, the buildings inhabited or the tactics adopted, tradition was present amongst all ranks of both armies. Within a garrison, and particularly when that garrison came under duress, the maintenance of traditional ways become important, both in terms of public and, in the case of the Dudley condoms, private activities (Gaimster *et al*. 1996). The sentiment that the 'world turn'd upside down' was a popular one during the Civil War (e.g. Anon 1646; Taylor 1647) and as a result the maintenance of a normality of sorts was essential. The use of the castle as a symbol for besieged garrisons indicates how anachronistic imagery and objects were used to construct the traditions for which the Royalists in particular were fighting to preserve.

9.5 Tradition and conviviality

The importance of dining as a group is noted in the records of many of the garrisons, most notably at Great Chalfield (see above, 7.8.3) and Sheffield, where the table was so important that Sir William Savile wrote to Major Beaumont that 'I have not heard any thinge since this businesse began that I am so much displeased with, as the puttinge downe the table at Shefeild Castle'[34] (Hunter 1819, 110, 114). Episodes such as this indicate the importance placed by commanders on communal consumption as a means of strengthening group cohesion through shared social discourse. The rituals and material culture employed during such activities clearly demonstrate the importance tradition played in the construction of a shared identity, particularly amongst the Cavaliers, who combined consumption and tradition in a flamboyant new identity.

As has previously been seen, the communal consumption of food was important in maintaining garrisons as a cohesive unit (see above, 3.6.2). The relative absence of food preparation vessels at many sites demonstrates the prevalence of communal cooking methods, such as the cauldrons depicted at the battle of Naseby (fig. 3.2.). Those that do

[34] There is some ambiguity to this reference, as it may also refer to a table used for religious purposes such as an altar.

survive are usually unusual vessels such as small Dutch cooking pots which themselves speak of exotic practices or were out-dated by the mid-17th century. Even at palaces such as Eccleshall, antiquated material culture such as dripping pans were used and discarded during this period alongside the latest imports from China. As a result, tradition pervaded all garrisons and this becomes most apparent when observing the social discourse surrounding alcohol consumption.

9.5.1 The Social Discourse of drinking

The importance of alcohol consumption within Civil War garrisons is clearly demonstrated by the number of drinking vessels present at the three sites studies and others, including Montgomery and Beeston (Lewis 1968, 142; Noake 1997, 3:D1). Where ceramic drinking vessels form only a small part of the assemblage, such as Eccleshall and Dudley, glass drinking vessels are present in significant numbers (Ratkai 1985, n.p.; 1987, 3). Given the reputation of soldiers during this period this dominance of drinking vessels is hardly surprising, the Marquis of Worcester stating of his garrison at Raglan that 'there is such swearing, and drunkennesse amongst you, that I fear me that from thence will come your greatest enemy' (Bayly 1650, 5). This sentiment was shared by many, as *The English Irish Souldier* demonstrates (see fig. 3.1).

Key events in a siege were often associated with the consumption of drink, particularly during negotiations between the two opposing sides. At Beeston the Parliamentarian governor, Thomas Steele, was condemned for surrendering the castle prematurely, but also for dining with his Royalist counterpart and sending 'much Beere' to the Royalist troops based in the Upper Ward (Malbon 1889, 91). The importance of ritual within communal drinking is exemplified by the exaggerated toasts of 'Brother Cavalier' and 'Brother Roundhead' at Pontefract, where a traditional sign of respect was combined with an epithet designed to be an insult to the opposing side (Holmes 1997, 188; see above, 8.8.1).

The employment of toasts at Pontefract is one example of how communal consumption of alcohol was inextricably linked with tradition. At Pontefract the incident with the newly broached well water indicates that so endemic were such rituals within a garrison that even when alcohol was absent the same rituals were still employed to strengthen

group identity (see above, 8.8.1). The importance placed by both sides on such rituals is exemplified by the following incident whilst Royalists were ransacking Sir Richard Mynshull's house in Buckinghamshire:

'the Lord Brooke with other Commanders commands the Wine-seller to be broken up: but in a fancy imitation of greatnesse they will not drink without a Taster; yet not being confident enough professedly to own Regall observances for prevention of danger, a pretence was made that the Wine was poisoned, and one of Sir Richard's servants compelled (a Pistoll set to his breast) to begin and lead the way, that if there were any danger the experiment might be made in him: he having gain'd a cup of Wine by their dissembled State, they follow freely; and drink very liberally to the good successe of their desines: without ever scrupling whether drinking so, did not come within the nature of a health. And indeed it was an oversight that Casuist [?] Prin [?] was not consulted in the Case, the Cup having often gone round, at last some inspired with the Spirit of Wine prophesie that Sir Richards Treasure was buryed in the Seller, presently they fall to digging and instead of Treasure find a Mine of Bottles: they drinke up the Wine and in indignation breake the Bottles: from hence to coole the Wine they goe to the Beere Seller, and in both what they could not drink, they break the vessels, & let run on the groud'

(Ryves 1643b)

The extract is telling in several instances. Firstly, it demonstrates how rituals could be employed in the creation of an identity; in this case the employment of a taster imitated the practices of royalty. Secondly, it indicates how the rituals had to be employed correctly, thus drinking to one's own success 'did not come within the nature of a health'. Therefore, tradition could be employed in two ways, firstly as a means of establishing common ground between warring factions but secondly as a weapon, condemning a foe for not observing the proper proprieties. After 1649, the drinking of the health increasingly came to be seen as a rebellious act, promoting drunkenness and subterfuge (Capp 2012, 163).

The communal aspects of consumption were facilitated by the drinking vessels themselves, many of which had multiple handles encouraging the passing of a single vessel from hand to hand (see above, 5.3.8). The sharing of a single cup, as exemplified

by Lord Brooke's men, increased the awareness of a communal identity which was clearly defined and legitimated by tradition. This communal identity was intensified at Sandal and Pontefract where there are a significant number of drinking vessels clearly linked to the local area through the distinctive Wrenthorpe mark (see above, 7.4.5 and 8.4.5). As many of the defenders of both Sandal and Pontefract originated from the local area, the use of these vessels would have served as a constant reminder of the cause supported by the garrison. As a result, drink was vital in melding men into a single, effective fighting unit through shared experience, tradition and ritual (Carlton 1992, 82). Nowhere is this more apparent than in the creation of the Cavalier persona.

9.5.1.1 The construction of the Cavalier identity

The term Cavalier, derived from the Latin for horseman, was originally employed as a derogatory term for a swaggering braggart and drunkard, referred to in Shakespeare's *Henry IV Part I* as 'I'll drink to Master Bardolph, and to all the cavaleros about London'. Although used in this form by the Parliamentarians it was quickly adopted by a section of Royalists as part of their image who reinterpreted the figure as a gallant, well-born man with a strict chivalric code, elaborate courtly manners and flamboyant dress. This was accompanied by strict rituals of consumption, for example the Cavalier would eschew beer in favour of wine and have elaborate toasts of loyalty to the King (Keblusek 2004, 56, 63). The character of the Cavalier is best characterised by the conduct of the Marquesses of Winchester and Worcester, two stalwarts of the Royalist cause. The former's windows at Basing, largely destroyed during Parliamentarian bombardment, were engraved with his family's motto 'Aymez Layaulte' or *Love Loyalty*, whilst the latter, who virtually bankrupted himself in the royal cause, refused to forgo drinking claret even when told it would exacerbate his gout (Moorhouse 1971a, 72; Bayly 1650, 45).

Elaborate displays of loyalty increased in prominence once the possibility of defeat became more apparent. As early as 1646 Brome wrote 'come pass about the Gourd to me, a health to our destroyed King' and after 1649, when many Royalists were forced to live in Continental exile, the Cavalier identity became even more prominent (Carlton 1992, 236; Keblusek 2004, 55). This revival of traditional ritual is also noticeable within other cultural practices, for example the first publication of English country

dances was issued in 1651 by John Playford, a man with known royalist sympathies. Although puritans participated in such dances alongside the general populous, this and other Playford publications continued traditions associated with a now discredited regime, forming ‘a flag for Royalists to rally round’ (Lindenbaum 2001, 137). Parallels can be drawn between this and the acceleration of bonfires towards the end of the siege at Pontefract, when traditional forms of communication between the Sandal and Pontefract garrisons became a vital way of maintaining morale in the face of defeat.

Drinking thus played a role in the construction of a specifically Royalist identity as well as preserving social cohesion. The importance of alcohol consumption is, however, also demonstrated by the locations where it took place. Although drinking vessels are present within almost all Civil War deposits, their concentration at particular locations, such as the motte at Sandal Castle, is of particular note. The selection of these areas highlights the role place played in the creation of group identity.

9.5.2 The location of drinking

Alcohol consumption was not restricted to a single locale, but at Sandal it is particularly associated with the motte. This pattern is also observed at Dudley, where large numbers of vessels may have been thrown from the windows or top of the Keep (Ratkai 1985, n.p.). At Pontefract, Nathan Drake’s diary indicates these locations were also inextricably linked with bonfires, which were regularly lit on top of the ‘round tower’ (Walker 1997, 41). The association of a significant location with traditional rituals highlights the importance place played in the affirmation of identity.

The importance of location, and the symbolism held by the Keep of a castle, is demonstrated at Hopton Castle. Here, the Parliamentarian defenders only described the Keep itself as the ‘castle’, referring to ancillary buildings within the outer wall as the castle by names such as ‘the brick tower’ or ‘newer brick house’ (Bath 1904, 38-39). The reservation of the word ‘castle’ for a single building, despite the attempt to defend the outer perimeter of the stronghold, demonstrates how a single building could represent the entire complex in the mind of its defenders. As a result, carousing and the lighting of bonfires on the highest points of the castle was more than mere chance, it

was also an opportunity for defenders to demonstrate their symbolic ownership of the heart, and therefore the whole, of the castle.

At Pontefract, thirteen separate bonfire events are mentioned by Drake from 18th May until 17th July 1645, two days before the surrender of the castle (Walker 1997, 46-59). The increase in the number of bonfires towards the end of the siege is indicative of the need for solidarity as Pontefract came under increasing duress, culminating in capitulation to Parliament. The conjunction of the practices of drinking and bonfires is of particular significance as bonfires were a ritual traditionally associated with the celebration of significant events such as the birth of a royal child or traditional festivals such as May Day (Cressy 1989, 67, 82). Although bonfires continued to be used for this purpose throughout the conflict they were also adopted to celebrate victories, boost morale or for political motives, for example in 1648 the pews from St Paul's Cathedral were used to create a bonfire (Cressy 1989, 67, 86; Kelsey 1997, 7).

Bonfires were events where social hierarchy and enmity was temporarily suspended, for example John Stow recalled a bonfire at the beginning of the 17th century where:

'the wealthier sort also before their doors near to the said bonfires would set out tables...whereunto they would invite their neighbours and passengers also to sit and be merry with them in great familiarity, praising God for his benefits bestowed on them. These were called bonfires as well of good amity amongst neighbours, that being before at controversy were there but by the labour of others reconciled, and made of bitter enemies loving friends.'

(Stow 1842, 39)

The cohesion given by such an event is indicated by the events at Sandal where bonfires were used to relay good news such as the safe return of messengers from the garrisons and to relieve the pressure of a siege which was moving inexorably towards Parliamentarian victory. The fact that all apart from one of the bonfires was instigated by the Sandal garrison is indicative of the position the castle held as a psychological support for the besieged within Pontefract.

The location of such events is significant, as bonfires and communal drinking took place in the highest points of the castle which were also its symbolic heart. This is exemplified by Pontefract, where on 13th July 1645 the garrison gave only a single shout from the courtyard but three from the top of the Round Tower (Walker 1997, 56). The significance such events held is suggested by Parliamentarian activities after the second Civil War, where the first building to be demolished was the 'great tower', the iconic Round Tower upon which bonfires had been lit and insults thrown (Holmes 1887, 235). The deliberate targeting of this building indicates this building was seen as a symbol of Royalist defiance, and the same can be said for the bonfires lit upon them.

In addition to the public consumption of alcohol, there is also strong evidence for its private consumption. For example, the entertaining of enemy opposition usually took place within the towers of the castle, as exemplified at Brampton Bryan (Bath 1904, 4). There is evidence that there was a hierarchy of locations for such parleys, with the best accommodation restricted to the commanders, royalist representatives were later denied entry to the garrison at Brampton Bryan, instead meeting their parliamentarian counterparts on the bowling green (Bath 1904, 15). Letters between the two sides indicated that the meeting place selected must be appropriate to the rank of the participants, thus Brilliana Harley was indignant that the room in which she spoke with the Royalist commander Sir John Scudamore was too cold (Bath 1904, 19). Similarly at Pontefract when the two sides met the officers discussed terms of surrender, whilst infantry from both sides joining forces to scrump an orchard (Walker 1997, 58). The maintenance of hierarchy when dealing with the enemy was thus a continuation of the maintenance of hierarchy within the garrison itself.

Although both officers and men took part in public consumption, significantly this took place in a liminal space away from the principal living areas where rigid hierarchies became fragmented as frivolity and alcohol were indulged. On the other hand private consumption was the reserve of officers alone, conducted alongside the elaborate rituals of hospitality. The events at Brampton Bryan indicate that higher quality material culture such as glass vessels may have been restricted to the upper classes and associated drinking rituals, and this is substantiated by the prominence of glass drinking vessels along the North Wall at Eccleshall (see above, 6.4.2). The division between public and private rituals of consumption were important as they maintained the

important division between officers and men whilst at the same time giving the illusion of a body of men with a shared common purpose. Although documents from Malmesbury and Sheffield indicate the need for communal consumption, Drake's diary suggests the officers had their own provisions in their private quarters (see above, 3.6.1). The continuation of traditional divisions of rank was important at a time when both sides viewed the abolition of class with alarm, as evidenced by the reaction against such groups as the Levellers (Hill 1991, 199-200). As a result, although communal consumption may take place at strategic times, the place in which this occurred was highly selective, occurring in a public rather than private arena. Shared rituals were important in maintaining the coherence of a garrison, but at the same time they were also needed to maintain a hierarchy which both sides believed in.

9.6 The need for closure, the destruction of tradition

The rituals and material culture adopted during the English Civil War clearly demonstrate the way in which tradition was employed by both sides to form a shared group identity legitimised by the past. In particular, the evolution of the Cavalier identity and the proliferation of bonfires at castles such as Pontefract indicate how traditional practice intensified and increased in importance once the royalist cause became tenuous. Given the importance tradition played in maintaining the identity of a garrison, its significance in the aftermath of the conflict, particularly after the first Civil War, must be appreciated.

Other studies have highlighted the multiple motives of those responsible for the slighting of castles during the Civil War (Rakoczy 2007). Certainly the reasons behind the destruction of castles are complex, as the three case studies have demonstrated (see above, 4.6), but the role of tradition, particularly in the destruction of material culture, must be considered. Studies of the destruction of Kenilworth Castle demonstrate how the new commander legitimised his control through the removal of the Earl of Leicester's insignia from the Great Hall to his new house in the Gatehouse, in the process adopting 'a lineage and a past that was not his own' (Rakoczy 2007, 203). Similar motivations can be seen in Sir William Brereton's attempts to retain Eccleshall Castle and his later decision to occupy the Bishop's Palace at Croydon, although his conversion of the chapel there is also indicative of his need to enforce his puritan beliefs

on a building he viewed as ostentatious and irreligious (Morrill 1985, 319; Dore 1990, 58).

The importance of tradition in the aftermath of the Civil War is further demonstrated by the actions of Lady Anne Clifford, Countess of Pembroke. Although she had taken little part in the Civil War, instead securing herself at Baynard's Castle from 1642 until 1648 (Clifford 1990, 95), her actions during the Interregnum demonstrate her belief in the maintenance of authority through tradition. In active defiance of Cromwell's government she restored the family castles of Appleby, Brough, Brougham, Pendragon and Skipton, despite the fact that several had already been slighted by act of Parliament and others, such as Brough and Pendragon, had been derelict for many years (Spence 1997, 155). The restoration of Skipton is particularly noteworthy as the castle had been subject to a four year siege until 1646 and had been largely destroyed (Spence 1997, 127). Her actions were unusual at a time when the government supported the obliteration of the past in favour of the creation of a new world order in which the king's role was greatly reduced and, after 1649, did not exist at all. Within this context, Lady Clifford's reaction is clear. Appleby for example she described as 'ye most auncient seat of myne inheritance', whilst the reconstruction of all five castles incorporated a quotation from Isaiah 58.12 stating 'and they that shall be of thee shall build the waste places; thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations, and thou shalt be called the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell therein' (Clifford 1990, 100-101). The Countess rebuilt castles, almshouses, and churches and even revived old customs such as the provision of a 'boon hen' by tenants in addition to their rents (Clifford 1990, 102; Spence 1997, 204). Although an anomaly, her actions demonstrate the importance placed on tradition in the maintenance of authority and how traditional methods were used to exert that authority.

As inhabited buildings are usually kept clear of debris, large deposits of material culture clearly demonstrate a significant change in building use. This is typified by events at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, where a large dunghill which had built up against the castle wall in the early 17th century was cleared to make a rampart in 1643/4 as part of the preparations for war (Harbottle and Ellison 1981, 94). Although demolished several decades after the conflict, the distribution of artefacts at Nonsuch Palace suggests that until the demolition of the buildings garderobes and other features were periodically

cleansed. Upon demolition, large deposits of material were only discarded in occupied areas, with garderobes elsewhere being largely empty (Biddle 2005, 53-4). Another mass deposit within the cellar of the Old Hall, Temple Balsall represents the disposal of material from three generations of the same family from c.1650 to c.1740 as part of a partial demolition when a new house was built for the family (Gooder 1984, 151). The large deposits of material culture at Civil War sites thus fit into a well-established pattern of closure deposits which usually symbolically marked the end to a particular phase in building use.

Aside from the castles already mentioned, other examples of closure deposits from Civil War castles include Laugharne Castle, Carmarthenshire, where a stone-lined pit 'probably' dating to the English Civil War was filled with pottery dating from the 15th to 17th centuries and a bronze candlestick dating to the 15th century (Avent 1977, 20-22). Even where the castle continued to be in active use after the conflict some deposition of material culture can be associated with the Civil War. For example, at Dover a dining assemblage largely consisting of contemporary dishes, drinking equipment and skillets were deposited in a garderobe shaft in the curtain wall (Maynard 1983, 31). Although this may be expected in a large town such as Newcastle-upon-Tyne, where the demolition of the curtain wall in the 17th century was succeeded by episodes of refuse disposal (Harbottle 1966, 100), the deliberate infilling of many castles with material culture consumed within them requires further explanation. Closure deposits from the Civil War are not restricted to castles, as demonstrated by the well of St Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln (Mann 2008), and reflect a genuine need amongst the population to bring the period to a physical as well as psychological conclusion. The removal of 'the Rubbidge...of the old Castle at Skipton, which had layn in it since it was throwne down and demolished in December 1648 and the January following' demonstrates how much of an obstacle it was to the use of a building, as Lady Anne Clifford had to cleanse the building in 1655 before commencing her renovations (Clifford 1990, 125).

If the use of archaic material culture during the conflict reinforced the defenders' need to legitimise their cause with past events, so the destruction of that material culture represented the need to dispose of that past in the creation of a new vision for the future. This is exemplified by the well of St Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln which contained an

assemblage containing a fragment of plate armour, a fragment of morion and a high concentration of Cistercian wares (Egan 2008, 70; Young 2008, 30). Despite having a large number of children's toys which may be associated with the clearance of a grammar school (Morris 2008), other contexts have a high proportion of drinking vessels similar to that of garrison sites, suggesting a significant part of the assemblage originates from a nearby inn (Young 2008, 36). The archaic material culture within the well was deposited alongside architectural elements proven to be from the shrine of Little St. Hugh, part of the cathedral destroyed by Parliament during the conflict (Graves 2008b, 21). The destruction of castles and associated material culture has many parallels with acts of iconoclasm, as although the former has few religious overtones both sought to destroy the traditional way of life, as 'king-breaking was lumped with thing-breaking' (Aston 1988, 63). Parliamentarian orders from 1643 and 1644 specifically excluded monuments of kings and nobles from acts of destruction, but the destruction at a number of sites of worship including Lincoln and Lichfield indicates anger was directed towards the old command structure, with effigies of the dead destroyed alongside idols and images (Aston 1988, 83; Ellis and Atherton 2009, 241; Spraggan 2003, 208; Graves 2008a, 83). Royal icons in particular were targeted, defaced monuments including the Arms of Catherine of Aragon and Mary, Queen of Scots at Peterborough, King John's tomb at Worcester and statues of James I and Charles I at Chichester (Spraggan 2003, 210). The destruction of cathedrals was particularly violent as, in addition to being perceived as gaining financially at the cost of civic bodies within the same city, they were seen as visual reminders not just of the reforms of Archbishop Laud, but also their Roman Catholic past (Spraggan 2003, 178-9). Iconoclasm was just as complex as the slighting of castles in its motivations and outcomes, nevertheless a reaction against tradition must be seen as an intrinsic aspect of this practice.

The abandonment of archaic armour after the conflict is partially due to active selection, with more modern pieces taken away by the victorious party leaving behind those pieces deemed unfit for purpose (Robinson 1993, 211). However, the same armour was deemed to be suitable only a few years before their abandonment and as a result their presence within slighting deposits demonstrates a cultural shift rather than a sudden improvement in military tactics. The presence of such armour alongside antiquated

ceramic and glass forms including Cistercian ware highlights this abandonment of old material culture in favour of artefacts which were less outdated.

Finding archaic wares in large deposits is not unusual, near-complete profiles of Cistercian ware vessels having been recovered from Temple Balsall almost a century after the last such vessel left the potter's wheel (Gooder 1984, 157). However, their presence in such large numbers in the period following the Civil War is noteworthy, particularly as they coincide with the destruction of the large monuments in which they were consumed. Their destruction, at this place and at this particular time, indicates their role in the widespread rejection of traditional rituals and lifestyles in favour of a new regime.

The English Civil War has been renamed by some commentators 'the English Revolution' due to the impact it had on social life (e.g. Morrill 1993; Hill 1955). Certainly there was continuity with preceding centuries, for example as late as the 17th century traditional cures such as burying a stoneware jug containing urine for kidney pain were still adhered to, even by leading surgeons of the period (Hill 1991, 278). However, in many ways the end of the first Civil War marked an end to many social conventions. Although Royalists continued the struggle for the crown until 1651, after 1645 old concerns of chivalry and feudalism were largely abandoned. This change in concern is marked by the material culture deposited at almost all castle sites. Although the deposits at Pontefract date to after 1649, the pleas of the local townspeople, although steeped in emotive language, also make it clear that the castle belonged to the events of the past rather than the future.

9.7 Conclusion

The reaction against the past following the Civil War, in which buildings were both utilised and destroyed as part of a legitimation of regime change, reflects the importance placed on tradition by those who participated in these events. As William Dugdale's statement at the beginning of this chapter demonstrates, events within the present are both framed by and understood through the actions of the past. It was this understanding

which was tested, reaffirmed and destroyed during the course of a conflict which affected every corner of England and its neighbouring countries.

It is usual to view the occupation of castles during the Civil War as an anomaly, removed from its medieval antecedents (see above, 2.3). However, as this study demonstrates, it is only by situating the events of the conflict within the context of the preceding centuries that it is possible to fully understand the role of the castle in social discourse during this period. The anachronistic symbolism of these buildings was reinforced with other elements to formulate a Royalist ideal seemingly threatened by the Parliamentarian forces. The reaction against this can be clearly seen in the destruction of all castles, but most particularly Pontefract, where the very name of the castle, Pomfret, was erased from the public record. This reaction was necessarily complex and cannot be ascribed to a simplistic reaction by the 'middling sort' against a repressive minority. Nevertheless, the participation of castles within the events of the mid-17th century demonstrates that, far being obsolete, they still played an active role in contemporary society. Only by seeing the post-medieval occupation of castles as a continuation of their medieval role is it possible to fully appreciate these institutions and the way in which their biography changed throughout time and space.

10 Conclusion

A foreword to one of the foremost publications on the later medieval castle states its aim ‘to discover the truth about castles in England’ (Johnson 2002, n.p.). However, as has been demonstrated by this study, there is no single truth about castles; there is instead a multitude of truths held by each individual who experiences these institutions. As a result, the challenge to all scholars of the castle is to seek new approaches which can interpret the castle in its entirety. The biographical methodology espoused here is one such approach, analysing assemblages from castles to demonstrate the true complexity of social discourse at these sites during a single, short-lived, period.

10.1 Fulfilment of Aims

This thesis had two primary aims: to promote a biographical approach to castles through the analysis of material culture, and to address the academic neglect of post-medieval castle studies, particularly their occupation during the English Civil War. As an initial investigation into this field of study, this thesis demonstrates that the “battle for Bodiam”, which has recently preoccupied scholars, has obscured the full complexity of the castle, although this can only be a partial victory as much work remains before the significance of these sites can be truly understood.

10.1.1 The post-medieval castle

This study has clearly demonstrated that during a period when castles have been described as almost obsolete (Bottomley 1979, 165), they could instead be extremely active both in terms of military strategy and as agents in the creation of social identities. Far from being isolated from their medieval past, they were in fact very much embedded within it, as demonstrated by the occupation of Sandal. The battle which occurred in front of its gates on 30th December 1460 was a clear impetus first for its renovation by Richard III and then its subsequent refortification during the English Civil Wars. Far from being anomalous, the refortification of buildings during the English Civil Wars is indicative of the way in which the castle was still a dominant force in military strategy and social discourse during the 17th century.

The approach adopted by this thesis has highlighted the non-military social discourse within castles during this period. Rather than focus on the destruction caused by war, an investigation of the construction of identity through eating and drinking provides new insights into the experiences of 17th-century warfare. Castles were far more than walls for a garrison to cower behind; they were instead active in the creation of identity, as evidenced by their prevalence on siege coinage of the period. The castles included within this study were just as important to their occupants as those who had inhabited them in previous centuries; it is only modern observers who diminish their importance during this period.

The division between the medieval and post-medieval periods has become almost insurmountable in recent decades, with clear divides drawn between the non-consumer society of the medieval period and the rise of a capitalist society, thus 'the one proposition that occasionally unites all archaeological studies of the period after c.1500 is that we study the rise of the modern world' (Johnson 1999b, 17, see also Fine and Leopold 1993, 64). Thus the castle is in inevitable decline during the 16th century, superseded by Henrican forts and more comfortable manor houses and mansions and whilst these new buildings 'referred to a medieval past…it was the past' (Johnson 2002, 173; see also Thompson 1987, 17-18). However, as this study has demonstrated, the occupation of castles during the Civil War should be viewed as a continuation of the past rather than its revival. As Courtney states (1997b, 9), 'both continuity and the true origins of change are often hidden by rigid period demarcations', and nowhere is this clearer than in the study of the Civil War castle. The symbolism of the castle as feudal fortress was still very much an active present during this period, representing many of the Royalists core values.

It would be wrong to suggest that the concept of the castle had remained unaltered over the century and a half separating the Wars of the Roses and the English Civil War. Nevertheless, to deny the post-medieval castle its medieval origin is to ignore an integral part of the castle's identity and the way in which it interacted with contemporary society. Just as there have been detailed discussions of the idea of the medieval castle (Wheatley 2004), so too there must now be a discussion of the idea of the post-medieval castle.

10.1.2 A biographical approach to castles

Despite concentrating on a single period of time, this thesis has highlighted the benefits to be gained from the biographical approach to castles outlined in chapter 2. Always intended to supplement rather than supplant current approaches, the analysis of material culture provides fresh insights into social discourse within castles. The social history of the castle was often more important than its architecture; for example, the actions of Sir William Brereton at Eccleshall demonstrate his need to occupy an ecclesiastical palace, a wish finally fulfilled at Croydon. Therefore, it is essential to appreciate the castle in its entirety rather than focus on the built environment alone.

The three sites chosen as detailed case studies have highlighted the importance of material culture choices during the mid-17th century, whether this was the elite drinking assemblage at Eccleshall, the separation of consumption areas at Sandal or a communal feasting assemblage at Pontefract. They, just as much as the architecture in which they were consumed, influenced and in turn were influenced by the individuals who used and discarded them. Far from being a passive tool for dating, such material culture allows archaeologists to explore the castle as it was experienced in the past. Although this thesis has focussed on one small element of the material record, the artefacts associated with the consumption of food and drink, this has still revealed the complexity of social discourse during a single phase of the castle's life.

The distribution of material culture at all three sites, and Sandal in particular, has highlighted the importance of place in consumption practices and drinking rituals in particular. The concentration of material around the symbolic heart of the castle, the motte, at a time when much of it had been destroyed, complements the documentary evidence from Pontefract where bonfires and flags of defiance were focussed on the locations most important to the garrison, namely the top of the Keep and the King's Tower. The use of these locations in conjunction with drinking rituals emphasises the way in which identity was shaped through the execution of actions within a particular location.

The importance of time has also been demonstrated through the maintenance of tradition by the use and deposition of archaic vessels at all sites. This practice

underlines the fact that the conflict, whilst being part of wider social change, also emphasised continuity with the past. The medieval vessels employed at Eccleshall and Pontefract highlight the curation of objects by the occupants of the castle and the embracing of historic elements within 17th-century social discourse. Rather than dismiss such items as residual, the incorporation of these into a meaningful discussion of their role with a Civil War context demonstrates the multiple roles a single artefact can play with contemporary society.

Matthew Johnson's knight sat outside the gate of Bodiam marvelling at its modernity but bemoaning its defensibility (Johnson 2002, 30). In the same way it is possible to envision a group of infantrymen, by no means elite, drinking at the top of the motte at Sandal. Among the vessels they are using are particular cups which situate them both spatially and temporally within a local framework. Their forms are archaic, suggesting the heritage for which they are fighting, whilst the Wrenthorpe marks on the base of their handle remind them of their homeland which they are defending. Just as Johnson's knight is only one individual, so they too are but one group who experienced the castle at one particular point in time. Only by reconstructing the biography of the castle is it possible to fully appreciate the complexity and multiplicity of social discourse conducted within its walls.

10.1.2.1 The biography of castles: the next chapter

In some ways the dual aims of this thesis were contradictory, promoting the use of a multi-phase biographical approach yet using a methodology that focuses on just a single period and restricted range of material culture. This was inevitable given the limited resources of the thesis; however, the methodology demonstrated here must now be applied to the entire lifespan of a castle. Studies of individual elements, for example Moorhouse's work on pottery distributions at Sandal or Thomas' analysis of changing consumption patterns of faunal remains at Dudley, have demonstrated this is a viable and informative approach, but these single-focus studies need to be extended to incorporate all forms of material culture (Moorhouse 1983a, 169-173; Thomas 2005, 75-77). The analysis of the entire biography of a castle would not involve any drastic change to the methodology employed here, merely the extension of that methodology to additional phases of the castle.

The biography of the castle should ideally incorporate every aspect of material culture used within the castles walls, although the scope of this thesis concentrated on the artefacts associated with the consumption of food and drink. In particular, tobacco pipes are a notable omission from this study of 17th-century social discourse, despite their considerable value in aiding a reconstruction of life within a Civil War garrison. Although not directly associated with the consumption of food and drink, the role of smoking in group identity and social discourse during this period should not be underestimated, as they are often associated with drinking rituals in contemporary woodcuts (see fig. 6.10).

The omission of certain types of material culture from this thesis serves to highlight the principal difference between current approaches and one governed by biography. Unlike the interpretation of landscape, which can be achieved by a single person, constructing the full biography of the castle requires an interdisciplinary and collaborative approach in which historical and archaeological methodologies are combined into a single narrative. It is impossible for a single person to be an expert on artefacts covering several material types, and a period of time that could cover almost a millennium from the inception of the castle to the present day. As a result the true biography of the castle, like the castle itself, must be the result of a large number of agents. This thesis has served to demonstrate that such an approach is possible, but only through a collaboration which can fully elucidate the complex social history of the castle.

10.2 Building for the future: new directions for a biographical approach

As with any preliminary study, this thesis has raised a number of directions for future study. The need for a holistic approach to castles has been outlined in the previous section, but there are numerous other possibilities for a biographical approach including the investigation of other Civil War assemblages, the analysis of assemblages from other siege sites and the extension of a biographical approach to other forms of architecture, most notably monasteries.

10.3 Further analysis of Civil War assemblages

If a material cultural approach to castles during the Civil War is to be truly successful it must incorporate more than the three sites presented here. This can be achieved in two

ways: the analysis of excavated sites which have yet to be published and the reanalysis of those that have appeared in print to conform to the methodological approach adopted for this thesis. Not all Civil War sites are suitable for such analysis; urban castles such as Newcastle for example would represent the biography of the local area rather than the castle in particular. Nevertheless, despite the decline of large open area excavation in recent years there are still a substantial number of sites for which the proposed approach would be applicable.

The number of castles with large unpublished assemblages is depressingly high. Although the reasons for their neglect vary from an architectural bias to a lack of money in developer-funded archaeology, the result, and the loss to archaeology, is the same. The castles presented here form only a small sample, but they typify the sites which have such great potential in the field of castle studies:

- Dudley Castle, West Midlands. A Manpower Services Commission funded excavation, investigations at Dudley castle resulted in one of the most exciting assemblages relating to the Civil War. The excavation of the Keep in particular revealed ceramic vessels which appeared to have been dropped from building's windows, whilst the conditions in the garderobe meant fragile items such as scraps of leather clothing survived. Despite the importance of this site, which also included an impressive collection of glass vessels and window glass, due to funding difficulties only selected elements such as the animal bones, environmental samples and condoms have been published (Boland 1984; 1985; Ratkai 1985: 1987; Gaimster *et al*. 1996: Thomas 2005). A general overview of the ceramic assemblage has been published along with a paper regarding the post-medieval coarsewares, although these contain insufficient detail to be of use to the methodology outline here. Dudley has great potential, particularly as it may lack the archaic material present at the case studies discussed here (S. Ratkai, *pers. comm.*). Its status during the 16th century as the Earl of Essex's home and its subsequent use by the Royalists as one of their principal midland garrisons means it has much to offer the field of castle studies, but this can only be achieved through the analysis and publication of the excavation.

- Sheffield Castle, South Yorkshire. Excavations during the development of the market at Sheffield produced an extensive assemblage relating predominantly to the outer gatehouse of the castle (Armstrong 1935). The published literature only relates to a plan of excavation and none of the artefacts recovered are included. Although only related to one particular area of the castle, the amount of material retrieved by the excavators suggests it could still reveal substantial information regarding social discourse at the site during the Civil War.

- Helmsley Castle, North Yorkshire. Like many castle sites, Helmsley was subject to clearance by the Ministry of Work in which material was removed wholesale to reveal the outline of ditches of walls. Despite this, it is possible to plot the distribution of material across the site, demonstrating there is still potential to investigate castles which have not been subject to systematic excavation practices (see fig. 1.2).

- Montgomery Castle, Powys. Although all other artefact types from the extensive excavations at Montgomery have been published, the pottery is restricted to a list of forms and fabrics recovered (Knight 1982). Whilst these suggest an unusually exotic collection of material for a castle so far inland, this must be confirmed through further analysis and quantification of the assemblage.

In addition to the analysis of unpublished assemblages, there are several sites which need to be reassessed to conform to the methodology posited within this thesis. These include examples such as Basing House (Moorhouse 1970; 1901a), which consist of a list of vessels with little indication of how complete they may be, thereby creating difficulties in estimating the number of vessels represented. Although unstratified sites such as Basing can still reveal exciting insights in social discourse at elite sites during this period, this can only be achieved through a more accurate estimate of vessels present than is currently available. Other published sites such as Beeston suffer from this to a lesser extent due to the difficulties of quantifying pottery at a given site. This thesis has highlighted the benefits to be gained from an accurate quantification of ceramics, but current conventions in ceramic analysis means it is difficult to compare

assemblages from numerous sites. This needs to be resolved before a wider study of material culture during this period can be achieved.

10.3.1 The biography of the siege

Although the period 1642-1651 marked one of most traumatic conflicts England has ever witnessed, it was not the only civil war conducted on its soil. Many of these during the medieval period included siege warfare to some extent, most notably during the Anarchy (1135-1153) but also as a result of the Barons' War during King John's reign, and even during the Wars of the Roses. The study of castles besieged in these conflicts not only provide an important parallel for the occupation of these sites during the 17th century, but also give a valuable insight into the experience of the castle during the medieval period.

Naturally this task is far from easy, particularly since the sieges of many of these castles was short-lived, and it is often impossible to isolate material culture related to these events. Nevertheless, the excavation of several siege castles constructed by King Stephen whilst besieging towns including Exeter and Wallingford suggest the methodology employed within this thesis can still be applied at particular sites. The possibilities of this approach are demonstrated by an assemblage relating to Crowmarsh Castle, constructed by Stephen whilst besieging Wallingford in 1139. Here a substantial assemblage of jugs and other drinking equipment suggests communal consumption amongst the elite was not restricted to 17th-century sieges (O. Creighton *pers. comm.*; Christie and Creighton 2013, 236).

10.3.2 The biography of occupation

The castle is not the only building for which a biography can be constructed. All structures are shaped by, and in turn shape, the social discourse which occurs within and around them, but the nature of deposition means it is often difficult to use a material culture approach to analyse them. However, where extensive excavations have occurred, as at urban centres such as Southampton and rural sites including Wharram Percy, it is possible to examine the way in which the experience of the site changed over time (Brown 2002; Hayfield 1987, 1-2).

One obvious target for this approach is monastic sites. A substantial number of these, like a significant number of castles, are sufficiently isolated within their environment to produce material assemblages which can be clearly associated with the sites occupation. Like castles, many suffered a similar period of catastrophic destruction during the Reformation, sealing substantial assemblages of material culture which can provide a wealth of information about the social discourse at the site. This has been demonstrated by the ceramic assemblages at sites including Kirkstall Abbey and Mount Grace Priory, and the interpretation of these sites can only be enhanced by the incorporation of other forms of material culture (Moorhouse and Slowikowski 1987; Roebuck and Coppack 1987)

Monastic sites also suffer from the same neglect as the post-medieval castle as their occupation during the 16th century onwards is largely ignored. Often adapted into elite houses, their use has parallels with the actions of elite commanders such as Sir William Brereton during the Civil War, and indeed a number of converted monasteries including Abbeycwmhir, Powys and Thurgarton Priory, Nottinghamshire played an active role in the conflict (Gaunt 1987, 132, 191-192). As a result, a biography of monastic sites, such as that adopted for Monk Bretton, is needed to incorporate this phase of their lives into earlier periods (Willmott and Bryson 2013, 138). As with castles, only by overcoming the medieval/post-medieval divide is it truly possible to appreciate ecclesiastical sites as the complex, flexible and exciting environments they truly were.

10.4 Final remarks

This thesis has been defined by two conflicts separated by several centuries but both caused by differing ideologies. Although the modern debate over the castle is scholarly in nature rather than military, there is still a need for closure between the two opposing arguments of status and defence. Rather than continue a tedious and pointless deadlock, it is now time to raise the siege and seek pastures new. A bibliographic approach facilitated through the analysis of material culture is a new weapon in an arsenal aimed at breaking down the castle gate and moving beyond it, focussing not on what a castle looked like but instead on how it was experienced. As a result, although the battle for Bodiam is definitively over, the war for the castle's true identity is just beginning.

Bibliography

Unpublished Sources

Cumberpatch, C. Unpublished. Analysis of ceramic material from Pontefract castle.

Eccleshall Archive. Unpublished. Archived material relating to the excavations at Eccleshall Castle held by the Potteries Museum, Stoke-on-Trent.

Fisher, J. 1993. *Outline of the Excavation*. Archived material relating to the excavations at Eccleshall Castle held by the Potteries Museum, Stoke-on-Trent. No pagination.

Ford, D. 1996. Handwritten notes on the pottery from Eccleshall Castle within the excavation archive held by Potteries Museum, Stoke-on-Trent.

Kent Archive Office U269. Archive of the Sackville family, Earls De La Warr.

MS. Tanner 217. Collections of Thomas Tanner held at the Bodleian University, Oxford.

PRO, DL 42/98. Duchy of Lancaster Commissions. Held by the National Archives.

PRO, DL 44/114. Survey of the castles of Pontefract and Sandal, Yorkshire. 6 Eliz I. Held by the National Archives.

SP 28/248. Commonwealth Exchequer Papers on Warwickshire held by the National Archives.

SRO GD 34/900. A list of rooms in the Queen's Castle at Pontefract. 25th May 1643. Held by the Scottish Archives.

Richardson, J. Unpublished. Analysis of animal bones more than 50% complete from Pontefract Castle.

Stubbes, K. and Butler, L. 1971. *Sandal Castle Wakefield, Yorkshire: Excavations 1971*. Unpublished typewritten notes in the excavation archive held by Wakefield Museums Service.

Wilcock, Unpublished. *Finds from the Eccleshall Castle Excavation, August 7-10, 1973*. Typewritten list stored with the Eccleshall Castle archive at the Potteries Museum, Stoke-on-Trent. No pagination.

Primary Sources

Alsop, B. (pub.) 1643. *The Weekly Account…* Number 2, 6th-13th September. London. TT 3:E.250[11].

Anon, 1629. *Wine, Beere and Ale. Together by the Eares.* London. STC 957:11.

Anon, 1641. *The Sucklington faction or (Sucklings) roaring boyes.* London. Wing (2nd edition)/ S6133.

Anon, 1642a. *The English Irish Souldier with his New Discipline…* London. Wing (2nd edition)/ E3093.

Anon, 1642b. *The Latest Remarkable Truths…* 4th October 1642. TT 41:E.240[23].

Anon 1642c. *True and Remarkable Passages from Several Places in the Kingdome.* London. Wing/ 247:E.116[28].

Anon 1646. *The World is Turned Upside Down.* London. TT 246:669.f.10[47].

Anon. 1660. *The Mystery of the Good Old Cause Briefly Unfolded....* London.

Bates, T. (pub) 1643. *Mercurius Civicus, Londons Intelligencer*. Number 16, 7th-14th September. London. TT 12:E.67[12].

Bates, T (pub.) 1645. *Mercurius Civicus, Londons Intelligencer*. Number 124, 1st-8th October. London. TT 50:E.304[8].

Bayly, T. 1650. *Worcesters Apopthegmes...* London. TT 178:E.1350[2].

de Beer, E.S. 1959. *The Diary of John Evelyn.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bickley, F. (ed.) 1930. *Report on the Manuscripts of the Late Reginald Rawdon Hastings, esq*. Volume II. London: HMSO.

Bishop, G. (pub.) 1645. *The Parliaments Post.* Number 21, 30th September-7th October. TT 50:E.304[6].

Brereton, W. 1646. *Sir William Brerетons Letter Sent to the Honorable William Lenthal Esq; Speaker of the Honorable House of Commons.* London. TT 53:E.325[30].

Brereton, W. 1844. *Travels in Holland, the United Provinces, England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1634-35.* Ed. E. Hawkins. London: Printed for the Chetham Society.

Butler, S. 1806. *Hudibras: In Three Parts, Written in the Time of the Late Wars, Volume 2*. London.

Carr, I. and Atherton, I. (eds.) 2007. The Civil War in Staffordshire in the Spring of 1646: Sir William Brereton's Letter Book, April-May 1646. *Collections for a History of Staffordshire* 4th series, volume 21.

C.J. 1802a. *Journal of the House of Commons.* Volume 4: 1644-1646.

C.J. 1802b. *Journal of the House of Commons.* Volume 5: 1646-1648.

Clarendon, E. 1705. *The History of the Rebellion and Civil wars in England, Begun in the Year 1641. Volume 2. Part 1.* Oxford.

Clifford, D.J.H. (ed.) 1990. *The Diaries of Lady Anne Clifford.* Stroud: Sutton.

Coe, J. (pub.) 1645. *The City-Scout.* London. Number 11, 30th September-7th October. TT 50:E.304[5].

Collings, R. (ed.) 1645. *The Kingdomes Weekly Intelligencer.* Number 120, 30th September-7th October. London. TT 50:E.304[7].

Dore, R.N. (ed.) 1984. The Letter Books of Sir William Brereton, Volume 1. *Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire* 123.

Dore, R.N. (ed.) 1990. The Letter Books of Sir William Brereton, Volume 2. June 18th 1645-February 1st 1645/6. *Record Society of Lancashire and Cheshire* 128.

Dugdale, W. 1656. *The Antiquities of Warwickshire Illustrated...* London.

Ellis, H. (ed.) 1853. Letters from a Subaltern Officer of the Earl of Essex's Army. *Archaeologia* 35: 310-334.

Evelyn, J. 2009. *Acetaria. A Discourse of Sallets.* London.

Fairfax, Baron F. 1643. *The Answer of Ferdinando Lord Fairfax to a Declaration of William Earle of Newcastle...* London. TT 16:E.91[28].

Firth, C.H. (ed.) 1917. Sir Hugh Cholmley's Narrative of the Siege of Scarborough, 1644-5. *The English Historical Review* 32: 568-587.

Glemham, T. 1648. *The Declaration of Sir Thomas Glenham, Sir Marmaduke Langdale, and Sir Philip Musgrave, in the North of England Concerning the Counties of Essex and Kent.* London. TT 70:E.446[29].

Hamilton, W.D. (ed.) 1890. *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I Preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office. (Vol.20), 1644-1645*. London: HMSO.

Harrison, W. and Edelen, G. 1994. *The Description of England: the Classic Contemporary Account of Tudor Social Life.* Washington, D.C.: Folger Shakespeare Library.

HC 1649. *The Petition and Presentment of the Grand-Juries of the County of York, for the Demolishing of Pontefract and Midlam Castles.* March 29th. London. TT 85:E.548[26].

Herrick, R. 1915. *The Poetical Works of Robert Herrick: Edited by F. W. Moorman.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Heylyn, P. (ed.) 1643a. *Mercurius Aulicus.* 32nd week, 12th August. Oxford. TT 11:E.65[26].

Heylyn, P. (ed.) 1643b. *Mercurius Aulicus.* 35th week, 2nd September. Oxford. TT 12:E.67[7].

Heylyn, P. (ed.) 1643c. *Mercurius Aulicus.* 36th week, 9th September. Oxford. TT 12:E.67[25].

Heylyn, P. (ed.), 1643d. *Mercurius Aulicus.* 22nd week, 3rd June. Oxford TT 19:E.106[2].

Heylyn, P. (ed.) 1643e. *Mercurius Aulicus.* 50th week, 16th December. Oxford. TT 14:E.79[19].

Heylyn, P. (ed.) 1645a. *Mercurius Aulicus.* 2nd-9th March. Oxford . TT 45:E.274[20].

Heylyn, P. (ed.). 1645b. *Mercurius Aulicus.* 20th-27th April. Oxford. TT 47:E.284[20].

HMC 4th Report, 1874. *Fourth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts. Part I. Report and Appendix*. London: HMSO.

HMC 7th Report, 1879. *Seventh Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts. Part I. Report and Appendix.* London: HMSO.

Holme, R. 1905. *The Academy of Armory, Part 2.* Edited by I.H. Jeayes. London: Roxburghe Club.

Holmes, R. (ed.) 1882a. *The Booke of Entries of the Pontefract Corporation 1653-1726.* Pontefract: Richard Holmes.

Hudson, R. (ed.) 1993. *The Grand Quarrel: Women's Memoirs of the English Civil War.* Stroud: Sutton.

Hutchinson, L. 2000. *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson.* London: Phoenix.

Ingler, W.(ed.) 1643. *Certaine Informations from Severall Parts of the Kingdome.* Number 34, 4th-11th September. London. TT 12:E.67[3].

Laud, W, Scott, W. and Bliss, J.1853. *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud, Sometime Lord Archbishop of Canterbury. Vol. V. Part II. Accounts of province, &c.* Oxford: John Henry Parker.

Lewis, T. (ed.) 1854. Letters of Brilliana Harley. *Camden Society* 1st series, 58.

Lodge, T. and Greene, R. 1970. *A Looking Glasse for London and England.* Edited by T. Hayashi. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow.

Malbon, T. 1889. Memorials of the Civil War in Cheshire and its Adjacent Counties. *The Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society* 19.

Mander, G.P. 1941. Civil War Documents from Rugeley. *Collections for a History of Staffordshire.* 3rd series. 1941: 147-153.

Markham, G. 1986. *The English Housewife: Containing the Inward and Outward Virtues Which Ought to be in a Complete Woman…* Edited by M.R. Best. Quebec: McGill-Queen's University Press.

May, R. 1685. *The Accomplisht Cook or the Art and Mystery of Cookery*. London. 5th edition.

Mews, P. 1646. *The ex-ale-tation of ale, the ancient lickquor of this realme.* London. Wing (2nd ed.)/ M1952

Newcastle, W., Duke of. 1643. *A Declaration of the Right Honourable the Earl of Newcastle His Excellency...* London. TT 16:E.92[17].

Pafford, J.H.P. (ed.) 1940. Accounts of the Parliamentary Garrisons of Great Chalfield and Malmesbury 1645-1646. *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society Records Branch* 2.

Parker, H. 1642. *The Manifold Miseries of Civil Warre and Discord in a Kingdom…* London. TT 27.E.153[3].

Paulden, T. 1702. *Pontefract Castle. An Account How it was Taken: and How General Rainsborough was Surprised in his Quarters at Doncaster, Anno 1648. ... By Captain Tho. Paulden.* London.

Pecke, S. (ed.) 1645. *A Continuation of Certaine an* [sic] R*emarkable Passeges Informed to the Parliament…* Number 2, 26th-3rd October. London. TT 50:E.303[35].

Pemberton, D.H. and Roots, I.A. (eds.) 1957. *The Committee at Stafford: 1643-1645* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ryves, B. (ed.) 1643a. *Mercurius Rusticus.* Number 1, 20th May. Oxford. TT 18:E.103[3].

Ryves, B. (ed.) 1643b. *Mercurius Rusticus.* Number 4, 10th June, Oxford. TT 19:E.106[12].

Sanderson, W. 1658. *A Compleat History of the Life and Raigne of King Charles from his Cradle to his Grave Collected and Written by William Sanderson, Esq.* London.

Sprigge, J. 1647. *Anglia Rediviva: England's Recovery: Being the History of the Motions, Actions and Successes of the Army under the Immediate Conduct of His Excellency Sir Thomas Fairfax, Captain-General of all the Parliament's Forces in England.* London.

Stow, J. 1842. *A Survey of London.* First Published 1598. London: Windet.

Taylor, J. 1630. *All the Works of John Taylor the Water-Poet.* London.

Taylor, J. 1647. *The World Turn'd Upside Down...* Wing/T532.

Taylor, J. 1649. *John Taylors Wandering, to See the Wonders of the West.* London. TT 83:E.573[12].

Taylor, J. 1651. *Ale Ale-vated into the Ale-titude.* London.

Tullie, I. 1988. *A Narrative of the Siege of Carlisle.* Edited by S. Jefferson. Otley: Smith Settle.

Vaisey, D.G. (ed.) 1969. Probate Inventories of Lichfield and District, 1568-1680. *Collections for a History of Staffordshire.* 4th series, volume 5.

Vicars, J. 1646. *Magnalia Dei Anglicana. Or, Englands Parliamentary Chronicle.* London.

Walbancke, M. (pub.) 1645. *A diary, or, An Exact Iournall Faithfully Communicating the Most Remarkable Proceedings in Both Houses of Parliament.* Number 3, 2nd-9th October 1645. London. TT 50:E.304[13].

Walker, A. (ed.) 1997. *The First and Second Siege of Pontefract Castle: Nathan Drake's Diary.* Pontefract: Gosling.

Whalley, H. (ed.) 1645a. *The True Informer*. Number 15, 2nd August. London. TT 48:E.294[22].

Whalley, H. (ed.) 1645b. *The True Informer*. Number 10, 28th June. London. TT 48:E.290[10].

Wood, A. 1692. *Athenae Oxoniensis: An Exact History of All the Writers and Bishops who have had their Education in the Most Ancient and Famous University of Oxford.* London.

Secondary Sources

Adamson, J.S.A. 1990. The Baronial Context of the English Civil War. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 40: 93-120.

Adamson, J.S.A. 1994. Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England. In *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England,* eds. K. Sharpe and P. Lake, 161-197. London: Macmillan.

Allan, J. 1983. Some Post-Medieval Documentary Evidence for the Trade in Ceramics. In *Ceramics and Trade: the Production and Distribution of Later Medieval Pottery in North-West Europe,* eds. P. Davey and R. Hodges, 37-45.

Sheffield: Department of Prehistory and Archaeology, University of Sheffield.

Allan, J. 1984. *Medieval and Post-Medieval Finds from Exeter, 1971-1980.* Exeter: Exeter Archaeological Reports 3.

Allan, J. 1996. The Excavated Glass Fragments. In Berry Pomeroy Castle, S. Brown. *Devon Archaeological Society Proceedings* 54: 237-238.

Albarella, U. and David, S.J.M. 1996. Mammals and Birds from Launceston Castle, Cornwall: Decline in Status and the Rise of Agriculture. *Circaea* 12: 1-156.

Allen, D. & Anderson, S. 1999. *Basing House, Hampshire Excavations 1978-1991*. Bristol: Hampshire Field Club Monograph 10.

Allen Brown, R. 1954. *English Medieval Castles.* London: Batsford.

Allen Brown, R. 1989. *Castles from the Air.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, J. 1971. *"A Solid Sufficiency": An Ethnography of Yeoman Foodways in Stuart England*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Anon. 1987. *Archaeology in Hereford 1986/7, being the Annual Report for the City of Hereford Archaeology Committee.* Hereford: Hereford Archaeology Service.

Anon. 2011. Found at Last: London's Civil War Ditch. *Current Archaeology* 250: 8-9.

Armitage, E.S. 1912. *The Early Norman Castle of the British Isles.* London: John Murray.

Armstrong, A.L. 1935. Sheffield Castle. An Account of the Discoveries Made During Excavations on the Site from 1927 to 1929. *Transactions of the Hunter Archaeological Society* 4(1): 7-27.

Arnold, C.J. 1990. Powis Castle: the Outer Bailey. *Montgomeryshire Collections* 78: 65-71.

Ashworth, W.J. 2003. *Customs and Excise: Trade, Production and Consumption in England, 1640-1845.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aston, M. 1988. *England's Iconoclasts. Volume 1: Laws against Images.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Austin, D. 1984. The Castle and the Landscape: Annual Lecture to the Society for Landscape Studies, May 1984. *Landscape History* 6: 69-81.

Avent, R. 1977. Laugharne Castle 1976: Introduction, Historical Summary and Excavations. *The Carmarthenshire Antiquary* 13: 17-41.

Baart, J.M. 1994. Dutch Redwares. *Medieval Ceramics* 18: 19-27.

Bacon, S.I. 1973. Colchester Castle Well, an Unusual Excavation. *Essex Archaeology and History* 3: 237-239.

Band, J. 1985. *The Battle for Stafford.* Stafford: Staffordshire County Library.

Barber, S.C. 1931. Excavations at Knaresborough Castle, 1925-8. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 30: 200–224.

Barclay, N. 1994. A Civil War Hoard from Middleham, North Yorkshire. *British Numismatic Journal* 64: 84-98.

Barker, D. 1985. Post-Medieval Pottery in the West Midlands. *West Midlands Pottery Research Group Newsletter* 5. No pagination.

Barker, D. 1986a. North Staffordshire Post-Medieval Ceramics- a Type Series. Part One: Cistercian Ware. *Staffordshire Archaeological Studies New Series* 3: 52-57.

Barker, D. 1986b. North Staffordshire Post-Medieval Ceramics- a Type Series. Part Two: Blackware. *Staffordshire Archaeological Studies New Series* 3: 58-75.

Barker, D. 1993. *Slipware.* Princes Risborough: Shire.

Barker, D. 1999. The Ceramic Revolution 1650-1850. In *Old and New Worlds*, eds. G. Egan, and R.L. Michael, 226-234. Exeter: Short Run.

Barker, D. 2011. The Post-Medieval Pottery. In *Tutbury: 'A Castle Firmly Built': Archaeological and Historical Investigations at Tutbury Castle, Staffordshire,* M. Hislop, M. Kincey and G Williams, 210-227. Oxford: BAR British Series 546.

Barley, M.W. and Waters, F. 1956. Newark Castle- Excavations, 1953-6. *Transactions of the Thoroton Society* 60: 20-33.

Barratt, J. 1995. *"Civil War Stronghold": Beeston Castle at War 1642-45*. Birkenhead: Caracole Press.

Bartlett, K.S. 1971. Excavations at the Potovens, near Wakefield, 1968. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 5: 1-34.

Bath, Marquis of. 1904. *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath, Vol. 1*. London: Historical Manuscripts Commission.

Baxter, M.J. and Cool, H.E.M. 1995. Notes on some Statistical Aspects of Pottery Quantification. *Medieval Ceramics* 19: 89-98.

BBC 2011. *Oliver Cromwell Beer Jug Found on Antiques Roadshow*. BBC News 1st October 2011. Available online at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-dorset-15137905. Accessed 30th August 2013.

Beaudry, M.C. Long, J., Miller, H., Neiman, F. and Stone, G.W. 1983. A Vessel Typology for Early Chesapeake Ceramics: The Potomac Typological System. *Historical Archaeology* 17(1): 18-42.

Bender, B. 2002. Contested Landscapes: Medieval to Present Day. In *The Material Culture Reader*, ed. V. Büchli, 141-174. London: Berg.

Bennett, M. 2000. *The Civil War Experienced: Britain and Ireland, 1637–1661*. London: Routledge.

Berkeley, Earl of. 1939. Excavations at Berkeley Castle. *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society* 60: 308-339.

Bernard, G.W. 1985. *The Power of the Early Tudor Nobility: a Study of the Fourth and Fifth Earls of Shrewsbury.* Sussex: Harvester.

Besly, E. 1987. *English Civil War Coin Hoards.* London: British Museum Occasional Paper 51.

Besly, E. 1998. A Civil War Hoard from Tregwynt, Pembrokeshire. *British Numismatic Journal* 68: 119-136.

Biddle, M. 1966. Winchester, the Old and New Minsters; the Brooks; Winchester Castle; Wolvesey Palace. *Archaeological Journal* 123: 172-221.

Biddle, M. 2005. *Nonsuch Palace: the Material Culture of a Noble Restoration Household.* Oxford: Oxbow.

Binford, L. 1981. Behavioral Archaeology and the "Pompeii Premise". *Journal of Anthropological Research* 37(3): 195-208.

Binns, J. 1986. Scarborough and the Civil Wars 1642-1651. *Northern History* 22: 95-122.

Binns, J. 1996. *A Place of Great Importance: Scarborough in the Civil Wars, 1640-1660.* Preston: Carnegie.

Boland, P., 1984, 'Dudley Castle Archaeological Project- First Interim Report 1983-4'. *West Midlands Archaeology* 27: 1-20.

Boland, P., 1985, 'Dudley Castle Archaeological Project- Summary Report 1984-5'. *West Midlands Archaeology* 28: 23-30.

Boothroyd, B. 1807. *The History of the Ancient Borough of Pontefract.* Pontefract.

Boothroyd, N. and Courtney, P. 2004. Late Medieval/Early Modern Pottery from Burslem Market Place, Stoke on Trent. *Medieval Ceramics* 28: 75-98.

Bonsall, J. 2007. The Study of Small Finds at the 1644 Battle of Cheriton. *Journal of Conflict Archaeology* 3(1): 29-52.

Bostwick, D. 2002. The Plasterwork, in *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-1986*, I. Roberts, 162-166. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Bostwick, D. and Roberts, I. 2002. Civil War Graffiti and Inscriptions, in *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-1986*, I. Roberts, 293-300. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Bottomley, F. 1979. *The Castle Explorer's Guide: a Guide to Everything There is to Know about Exploring Castles in England, Scotland and Wales.* London: Bracken Books.

Bourdieu P. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste.* London: Routledge.

Boyle, A. 2002-2003. The Cistercian Ware Products of Ticknall, South Derbyshire. *Medieval Ceramics* 26/7: 113-118.

Boyle, A. 2006. *Cistercian Ware Pottery in Yorkshire and the East Midlands.* PhD thesis, University of Nottingham.

Boyle, A. and Rowlandson, I. 2006-2008. A Midlands Purple and Cistercian Ware Kiln at Church Lane, Ticknall, South Derbyshire. *Medieval Ceramics* 30: 49-59.

Bradley, R. 1976. Maumbury Rings, Dorchester: the Excavations of 1908-1913. *Archaeologia* 105: 1-97.

Bradley, R. 1990. *The Passage of Arms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brady, A. 2006. Dying with Honour: Literary Propaganda and the Second English Civil War. *The Journal of Military History* 70 (1): 9-30.

Brauer, J. and van Tuyll, H. 2008. *Castles, Battles, and Bombs: How Economics Explains Military History.* London: University of Chicago Press.

Braun, H. 1948. *The English Castle.* 3rd edition, revised. London: Batsford.

Brears, P.C.D. 1967. Excavations at Potovens, near Wakefield. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 1: 1-43.

Brears, P.C.D. 1971a. *The English Country Pottery: its History and Techniques.* Newton Abbot: David and Charles.

Brears, P.C.D. 1971b. The Pottery, in Excavations at Potovens, near Wakefield, 1968, K.S. Bartlett, 16-31. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 5: 1-39.

Brears, P.C.D. 1974. Oatcake in the West Riding. *Folk Life-Journal of Ethnological Studies* 12(1): 55-59.

Brears, P.C.D. 1983. The Post-Medieval Pottery. In *Sandal Castle Excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report,* S. Mayes and L.A.S. Butler, 215-224. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Brears, P.C.D. 1985. *Food and Cooking in 17th-Century Britain.* London: Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England.

Brinklow, D. 1986. Cawood Castle. *Archaeology in York* 11(3): 29-35.

Brooks, N.P. 1966. Excavations at Wallingford Castle, 1965: an Interim Report. *Berkshire Archaeological Journal* 62: 17-21.

Brown, C.C. 2004. Sons of Beer and Sons of Ben: Drink as a Social Marker in Seventeenth-Century England. In *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England,* ed. A. Smyth, 3-20. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer.

Brown, D.H. 1985. Looking at Cross-Fits. *Medieval Ceramics* 9: 35-42.

Brown, D.H. 1997. Pots from Houses. *Medieval Ceramics* 21: 83-94.

Brown, D.H. 2002. *Pottery in Medieval Southampton, c.1066-1510.* York: CBA Research Report 133.

Brown, R.A. 1969. An Historian's Approach to the Origins of Castles in England. *Archaeological Journal* 126: 131-48.

Brück, J. 2005. Experiencing the Past? The Development of a Phenomenological Archaeology in British Prehistory. *Archaeological Dialogues* 12(1): 45-72.

Brudenell, M. and Cooper, A. 2008. Post-Middenism: Depositional Histories on Later Bronze Age Settlements at Broom, Bedfordshire. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 27(1): 15-36.

Burgess, A. and Winfield, L. 2002. The Human Remains. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-1986,* I. Roberts, 396-400. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Burnham, H. 1992. Test pits at Aberystwyth Castle, December 1989: Results of an Archaeological Recording. *Ceredigion* 11(4): 337–356.

Burrow, I. and Dennison, E. 1988. Excavations and Recording in Taunton and Wellington, 1982-5. *Somersetshire Archaeology and Natural History* 132: 165-80.

Butler, L.A.S. 1983a. History of the Site. In *Sandal Castle Excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report,* P. Mayes and L.A.S. Butler, 3-8. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Butler, L.A.S. 1983b. The Reconstruction of the Buildings. In *Sandal Castle Excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report,* P. Mayes and L.A.S. Butler, 76-82. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Butler, L.A.S., Mayes, P and Moorhouse, S.A. 1983. Phase Dating. In Sandal *Castle Excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report,* and L.A.S. Butler, 27-29. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Campbell, C. 1993. Understanding Traditional and Modern Patterns of Consumption in Eighteenth-Century England: a Character-Action Approach, in *Consumption and the World of Goods,* eds. J. Brewer, and R. Porter, R, 40-57. London: Routledge.

Capp, B. 2012. *England's Culture Wars: Puritan Reformation and its Enemies in the Interregnum, 1649-1660.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carlton, C. 1991. The Impact of the Fighting. In *The Impact of the English Civil War,* ed. J. Morrill, 17-31. London: Collins and Brown.

Carlton, C. 1992. *Going to the Wars: the Experience of the British Civil Wars 1638-1651.* London: Routledge.

Carmen, J. 1999 Bloody Meadows: the Places of Battle. In *The Familiar Past? Archaeologies of Later Historical Britain,* eds. S. Tarlow, and S. West, 233-245. London: Routledge.

Castle Studies Group, 1987. Statement of Intent. *Castle Studies Group Newsletter* 1: 2.

Cathcart King, D.J. 1988. *The Castle in England and Wales: an Interpretative History.* London: Croom Helm.

Celoria, F.S.C. and Kelly, J.H. 1973. A Post Medieval Pottery Site with a Kiln Base Found off Albion Square, Hanley, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire, England, SJ885 474. *City of Stoke-on-Trent Museum Archaeological Society Report* 4.

Cessford, C. 2008. Excavation of the Civil War Bastion Ditch at Cambridge Castle. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 97: 137-148.

Cessford, C. and Dickens, A. 2005. Cambridge Castle Hill: Excavations of Saxon, Medieval and Post-Medieval Deposits, Saxon Execution Site and a Medieval Coin Hoard. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 94: 73-101.

Chambers, G.E. 1950. A Note on the Excavations at Corfe Castle, 1949. *Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society* 71: 58-59.

Chapman, J. 2000a. 'Rubbish-Dumps' or 'Places of Deposition'? Neolithic and Copper Age Settlements in Central and Eastern Europe. In *Neolithic Orkney in its European context,* ed. A. Ritchie, 347-362. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Chapman, J. 2000b. *Fragmentation in Archaeology: People, Places, and Broken Objects in the History of South-Eastern Europe.* London: Routledge.

Charleston, R. 1971. Glass. In Finds from Basing House, S. Moorhouse. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 5: 63-70.

Charleston, R. 1984. *English Glass and the Glass Used in England AD 400-1940.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Charleston, R. 1993. The Seventeenth-Century Glass. In *Beeston Castle, Cheshire: A Report on the Excavations 1968-1985*, ed. P. Ellis, 170-172. London: English Heritage.

Charleston, R. 2002. Glass. In *Baconsthorpe Castle, Excavations and Finds, 1951-72,* C. Dallas and D. Sherlock, 68-75. Norwich: East Anglia Archaeology Report 102.

Charleston, R. 2005. Fine Vessel Glass. In *Nonsuch Palace: the Material Culture of a Noble Restoration Household,* M. Biddle, 200-265. Oxford: Oxbow.

Cherry, J. 1991. Leather. In *English Medieval Industries. Craftsmen, Techniques, Products,* eds. J. Blair and N. Ramsay, 295-318. London: Hambledon.

Cherry, M. 2007. Review Article: Greater Houses of England 1300-1500. Vol. III: Southern England. By Anthony Emery. *Antiquaries Journal* 87: 411-415.

Christie, N.J., Creighton, O.H., O'Sullivan, D. and Hamerow, H. 2003. The Wallingford Burgh to Borough Project: 2003 Fieldwork. *Medieval Settlement Research Group Annual Report* 18: 9-13.

Christie, N. and Creighton, O.H., with Hamerow, H. and Edgeworth, M. 2013. *Townscapes in Transformation. From Burh to Borough: the Archaeology of Wallingford, AD 800-1400.* Leeds: Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph.

Clark, G.T. 1884. *Medieval Architecture in England, Volumes 1 and 2.* London: Wyman and Sons.

Clark, P. 1983. *The English Alehouse: a Social History 1200-1830.* London: Longman.

Clarke, S. 1996. Abandonment, Rubbish Disposal and 'Special' Deposits at Newstead. In *TRAC 96: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference,* eds. K. Meadows, C. Lemke and J. Heron, 73-81. Oxford: Oxbow.

de Clerq, W., Caluwé, D., Cooremans, B., de Buyser, F., de Groote, K., Deforce, K., Ervynck, A., Lentacker, A., Mortier, S., Pype, P., Vandenberghe, S., van Neer, W. and Wouters, H. 2007. Living in Times of War: Waste of c.1600 from Two Garderobe Chutes in the Castle of Middleburg-in-Flanders (Belgium). *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 41(1): 1-63.

Cocroft, W.D. 1991-2. Post Medieval Glass from West Bromwich Manor House. *South Staffordshire Archaeological and Historical Society Transactions* 33: 25-41.

Cocroft, W. 2007. Vessel Glass. In *Stafford Castle: Survey, Excavation and Research 1978-1998. Volume II- The Excavations,* ed. I. Soden, 148-151. Stafford: Stafford Borough Council.

Colvin, H.M. 1968. Castles and Government in Tudor England. *The English Historical Review* 83(327): 225-234.

Colvin, H.M., Ransome, D.R. and Summerson, J. 1975. *The History of the King's Works. Volume III 1485-1660 (Part I).* London: HMSO.

Cooper, D.2008. The English Civil War in Staffordshire: the Experience of Uttoxeter. *Staffordshire Studies* 19: 61-100.

Cope, E.S. 1990. The Bishops and Parliamentary Politics in Early Stuart England. *Parliamentary History* 9(1): 1-13.

Coppack, G. 1976. The Pottery. In The Excavations of the Great Hall at Bolingbroke Castle, 1973, P. Drewett, G. Coppack, I. Goodall, and S.E. Rigold. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 10: 6-24.

Coulson C.L.H. 1979. Structural Symbolism in Medieval Castle Architecture. *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 132: 73-90.

Coulson, C.L.H. 1992. Some Analysis of the Castle of Bodiam, East Sussex. *Medieval Knighthood* 4: 51-107.

Coulson, C.L.H. 1994. Freedom to Crenellate by Licence: an Historiographical Revision. *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 38: 86-137.

Coulson, C.L.H. 2003. *Castles in Medieval Society: Fortresses in England, France, and Ireland in the Central Middle Ages.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coulton, B. 2003. Rivalry and Religion: the Borough of Shrewsbury in the Early Stuart Period. *Midland History* 28(1): 28-50.

Courtney, P. 1997a. Ceramics and the History of Consumption: Pitfalls and Prospects. *Medieval Ceramics* 21: 95-108.

Courtney, P. 1997b. The Tyranny of Constructs: Some Thoughts on Periodisation and Culture Change. In *The Age of Transition: the Archaeology of English Culture* 1400-1600, eds. D. Gaimster and P. Stamper, 9-23. Oxford: The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 15.

Courtney, P. 2001. The Archaeology of the Early-Modern Siege. In *Proceedings of a Conference held in the Department of Archaeology, University of Glasgow, April 2000,* eds. P.W.M. Freeman and A. Pollard, 105-115. Oxford: BAR International Series 958.

Courtney, P. and Courtney, Y. 1992. A Siege Examined: the Civil War Archaeology of Leicester. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 26: 47-90.

Courtney, T.W. 1973. Newark Castle Excavation 1972. *Transactions of the Thoroton Society* 77: 34-40.

Cowan, R.S. 1989. The Consumption Junction: A Proposal for Research Strategies in the Sociology of Technology. In *The Social Construction of Technological Systems: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology,* eds. W.E. Bijker, T.P. Hughes and T. Pinch, 261-280. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Cox, S. 1997. Bristol's Medieval and Civil War Defences. *Rescue News* 73: 4-5.

Credland, A.G. 1983. Military Finds. In *Sandal Castle Excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report.* S. Mayes and L.A.S. Butler, 259-266. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Creighton, O. 2002. *Castles and Landscapes: Power, Community and Fortification in Medieval England.* London: Equinox.

Creighton, O. 2008. Castle Studies and Archaeology in England: Towards a Research Framework for the Future. *Chateau Gaillard* 23: 79-90.

Creighton, O. and Liddiard, R. 2008. Fighting Yesterday's Battle: Beyond War or Status in Castle Studies. *Medieval Archaeology* 52: 161-169.

Cressy, D. 1989. *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Crossley, D.W. 1967. Glassmaking in Bagot's Park, Staffordshire, in the Sixteenth Century. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 1: 44-83.

Crossley, D.W. 1990. *Post-Medieval Archaeology in Britain.* Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Cumberpatch, C.G. 1996. The Pottery. In *Excavations at 16-20 Church Street, Bawtry, South Yorkshire,* eds. J.A. Dukley and C.G. Cumberpatch, 55-138. Oxford: BAR British Series 248.

Cumberpatch, C.G. 1997. Towards a Phenomenological Approach to the Study of Medieval Pottery. In *Not so much a Pot, more a Way of Life: Current Approaches to Artefact Analysis in Archaeology,* eds. C.G. Cumberpatch and P.W. Blinkhorn, 125-151. Oxford: Oxbow Monograph 83.

Cumberpatch, C.G. 2002. The Pottery. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-1986,* I. Roberts, 169-226. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Cumberpatch, C.G. 2003. The Transformation of Tradition: the Origins of the Post-Medieval Ceramic Tradition in Yorkshire. *Assemblage* 7. Available online at http://www.assemblage.group.shef.ac.uk/issue7/cumberpatch.html. Last accessed 30th August 2013.

Curth, L.H. and Cassidy, T.M. 2004. 'Health, Strength and Happiness': Medical Constructions of Wine and Beer in Early Modern England. In *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England,* ed. A. Smyth, 143-159. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer.

Dant, T. 1999. *Material Culture in the Social World: Values, Activities, Lifestyles.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Darlington, J. and Soden, I. 2007. Discussion. In *Stafford Castle: Survey, Excavation and Research 1978-98. Volume II- The Excavations,* ed. I. Soden, 189-223. Stafford: Stafford Borough Council.

Davey, P.J. 1988. Theory and Practice in Medieval Ceramic Studies. *Medieval Ceramics* 12: 3-13.

Davey, W. & Walker, H. 2009. *The Harlow Pottery Industries*. London: Medieval Pottery Research Group Occasional Paper 3.

Davey, P.J. and White, S.D. 2002. The Clay Tobacco Pipes. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-1986,* I. Roberts, 226-249. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Davies, J. 1992. *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism 1625-1641*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Davies, J.D. 2002. The Bird Bones. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-1986,* I. Roberts, 385-390. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Deetz, J. 1977. *In Small Things Forgotten.* New York: Doubleday.

Dixon, P. 1990. The Donjon of Knaresborough: the Castle as Theatre. *Chateau Gaillard* 14: 121-139.

Donagan, B. 1988. Codes and Conduct in the English Civil War. *Past and Present* 118: 65-95.

Donagan, B. 1994. Atrocity, War Crime, and Treason in the English Civil War. *The American Historical Review* 99(4): 1137-1166.

Donaldson, A.M., Jones, A.K.G. and Rackham, D.J. 1980. Barnard Castle, Co. Durham. A Dinner in the Great Hall. Report on the Contents of a Fifteenth-Century Drain. *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 133: 86-96.

Dore, R.N. 1965-1966. Beeston Castle in the Great Civil War, 1643-1646. *Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society* 75 and 76: 103-122.

Douglas, M. and Isherwood, B. 1996. *The World of Goods: Towards an Anthropology of Consumption.* 2nd edition. London: Routledge.

Drage, C. 1978. Excavations at Nottingham Castle, 1976-8: an Interim Report. *Transactions of the Thoroton Society* 82: 72-3.

Drage, C. 1981. Nottingham Castle: the Gatehouse of the Outer Bailey. *Transactions of the Thoroton Society* 85: 48-55.

Drage, C. 1987. An Excavation of the Royalist Town Ditch at Victoria Street, Newark, Nottinghamshire, 1986. *Transactions of the Thoroton Society* 93: 127-132.

Drage, C. 1989. Nottingham Castle: a Place Full Royal. *Transactions of the Thoroton Society* 93.

Draper, J. 1984. *Post-Medieval Pottery 1650-1800.* Princes Risborough: Shire.

Draper, J. 1997. A Civil War Pot from Corfe Castle. *Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeology Society* 118: 150–151.

Draper, J. 2001. Post-Medieval Pottery 1650-1800. Princes Risborough: Shire.

Drewett, P. 1973. The Excavation of the Great Hall at Bolingbroke Castle, Lincolnshire. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 18: 1-33.

Dumas, S. and Vedel-Petersen, K.O. 1923. *Losses of Life Caused by War.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Duncan, H. 2002. The Domestic Metalwork. In Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-1986, I. Roberts, 249-280. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Durham, B., Halpin, C. And Palmer, N. 1983. Oxford's Northern Defences: Archaeological Studies 1971-1982. *Oxoniensia* 48: 13-40.

Eaves, I. 1989. On the Remains of a Jack of Plate Excavated from Beeston Castle in Cheshire. *The Journal of the Arms and Armour Society* 8(2): 81-154.

Eaves, I. 2002. Arms, Armour and Militaria. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-1986,* I. Roberts, 324-355. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Edwards, P. 1998. Logistics and Supply. In *The Civil Wars: a Military History of England, Scotland and Ireland 1638-1660,* eds. J. Kenyon and J. Ohlmeyer, 234-271. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Egan, G. 2008. Armour and Weapons. In *Finds from the Well at St Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln,* ed. J. Mann, 70-72. Oxford: Lincoln Archaeological Studies 9.

Ellis, P. 1983. Spurs. In *Sandal Castle Excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report,* P. Mayes and L.A.S. Butler, 256-258. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Ellis, P. (ed.) 1993a. *Beeston Castle, Cheshire: a Report on the Excavations 1968-85.* London: RCHME.

Ellis, P. 1993b. The Excavations. In *Beeston Castle, Cheshire: Excavations by Laurence Keen & Peter Hough, 1968-85,* ed. P. Ellis, 108-131. London: RCHME.

Ellis, P. 1993c. Discussion: Civil War and Later. In *Beeston Castle, Cheshire: Excavations by Laurence Keen & Peter Hough, 1968-85,* ed. P. Ellis, 213-214. London: RCHME.

Ellis, N. and Atherton, I. 2009. Gareth Higgs's Account of the Sieges of and Iconoclasm at Lichfield Cathedral in 1643. *Midland History* 34(2): 233-245.

Ellison, M. and Harbottle, B. 1983. The excavation of a 17th-Century bastion in the Castle of Newcastle upon Tyne, 1976-81 *Archaeologia Aeliana 5th series* 11: 135-263.

Everson, P. 1996. Bodiam Castle, East Sussex: Castle and its Designed Landscape. *Chateau Gaillard* 17: 79-84.

Every, R. and Richards, M. 2005. Knives and Knife Sheaths. In *Before the Mast: Life and Death aboard the Mary Rose,* eds. J. Gardiner, 144-153. Portsmouth: the Archaeology of the Mary Rose 4.

Fairchilds, C. 1993. Consumption in Early Modern Europe. A Review Article. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 35(4): 850-858.

Fasham, P.J. 1973. Excavations in Banbury, 1972: First Report. *Oxoniensia* 38: 312-338.

Fasham, P.J. 1983. Excavations in Banbury, 1972: Second and Final Report. *Oxoniensia* 48: 71-118.

Ferguson, L.G. 1977. An Archaeological-Historical Analysis of Fort Watson: December 1780-April 1781. In *Research Strategies in Historical Archaeology,* ed. S. South, 41-71. London: Academic Press.

Fergusson, P. and Harrison, S. 1999. *Rievaulx Abbey: Community, Architecture, Memory.* London: Yale University Press.

Fine, B. and Leopold, E. 1993. *The World of Consumption.* London: Routledge.

Fleming, A. 2006. Post-Processual Landscape Archaeology: a Critique. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 16(3): 267-80.

Floore, P.M. and Jayasena, R.M. 2010. In Want of Everything? Archaeological Perceptions of a Dutch Outstation on Mauritius (1638-1710). *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 42(2): 320-340.

Foard, G. 2001. The Archaeology of Attack: Battles and Sieges of the English Civil War. In *Fields of Conflict: Progress and Prospect in Battlefield Archaeology*, eds. P.W.M. Freeman and A. Pollard, 87-103. Oxford: BAR International Series 958.

Foard, G. 2012. *Battlefield Archaeology of the English Civil War.* Oxford: BAR British Series 570.

Ford, D. 1995. Medieval Pottery in Staffordshire, AD 800-1600: A Review. *Staffordshire Archaeological Studies* 7.

Fothergill, B.B.C. 2013. *The Bird of the Next Dawn: the Husbandry, Translocation and Transformation of the Turkey.* PhD thesis, University of Leicester.

Fox, G. 1827. *The History of Pontefract, in Yorkshire.* Pontefract: John Fox.

Fox, G. 1987. *The Three Sieges of Pontefract Castle.* Leeds: Old Hall Press.

Fradley, M. 2006. Space and Structure at Carnarfon Castle. *Medieval Archaeology* 50: 165-178.

Fraser, A. 1984. *The Weaker Vessel: Woman's Lot in Seventeenth-Century England.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Friar, S. 2003. *The Sutton Companion to Castles.* Stroud: Sutton.

Gaimster, D. 1994. The Archaeology of Post-Medieval Society, c. 1450-1750: Material Culture Studies in Britain since the War. In *Building on the Past: Papers Celebrating 150 Years of the Royal Archaeological Institute*, ed. B. Vyner, 283-312. London: Royal Archaeological Institute.

Gaimster, D. 1997. *German Stoneware 1200-1900: Archaeology and Cultural History.* London: British Museum.

Gaimster, D. 2005. Hanseatic Table Culture in Northern Europe 1200-1600: the Archaeology of Cultural Transfer and Resistance. In *Consuming Passions: Dining from Antiquity to the 18th Century*, eds. M. Carroll, D.M. Hadley and H. Willmott, 67-85. Stroud: Tempus.

Gaimster, D., Boland, P., Linnane, S. and Cartwright, C. 1996. The Archaeology of Private Life: the Dudley Castle condoms. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 30: 129-142.

Garner, F.H. and Archer, M. 1948. *English Delftware.* London: Faber and Faber.

Gaunt, P. 1987. *The Cromwellian Gazetteer: an Illustrated Guide to Britain in the Civil War and Commonwealth.* Stroud: Sutton.

Gaunt, P. 1991. *A Nation under Siege: the Civil War in Wales 1642-48.* London: HMSO.

Gentles, I. 2007. *The English Revolution and the Wars in the Three Kingdoms, 1638-1652.* London: Longman.

Gilchrist, R. 1997. *Gender and Material Culture: the Archaeology of Religious Women.* London: Routledge.

Gilchrist, R. 1999. Landscapes of the Middle Ages: Churches, Castles and Monasteries. In *The Archaeology of Britain: an Introduction from the Upper Palaeolithic to the Industrial Revolution,* eds. J. Hunter and I. Ralston, 228-246. London: Routledge.

Giorgi, J, 1997. Diet in Late Medieval and Early Modern London: the Archaeobotanical Evidence. In *The Age of Transition. The Archaeology of English Culture 1400-1600,* eds. D Gaimster & P Stamper, 197-213. Oxford: Oxbow monograph 98.

Godfrey, E.S. 1975. *The Development of English Glassmaking 1560-1640.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Godwin, G.N. 1904. *The Civil War in Hampshire.* Revised edition. London: J. and E. Bumpus.

Gomersall, H. and Roberts, I. 2002. The Kitchen. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-1986*, I. Roberts, 41-55. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Good, GL. 1996. Bristol Castle Keep: a Re-Appraisal of the Evidence and Report on the Excavations in 1989. *Bristol and Avon Archaeology* 13: 17-45.

Goodall, A.R. 1983. Non-Ferrous Metal Objects (except Military Finds, Spurs and Pins). In *Sandal Castle excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report,* P. Mayes and L. Butler, 231-239. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Goodall, I.H.1976. Metalwork. In Excavations at Bolingbroke Castle, Lincolnshire, P. Drewett. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 10: 26-33.

Goodall, I. H. 1983. Iron Objects (except Military Finds and Spurs). In *Sandal Castle excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report,* P. Mayes and L. Butler, 240-252. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Gooder, E. 1984. The Finds from the Cellar of the Old Hall, Temple Balsall, Warwickshire. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 18: 149-249.

Goldthwaite, R.A. 1989. The Economic and Social World of Italian Renaissance Maiolica. *Renaissance Quarterly* 42(1): 1-32.

Gosden, C. and Marshall, Y. 1999. The Cultural Biography of Objects. *World Archaeology* 31(2): 169-178.

Grace, N. and Papworth, M. 1997. Excavations at Corfe Castle 1996. *Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society* 118: 138-139.

Graves, P. 2008a. Evidence of Iconoclasm? In *Finds from the Well at St Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln,* ed. J. Mann, 82-92. Oxford: Lincoln Archaeological Studies No. 9.

Graves, P. 2008b. Architectural Fragments. In *Finds from the Well at St Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln*, ed. J. Mann, 20-22. Oxford: Lincoln Archaeological Studies No. 9.

Greene, J.P. 1992. *Medieval Monasteries.* Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Greenslade, M. 2006. *Catholic Staffordshire.* King's Lynn: Biddles.

Greenslade, M.W. and Stuart, D.G. 1965. *A History of Staffordshire.* Beaconsfield: Darwen Finlayson.

Griffenhagen, G. B., and Bogard, M. 1999. *History of Drug Containers and Their Labels*. Madison, Wisconsin: American Institute of the History of Pharmacy.

Griffith, N.J.L., Halstead, P.L.J., MacLean, A.C. and Rowley-Conwy, P.A. 1983. Faunal Remains and Economy. In *Sandal Castle Excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report,* P. Mayes and L. Butler, 341-348. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

de Groote, K. and Pype, P. 2007. The Pottery. In Living in Times of War: Waste of c.1600 from Two Garderobe Chutes in the Castle of Middelburg-in-Flanders (Belgium), in W. de Clerq, D. Caluwé, B. Cooremans, de Buyser, F. de Groote, K. DeForce, A. Ervynck, A. Lentacker, S. Mortier, P. Pype, S. van den Berghe, W. van Neer and H. Wouters. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 41(1): 7-20.

Guilbert, G. (ed.) 1999. Fieldwork by Trent & Peak Archaeological Trust in Derbyshire, 1999. *Derbyshire Archaeological Journal* 119: 227-296.

Haigh, P.A. 1995. *The Military Campaigns of the Wars of the Roses.* Stroud: Sutton.

Hallam, A.D. 1964. Further Excavations at Taunton Castle, 1964. *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society* 109: 93-103.

Hannaford, H.R. 1988 Flint Castle, Clwyd: Excavations to the West of the Castle. *Archaeology in Wales* 33: 30-33.

Harbottle, B. 1966. Excavations at the South Curtain Wall of the Castle, Newcastle upon Tyne, 1960-61. *Archaeologia Aeliana* 4th series 44: 79-145.

Harbottle, B. and Ellison, M. 1981. An Excavation in the Castle Ditch, Newcastle upon Tyne, 1974-6. *Archaeologia Aeliana* 5th series 9: 75-250.

Harrington, P. 1992. *Archaeology of the English Civil War.* Princes Risborough: Shire.

Harrington, P. 2004. *English Civil War Archaeology.* Batsford: English Heritage.

Harrington, P. 2005. Siegefields: an Archaeological Assessment of 'Small' Sieges of the British Civil Wars. *Journal of Conflict Archaeology* 1(1): 93-113.

Harrison-Hall, J. 2001. *Catalogue of Late Yuan and Ming Ceramics in the British Museum.* London: British Museum.

Hartshorne, A. 1968. *Antique Drinking Glasses: a Pictorial History of Glass Drinking Vessels.* New York: Brussel and Brussel.

Hayfield, C. 1987. *An Archaeological Survey of the Parish of Wharram Percy, East Yorkshire. 1. The Evolution of the Roman Landscape.* Oxford: British Archaeological Reports British Series 172.

Henderson, J. 2005. Medieval and Post-Medieval Glass Finewares from Lincoln: an Investigation of the Relationships between Technology, Chemical Composition, Typology and Value. *The Archaeological Journal* 162: 256-322

Henderson, J. and Mann, J. 2008. Glass Vessels. In *Finds from the Well at St Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln*, ed. J. Mann, 36-40. Oxford: Lincoln Archaeological Studies 9.

Heslop, T.A. 1991. Orford Castle, Nostalgia and Sophisticated Living. *Architectural History* 34: 36-58.

Higham, R. and Barker, P. 2000. *Hen Domen, Montgomery: a Timber Castle on the English-Welsh Border, Vol. 2: A Final Report.* Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Hill, C. 1955. *The English Revolution 1640.* 3rd edition. Southampton: Camelot.

Hill, C. 1970. *God's Englishman: Oliver Cromwell and the English Revolution.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Hill, C. 1991. *Change and Continuity in 17th-Century England.* 2nd edition. London: Yale University Press.

Hill, J.D. 1995. *Ritual and Rubbish in the Iron Age of Wessex: a Study on the Formation of a Specific Archaeological Record.* Oxford: BAR British Series 242.

Hinton, D.A. and Hodges, R. 1980. Excavations in Wareham, 1974-5. *Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society* 99: 42-83.

Hodder, M.A. 1988-1989. Medieval and Post-Medieval Pottery from West Bromwich Manor House. *South Staffordshire Archaeological and Historical Society Transactions* 30: 35-38.

Hodder, M.A. 1991-1992. Post-Medieval Glazed Coarseware from West Bromwich Manor House. *South Staffordshire Archaeological and Historical Society Transactions* 33: 21-24.

Hohler, C. 1966 Kings and Castles. In *The Flowering of the Middle Ages*, ed. J. Evans, 133-178. London: Thames and Hudson.

Holmes, R. 1878. *Pontefract: Its Name, its Lords and its Castle.* Pontefract: Richard Holmes.

Holmes, R. 1882b. The Disinternment of Pontefract Castle. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 7: 470-472.

Holmes, R. 1883. The Disinternment of Pontefract Castle. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 8: 159-162.

Holmes, R. 1887. *The Sieges of Pontefract Castle: 1644-48.* Pontefract: Richard Holmes.

Holtorf, C. 2002. Notes on the Life History of a Pot Sherd. *Journal of Material Culture* 7(1): 49-71.

Holyoak, V. 1997. Civil War Monuments Project, Newark-on-Trent, Nottinghamshire: Rediscovery of Civil War Redoubt `Z'. *Transactions of the Thoroton Society* 101: 119-124.

Hope-Taylor, B. 1959. Excavations at Farnham Castle. *Antiquity* 33(130): 124-125.

Hughes, H. 1904. Aberystwyth Castle: Excavations Carried on in the Year 1903. *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 4: 317-323.

Hughes, A. 2012. *Gender and the English Revolution.* London: Routledge.

Humphreys, R. 2010. *Dover Castle: England's First Line of Defence.* Stroud: History Press.

Humphrys, J. 2007. *Enemies at the Gate: English Castles under Siege from the 12th Century to the Civil War.* Swindon: English Heritage.

Hunter, J. 1819. *Hallamshire: The History and Topography of the Parish of Sheffield in the County of York.* London: Lackington, Hughes, Harding, Mavor and Jones.

Hurst, D.G. 1962-3. Medieval Britain in 1961, Part II: Post-Conquest. *Medieval Archaeology* 6-7: 313-349.

Hurst, J.D. and Wright, S.M. 2011. Midlands Purple and Cistercian-Type Wares in the West Midlands in the 15th-16th Centuries. *Medieval Ceramics* 32: 55-64.

Hurst, J.G. 1974. Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Imported Pottery from the Saintonge. In *Medieval Pottery from Excavations: Studies Presented to Gerald Clough Dunning, with a Bibliography of his Works,* eds. V.I. Evison, H. Hodges and J.G. Hurst, 221-255. London: Baker.

Hurst, J.G., Neal, D.S., van Beuningen, H.J.E. 1986. *Pottery Produced and Traded in North-West Europe 1350-1650.* Rotterdam: Museum Boymans-van Beuningen. Rotterdam Papers VI.

Hurst Vose, R. 1994. Excavations at the 17th-Century Glasshouse at Haughton Green, Denton, near Manchester. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 28: 1-71.

Hutton, R. 1999. *The Royalist War Effort 1642-1646.* 2nd edition. London: Routledge.

Hutton, R. and Reeves, W. 1998. Sieges and Fortifications. In *The Civil Wars: a Military History of England, Scotland and Ireland 1638-1660,* J. Kenyon, J. and J. Ohlmeyer, 195-233. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

James, T. 1991, Carmarthen's Civil War Defences: Discoveries at Carmarthen Greyfriars Excavations 1983 – 1990. *The Carmarthenshire Antiquary* 27: 21-30.

Jennings, S. 1981. *Eighteen Centuries of Pottery from Norwich.* Norwich: East Anglian Archaeology Report no. 13.

Jennings, S.B. 2003. `A Miserable, Stinking, Infected Town': Pestilence, Plague and Death in a Civil War Garrison, Newark 1640–1649. *Midland History* 28: 51–70.

Johnson, M. 1996. *An Archaeology of Capitalism.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Johnson, M. 1999a. Reconstructing Castles and Refashioning Identities in Renaissance England. In *The Familiar Past? Archaeologies of Later Historical Britain,* eds. S. Tarlow and S. West, 69-86. London: Routledge.

Johnson, M. 1999b. The New Postmedieval Archaeology. In *Old and New Worlds*, eds. G. Egan and R.L. Michael, 17-22. Oxford: Oxbow.

Johnson, M. 2002. *Behind the Castle Gate: from Medieval to Renaissance.* London: Routledge.

Johnson, P.H. 1981. *The National Trust Book of Castles.* London: Granada.

Jones, A.M. 2004. Roaring Royalists and Ranting Brewers: the Politicisation of Drink and Drunkenness in Political Broadside Ballads from 1640 to 1689. In *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England,* ed. A. Smyth, 69-87. Cambridge: Brewer.

Jones, R.L.C. 1999. Fortifications and Sieges in Western Europe, c.800-1450. In *Medieval Warfare: a History,* ed. M. Keen, 163-185. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jörg, C.J.A. 1997. *Chinese Ceramics in the Collection of the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam: the Ming and Qing Dynasties.* London: Philip Wilson.

Keblusek, M. 2004. Drinking and the Royalist Exile Experience, 1642-1660. In *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England,* ed. A. Smyth, 55-68. Cambridge: Brewer.

Keen, L. 1993. The Castle: History and Structure. In *Beeston Castle, Cheshire: a Report on the Excavations 1968-85,* ed. P. Ellis, 93-107. London: RCHME.

Kelsey, S. 1997. *Inventing a Republic: the Political Culture of the English Commonwealth, 1649-1653.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Kenyon, J.R. 1982a. The Civil War Earthworks around Raglan Castle, Gwent: an Aerial View. *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 131: 139-142.

Kenyon, J.R. 1982b. A Cannon Shot Mould from Raglan Castle, Gwent. *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 131: 142-143.

Kenyon, J.R. 1990. *Medieval Fortifications.* London: Leicester University Press.

Kightly, C. 1979. *Strongholds of the Realm: Defences in Britain from Prehistory to the Twentieth Century.* London: Thames and Hudson.

King, D.J.C. 1983. *Castellarium Anglicanum: an Index and Bibliography of the Castles in England, Wales, and the Islands.* Two volumes. Millwood: Kraus International.

Kinsley, G. 1988. Excavation on the Supposed Site of Civil War Redoubt 11B, Newark-on-Trent, Nottinghamshire [failed to confirm RCHME projection]. *Transactions of the Thoroton Society* 92: 78.

Kinsley, G. 2004. Recent Archaeological Work on the Medieval Castle at Nottingham. *Transactions of the Thoroton Society* 107: 83–94.

Knight, J.K. 1970. A 17th Century Pottery Group from Swansea Castle. *The Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies* 23(4): 403-411.

Knight, J.K. 1982. Montgomery Castle: a Provisional Checklist of Fabric Types. *Medieval and Later Pottery in Wales* 5: 44-62.

Knight, J.K. 1992. Excavations at Montgomery Castle. Part I. The Documentary Evidence, Structures and Excavated Features. *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 141: 97-180.

Knight, J.K. 1993. Excavations at Montgomery Castle. Part II. The Finds: Metalwork. *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 142: 182-242.

Knight, J.K. 1994. Excavations at Montgomery Castle. Part III. The Finds: other than Metalwork. *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 143: 139-203.

Koptyoff, I. 1986. The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process. In *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective,* ed. A. Appadurai, 64-91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Landewé, W. 2010. The Image of the Castle: the Castle as a Motif in Medieval Marriage Ideology. *Chateau Gaillard* 24: 165-172.

LaMotta, V.M. and Schiffer, M.B. 2002. Behavioral Archaeology: Towards a New Synthesis. In *Archaeological Theory Today,* ed. I. Hodder, 14-64. Oxford: Blackwell.

Larkin, F.C. 1929. Excavations on the Site of Liverpool Castle. *The Historical Society of Lancashire and Cheshire Transactions* 79: 175-197.

Lawrence, S. 1983. Clay Tobacco Pipes. In *Sandal Castle Excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report,* and L.A.S. Butler, 285. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Le Patourel, H.E.J. 1967. Knaresborough Castle. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 41(4): 591-607.

Leach, P. 1984. *The Archaeology of Taunton: Excavations and Fieldwork to 1980*. Gloucester: Western Archaeological Trust Excavation Monograph 8.

LeeDecker, C.H. 1994. Discard Behavior on Domestic Historic Sites: Evaluation of Contexts for the Interpretation of Household Consumption Patterns. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 1(4): 345-375.

Lees, T. (ed.) 1883. *A Glossary of the Dialect of Almondbury and Huddersfield Compiled by the Late Rev. Alfred Easther*. London: Teubnee.

Lewis, J. 1999. Lathom House: the Northern Court. *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 152: 150–171.

Lewis, J.M. 1968. The Excavation of the 'New Building' at Montgomery Castle. *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 117: 127-156.

Liddiard, R. 2005. *Castles in Context: Power, Symbolism and Landscape, 1066 to 1500.* Macclesfield: Windgather.

Liddiard, R. and Williamson, T. 2008. There by Design? Some Reflections on Medieval Elite Landscapes. *Archaeological Journal* 165: 520-535.

Lindenbaum, P. 2001. John Playford: Music and Politics in the Interregnum. *Huntingdon Library Quarterly* 64(1/2): 124-138.

Lloyd, J.D.K. 1965. The 'New Building' at Montgomery Castle. *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 114: 60-68.

Ludlow, N. 2003. An Interim Review of 10 Years' Work at Carmarthen Castle, 1993–2003. *The Carmarthenshire Antiquary* 39: 147–151.

Lunsingh Scheurleer, D. F. 1974. *Chinese Export Porcelain, 'Chine de Commande'*. London: Faber.

Mabbitt, J.C. 2012. *Urban Society and the English Revolution: the Archaeology of the New Jerusalem.* PhD thesis, University of Newcastle.

MacGregor, A. 1985. *Bone, Antler, Ivory and Horn: the Technology of Skeletal Materials since the Roman Period.* London: Croom Helm.

MacGregor, A. 1991. Antler, Bone and Horn. In *English Medieval Industries*, eds. J. Blair and N. Ramsay, 355-378. London: Burns and Oates.

MacGregor, A., Mainman, A.J. and Rogers, N.S.H., 1999. *Craft, Industry and Everyday Life: Bone, Antler, Ivory and Horn from Anglo-Scandinavian and Medieval York.* York: The Archaeology of York 17/12.

MacInnes, A.I. 2005. *The British Revolution 1629-1660.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Maclean, P. and Starley, D. 1999. The Analysis of Metalworking Debris, Domestic Metalwork and Plate Armour from Pontefract Castle, West Yorkshire. *Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report* 33/1999.

Maddison, J. 1993. Building at Lichfield Cathedral during the Episcopate of Walter Langton (1296-1321). in *Medieval Archaeology and Architecture at Lichfield,* ed. J. Maddison, 65-84. Leeds: Maney.

Malim, T. and Taylor, A. 1992. Cambridge Castle Ditch. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 80: 1-6.

Manchester, K. 1983. Human Remains. In *Sandal Castle Excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report,* and L.A.S. Butler, 337-339. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Mann, J. (ed.) 2008. *Finds from the Well at St Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln.* Oxford: Lincoln Archaeological Studies No. 9.

Manning, R.B. 2007. Styles of Command in Seventeenth-Century English Armies. *The Journal of Military History* 71(3): 671-699.

Martin, A.S. 1991. The Role of Pewter as Missing Artefact: Consumer Attitudes toward Tablewares in Late 18th Century Virginia. In *Approaches to Material Culture Research for Historical Archaeologists,* compilers G.L. Miller, O.R. Jones, L.A. Ross and T. Majewski, 161-186. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania.

Martin, A.S. 1993. Makers, Buyers, and Users: Consumerism as a Material Culture Framework. *Winterthur Portfolio 2*8(2/3): 141-157.

Masinton, A. 2008. The Destruction of the Monasteries: Dissolution and Continuity of Sacred Space in Tudor Yorkshire. In *The Archaeology of Destruction,* ed. L. Rakoczy, 239-260. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Mayes, P. 1983. Description of the Excavated Buildings and Earthworks. In *Sandal Castle Excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report,* and L.A.S. Butler, 30-69. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Mayes, P. and Butler, L. 1983. *Sandal Castle Excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report.* Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Maynard, D.C. 1983. A Group of Post-Medieval Pottery from Dover Castle. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 17: 31-46.

McBride, C. 2004. National Stereotyping in Early Modern Culture. In *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England,* ed. A. Smyth, 37-51. Cambridge: Brewer.

McCarthy, M.R. and Brooks, C.M. 1988. *Medieval Pottery in Britain AD900-1600*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

McKendrick, N., Brewer, J. and Plumb, J.H. 1982. *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialisation of Eighteenth-Century England.* London: Europa Publications.

McNeill, T.E. 1989. Excavations at Tamworth Castle, 1972 and 1974. *South Staffordshire Archaeological and Historical Society Transactions* 29: 1-54.

Mennell, S. 1985. *All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present.* Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Merrifield, R. 1987. *The Archaeology of Ritual and Magic.* London: Batsford.

Miller, D. 1987. *Material Culture and Mass Consumption.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Miller, D. 2002. Coca-Cola: a Black Sweet Drink from Trinidad. In *The Material Culture Reader,* ed. V. Büchli, 245-263. London: Berg.

Minnitt, S.C. 1981. Civil War Coin Hoard from Taunton. *Somersetshire Archaeology and Natural History* 125: 121-123.

Mintz, S.W. 1993. The Changing Role of Food in the Study of Consumption. In *Consumption and the World of Goods,* eds. J. Brewer. J. and R. Porter, 261-273. London: Routledge.

Moffett, L. 1992. Fruits, Vegetables, Herbs and Other Plants from the Latrine at Dudley Castle in Central England, used by the Royalist Garrison during the Civil War. *Review of Palaeobotany and Palynology* 73: 271-286.

Moorhouse, S.1970. Finds from Basing House, Hampshire (c.1540-1645): Part One. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 4: 31-91.

Moorhouse, S. 1971a. Finds from Basing House, Hampshire (c.1540-1645): Part Two. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 5: 35-76.

Moorhouse, S. 1971b. Two Late- and Post-Medieval Pottery Groups from Farnham Castle, Surrey. *Surrey Archaeological Collections* 68: 39-55.

Moorhouse, S. 1972. Medieval Distilling-Apparatus of Glass and Pottery. *Medieval Archaeology* 16: 79-121.

Moorhouse, S. 1978. Documentary Evidence for the Uses of Medieval Pottery: an Interim Statement. *Medieval Ceramics* 2: 3-21.

Moorhouse, S. 1983a. The Pottery. In *Sandal Castle Excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report,* S. Mayes and L.A.S. Butler, 83-212. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Moorhouse, S. 1983b. Documentary Evidence and its Potential for Understanding the Inland Movement of Medieval Pottery. *Medieval Ceramics* 7: 45-87.

Moorhouse, S. 1983c. Vessel Glass. In *Sandal Castle Excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report,* S. Mayes and L.A.S. Butler, 225-230. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Moorhouse, S. 1983d. Civil War Period Non-Local Wares. In *Sandal Castle Excavations 1964-1973: a Detailed Archaeological Report,* S. Mayes and L.A.S. Butler, 213-214. Wakefield: Wakefield Historical Publications.

Moorhouse, S. 1986. Non-Dating Uses of Medieval Pottery. *Medieval Ceramics* 10: 85-123.

Moorhouse, S. and Roberts, I. 2002. *Wrenthorpe Potteries: Excavations of 16th and 17th-Century Potting Tenements near Wakefield, 1983-86.* Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 2.

Moorhouse, S. and Slowikowski, A.M. 1987. The Pottery. In *Kirkstall Abbey Vol. 1: the 1950-64 Excavations: a Reassessment,* eds. S. Moorhouse and S. Wrathmell, 59-119. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 1.

Moorhouse, S. and Slowikowski, A.M. 1992. The Pottery. In *Wrenthorpe Potteries: Excavations of 16th and 17th-Century Potting Tenements near Wakefield, 1983-86,* S. Moorhouse and I. Roberts, 89-149. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 2.

Moreland, J. 1999. The World(s) of the Cross. *World Archaeology* 31(2): 194-213.

Morrill, J. 1985. Sir William Brereton and England's Wars of Religion. *Journal of British Studies* 24(3): 311-332.

Morrill, J. 1993. *The Nature of the English Revolution.* London: Longman.

Morris, C. 2002. Objects of Wood. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-1986,* I. Roberts, 320-323. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Morris, C. 2008. Wooden Gaming Pieces. In *Finds from the Well at St Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln,* ed. J. Mann, 59-66. Oxford: Lincoln Archaeological Studies 9.

MPRG 1998. *A Guide to the Classification of Medieval Ceramic Forms.* Medieval Pottery Research Group Occasional Paper 1.

Nicholson, R. 2002. The Fish Bones. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-1986,* I. Roberts, 390-394. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Noake, P. 1993. The Post-Medieval Pottery. In *Beeston Castle, Cheshire: A Report on the Excavations 1968-1985,* ed. P. Ellis, 191-210. London: English Heritage.

Nolan, J. 1990. The Castle of Newcastle upon Tyne after c.1600. *Archaeologia Aeliana* 5th Series 18: 79-126.

Nolan, J. 1993. The Town Wall, Newcastle upon Tyne. Excavations at Orchard Street and Croft Street, 1987–89. *Archaeologia Aeliana* 5th Series 21: 93–149.

O'Callaghan, M. 2004. Tavern Societies, the Inns of Court, and the Culture of Conviviality. In *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England,* ed. A. Smyth, 37-51. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer.

O' Connor, S. and Duncan, H. 2002. The Bone, Antler and Ivory Artefacts. In Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-1986, I. Roberts, 293-300. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

O' Keeffe, T. 2001. Concepts of 'Castle' and the Construction of Identity in Medieval and Post-Medieval Ireland. *Irish Geography* 34(1): 69-88.

O'Mahoney, C. 1985. Excavation and Survey at Cardigan Castle. *Ceredigion* 10: 189-218.

O'Neil, B.H.St.J. 1960. *Castles and Cannon: a Study of Early Artillery Fortification in England.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Orton, C. 1993. How Many Pots Make Five? An Historical Review of Pottery Quantification. *Archaeometry* 35: 169-184.

Orton, C. 2000. Reinventing the Sherd: 25 Years of Pottery Statistics. *Medieval Ceramics* 24: 73-78.

Orton, C., Tyers, P. and Vince, A. 1993. *Pottery in Archaeology.* Cambridge: Cambridge Manuals in Archaeology.

Pacitto, A.L. 2004. English Heritage Excavations at Scarborough Castle, 1978. *East Riding Archaeologist* 11: 217-223.

Parker, G. 1996. *The Military Revolution: Military Innovation and the Rise of the West 1500-1800.* 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parry, C. 1987. Survey and Excavation at Newcastle Emlyn Castle. *Carmarthenshire Antiquary* 23: 11-27.

Partridge, J. 1993. The Excavation of a Lift Shaft at Colchester Castle. *Essex Archaeology and History* 24: 234-236.

Peck, L.L. 2005. *Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peers, C.R. 1909. On the Excavation of the Site of Basing House, Hampshire. *Archaeologia* 61(2): 553-564.

Pennell, S. 1998. 'Pots and Pans History': the Material Culture of the Kitchen in Early Modern England. *Journal of Design History* 11(3): 201-216.

Pennell, S. 1999. The Material Culture of Food in Early Modern England c.1650-1750. In *The Familiar Past? Archaeologies of Later Historical Britain,* eds. S. Tarlow, and S. West, 35-50. London: Routledge.

Peachey, S. 1988. *Civil War and Salt Fish: Military Diet in the 17th Century*. Norfolk, VA: Partisan Press.

Pearce, J. 2007. *Pots and Potters in Tudor Hampshire: Excavations at Farnborough Hill Convent 1968-1972.* Guildford: Guildford Museum.

Pettifer, A. 1995. *English Castles: a Guide by Counties.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Platt, C. 1982. *The Castle in Medieval England and Wales.* London: Secker and Warburg.

Platt, C. 2007. Revisionism in Castle Studies: a Caution. *Medieval Archaeology* 51: 83-102.

Pollard, T. 2008. The Archaeology of the Siege of Fort William, 1746. *Journal of Conflict Archaeology* 4(1-2): 189-229.

Porter, S. 1984a Property Destruction in Civil War London. *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 35: 59-62.

Porter, S. 1984b. The Civil War Destruction of Boarstall. *Records of Buckinghamshire* 26: 86-91.

Porter, S. 1994. *Destruction in the English Civil Wars.* Stroud: Sutton.

Prior, C.W.A and Burgess, G. (eds.). 2011. *England's Wars of Religion, Revisited.* Farnham: Ashgate.

Quinn, J.M.V. 1992. '*These Unhappy Warres': The Civil War and Pontefract.* Pontefract: Cluny.

Radford, C.A.R. and Hallam, A.D. 1953. The History of Taunton Castle in the Light of Recent Excavations. *Proceedings of the Somerset Archaeological and Natural History Society* 98: 55-96.

Rakoczy, L. 2007. *Archaeology of Destruction: a Reinterpretation of Castle Slightings in the English Civil War.* PhD thesis, University of York.

Rakoczy, L. 2008a. Introduction. In *The Archaeology of Destruction,* ed. L. Rakoczy, 1-5. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Rakoczy, L. 2008b. Out of the Ashes: Destruction, Reuse, and Profiteering in the English Civil War. In *The Archaeology of Destruction,* ed. L. Rakoczy, 261-286. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Ralegh Radford, C.A. and Hallam, A.D. 1953. The History of Taunton Castle in the Light of Recent Excavations. *Somersetshire Archaeological and Natural History Society* 98: 55-96.

Rathje, W. and Murphy, C. 2001. *Rubbish! The Archaeology of Garbage.* New York: University of Arizona Press.

Ratkai, S. 1985 The Medieval Pottery from Dudley Castle. *West Midlands Pottery Research Group Newsletter* 5. No pagination.

Ratkai, S. 1987, The Post-Medieval Coarsewares from the Motte and Keep of Dudley Castle *Staffordshire Archaeological Studies* 4: 1-11.

Ratkai, S. 2002. Vessel Glass. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological excavations 1982-1986*, I. Roberts, 287-290. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Ratkai, S. 2007. The Medieval and Early Post-Medieval Pottery. In *Stafford Castle: Survey, Excavation and Research 1978-1998. Volume II- The Excavations,* ed. I. Soden, 57-117. Stafford: Stafford Borough Council.

RCHME, 1960. Excavations in the West Bailey at Corfe Castle. *Medieval Archaeology* 4: 29-55.

RCHME. 1964. *Newark on Trent: the Civil War Siegeworks.* London: HMSO.

Reid, A. 1973. *The Castles of Wales.* London: George Philip and Son.

Richards, C. and Thomas, J.S. 1984. Ritual Activity and Structured Deposition in Later Neolithic Wessex. In *Neolithic Studies: a Review of Some Recent Work*, eds. R.J. Bradley, and J. Gardiner, 189-218. Oxford: BAR British Series 133.

Richardson, A. 2003. Gender and Space in English Royal Palaces c.1160-c.1547: a Study in Access Analysis and Imagery. *Medieval Archaeology* 47(1): 131-166.

Richardson, J. 2002. The Mammal Bones. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-86,* I. Roberts, 363-385. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Richardson, R.C. (ed.) 1997. *The English Civil Wars: Local Aspects.* Stroud: Sutton.

Riedlmayer, A. 1995. *Killing Memory: the Targeting of Bosnia's Cultural Heritage*. U.S. Congress, April 4. 1995. Available online at: *https://www.ischool.utexas.edu/~archweek/2002/killingmemory.doc* Last accessed 30th August 2013.

Rinaldi, M. 1989. *Kraak Porcelain: a Moment in the History of Trade.* London: Bamboo.

Roberts, I. 1988. *Pontefract Castle: The Archaeology of the Civil War*. Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeological Service.

Roberts, I. 2002a. *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-86.* Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Roberts, I. 2002b. The Evidence from Research and Excavations. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-86,* I. Roberts, 17-133.

Roberts, I. 2002c. Development of the Castle. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-86,* I. Roberts, 401-411. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Roberts, I. 2002d. Pontefract Castle in the Civil War. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-86,* I. Roberts, 413-434. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Roberts, I. 2002e. Introduction. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-86,* I. Roberts, 1-16. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Robinson, C.J. 1869. *A History of the Castles of Herefordshire and their Lords.* London: Longman.

Robinson, H.R. 1993. Introduction. In Excavations at Montgomery Castle. Part II. The Finds: Metalwork, J. Knight, 210-211. *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 142: 182-242.

Rodwell, K.A. 1976. Excavations on the Site of Banbury Castle. *Oxoniensia* 41: 90-147.

Roebuck, J. and Coppack, G. 1987. A Closely Dated Group of Late Medieval Pottery from Mount Grace Priory. *Medieval Ceramics* 11: 15-24.

Ross, C. 1981. *Richard III.* London: Methuen.

Roy, I. 1978. England Turned Germany? The Aftermath of the Civil War in its European Context. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 28: 127-144.

Samuels, J. 1998. Newark Castle. *Current Archaeology* 13(12): 458–461.

Saunders, A. 1977. Five Castle Excavations: Reports on the Institute's Research Project into the Origins of the Castle in England. *The Archaeological Journal* 134: 1-156.

Saunders, A, 1989. *Fortress Britain: Artillery Fortifications in the British Isles and Ireland.* Liphook: Beaufort.

Saunders, A. 2006. *Excavations at Launceston Castle, Cornwall.* Leeds: The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 24.

Schiffer, M.B. 1972. Archaeological Context and Systemic Context. *American Antiquity* 37: 156-165.

Schiffer, M.B. 1985. Is There a "Pompeii Premise" in Archaeology? *Journal of Anthropological Research* 41(1): 18-41.

Schiffer, M.B. 1987. *Formation Processes of the Archaeological Record.* Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Shaw, S. 1798. *The History and Antiquities of Staffordshire.* London.

Sheale, C.A.M. 1993. *Excavated Vessel Glass from Eccleshall Castle, Staffordshire.* MA thesis, University of Leicester.

Sheppard, R. 2003. Excavation of a Medieval Building and a Civil War Refortification at Bolsover Castle, Derbyshire. *The Derbyshire Archaeological Journal* 123: 111-145.

Sheppard, R. 2004. Bolsover Castle. *The Derbyshire Archaeological Journal* 124: 220–222.

Sherwood, R. 1992. *The Civil War in the Midlands: 1642-1651.* Stroud: Alan Sutton.

Shoesmith, R. 1986. *Archaeology in Hereford 1985/6.* Hereford: Hereford: Hereford Archaeology Service.

Shoesmith, R. 1991 Excavations at Chepstow 1973–1974. *Cambrian Archaeological Monographs* 4.

Smuts, R.M. 1987. *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Smyth, A. 2004. Introduction. In *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. A. Smyth, xiii-xxv. Cambridge: Brewer.

Soden, I. 2007. *Stafford Castle: Survey, Excavation and Research 1978-1998, Volume II- the Excavations.* Stafford: Stafford Borough Council.

Spavold, J. and Brown, S. 2005. *Ticknall Pots and Potters.* Ashbourne: Landmark Collector's Library.

Speight, S. 2008. Castles as Past Culture: Living with Castles in the Post-Medieval World. *Chateau Gaillard* 23: 385-394.

Spence, R.T. 1997. *Lady Anne Clifford: Countess of Pembroke, Dorset and Montgomery (1590-1676).* Stroud: Sutton.

Spraggan, J. 2003. *Puritan Iconoclasm During the English Civil War.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Spurgeon, C.J. and Thomas, H.J. 2001. Caerphilly Castle: the Civil War Redoubt. *Archaeologia Cambrensis* 147: 181-193.

Stocker, D. 1993. The Shadow of the General's Armchair. *The Archaeological Journal* 149: 415-420.

Stone, J.B. 1870. *A History of Lichfield Cathedral, from its Foundation to the Present Time.* London: Longmans, Green, Reader and Dyer.

Stone, L. 1972. *The Causes of the English Revolution 1529-1642.* London: Routledge.

Stoyle, M.J. 1996. *From Deliverance to Destruction: Rebellion and Civil War in an English City.* Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Stoyle, M.J. 1997. 'Whole Streets Converted to Ashes': Property Destruction in Exeter During the English Civil War. In *The English Civil Wars: Local Aspects,* ed. R.C. Richardson, 129-144. Stroud: Sutton.

Stoyle, M.J. 2005. *Soldiers and Strangers: an Ethnic History of the English Civil War.* London: Yale University Press.

Straube, B. 2006. 'Unfitt for any Moderne Service?' Arms and armour from James Fort. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 40(1): 33–61.

Stuard, S.M. 1985. Medieval Workshop: Toward a Theory of Consumption and Economic Change. *Journal of Economic History* 45(2): 447-451.

Tani, M. 1995. Beyond the Identification of Formation Processes: Behavioural Inference Bases on Traces Left by Cultural Formation Processes. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 2(3): 231-252.

Taylor, C., Everson, P. and Wilson-North, R. 1990. Bodiam Castle, Sussex. *Medieval Archaeology* 34: 155-157.

Tennant, P. 1992. *Edgehill and Beyond: the People's War in the South Midlands, 1642-1645.* Sutton: The Banbury Historical Society Vol. 23.

Tennant, P. 1996. *The Civil War in Stratford-upon-Avon: Conflict and Community in South Warwickshire, 1642-1646.* Stroud: Sutton.

Thirsk, J. 2006. *Food in Early Modern England: Phases, Fads, Fashions 1500-1760.* London: Hambledon Continuum.

Thomas, J. 1991. *Rethinking the Neolithic.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, R. 2005. *Animals, Economy and Status: Integrating Zooarchaeological and Historical Data in the Study of Dudley Castle, West Midlands (c.1100-1750).* Oxford: BAR British Series 392.

Thompson, M. 1979. *Rubbish Theory: The Creation and Destruction of Value.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thompson, M.W. 1960. Recent Excavations in the Keep of Farnham Castle, Surrey. *Medieval Archaeology* 4: 81-94.

Thompson, M.W. 1987. *The Decline of the Castle.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, M.W. 1991. *The Rise of the Castle.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, M.W. 1994. The Military Interpretation of Castles. *The Archaeological Journal* 151: 439-444.

Thorpe, W.A. 1961. *English Glass.* 3rd edition. London: Adam and Charles Black.

Tlusty, B.A. 2002. The Public House and Military Culture in Germany, 1500-1648. In *The World of the Tavern: Public Houses in Early Modern Europe,* eds. B. Kümin and B.A. Tlusty, 136-156. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Toy, S. 1963. *The Castles of Great Britain.* London: Heinemann.

Tullett, F. 1992. *War and Society in Early Modern Europe, 1495-1715.* London: Routledge.

Turner, D.J. 1986. Bodiam, Sussex: True Castle or Old Soldiers' Dream House? In *England in the Fourteenth Century: Proceedings of the 1985 Harlaxton Symposium,* ed. W.M Ormrod, 267-277. Woodbridge: Boydell.

Underdown, D. 1979. The Chalk and the Cheese: Contrasts Among the English Clubmen. *Past and Present* 85: 25-48.

Uotila, K. 2004. The Changing Roles of Outer Baileys in Finnish Castles. *Chateau Gaillard* 21: 281-289.

Varley, W.J. 1975 Excavations at Woodhall Manor, Beverley. *East Riding Archaeologist* 2: 12-45.

Vaughan, J. 2007. Early Post-Medieval Ceramics on Tyneside: a Summary and Discussion Regarding Aspects of Chronology and Interpretations. *Archaeologia Aeliana* 5th series, 36: 251-255.

Vinais, L. and Walsh, J. 2008. *Kraak Porcelain: the Rise of Global Trade in the Late 16th and Early 17th Centuries.* London: Jorge Welsh.

Vince, A. 2001. The UK Ceramic Thin Section Database. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 35: 106-118.

Walker, J. W. 1895. Sandal Castle. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 13: 154-188.

Ward, S. 1987. *Excavations at Chester: the Civil War Siegeworks 1642-6.* Chester: Grosvenor Museum Archaeological Excavation and Survey Reports 4.

Warmington, A.R. 1997. *Civil War, Interregnum and Restoration in Gloucestershire, 1640-1672.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Warner, P. 1971. *The Medieval Castle: Life in a Fortress in Peace and War.* London: Arthur Baker.

Watkins, J. 1987. The Pottery. In *Excavations in High Street and Blackfriargate,* P. Armstrong and B. Ayers, 53-181. Beverley: East Riding Archaeologist Vol. 8.

Weatherill, L. 1996. *Consumer Behaviour and Material Culture in England 1660-1760.* 2nd edition. London: Routledge.

Weatherill, L. 1971. *The Pottery Trade and North Staffordshire, 1660-1760.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Weinstein, R. 2005a. The Assemblage: an Introduction. In *Before the Mast: Life and Death Aboard the Mary Rose,* ed. J. Gardiner, 423-429. Portsmouth: The Archaeology of the *Mary Rose* 4.

Weinstein, R. 2005b. 'Messing' Items. In *Before the Mast: Life and Death Aboard the Mary Rose*, ed. J. Gardiner, 440-448. Portsmouth: The Archaeology of the *Mary Rose* 4.

Wheatley, A. 2001. *The Idea of the Castle in Medieval England.* PhD thesis, University of York.

Wheatley, A. 2004. *The Idea of the Castle in Medieval England.* York: York Medieval Press.

White, H. 2012. The Problem of Provenancing English Post-Medieval Slipwares: a Chemical and Petrographic approach. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 46(1): 56-69.

Wiggins, K. 2001 *Anatomy of a Siege: King John's Castle, Limerick, 1642.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Wilkinson, F. 1973. *The Castles of England.* London: George Philip and Son.

Williams, B. 1992. Exciting New Discoveries at Bristol Castle. *Rescue News* 56: 3.

Willmott, H.B. 2002. *Early Post-Medieval Vessel Glass in England, c.1500-1670.* York: CBA Research Report 132.

Willmott, H.B. 2005. Tudor Dining, Object and Image at the Table. In *Consuming Passions, Dining from Antiquity to the 18th Century*, eds. D.M. Hadley, H.B. Willmott and M. Carroll, 121-142. Stroud: Sutton.

Willmott, H.B. and Bryson, A. 2013. Changing to Suit the Times: a Post-Dissolution History of Monk Bretton Priory, South Yorkshire. *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 47(1): 136-163.

Wilson, P.R. 1989. Excavations at Helmsley Castle. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 61: 29-33.

Wilson. T.M. 2005. *Drinking Cultures: Alcohol and Identity.* Oxford: Berg.

Winter, J.M. 1977. Britain's `Lost Generation' of the First World War. *Population Studies* 31(3): 449-466.

Woolgar, C.M. 1999. *The Great Household in Late Medieval Britain.* London: Yale University Press.

Wright 2002. The Civil War Coinage. In *Pontefract Castle: Archaeological Excavations 1982-1986*, I. Roberts, 282-287. Wakefield: Yorkshire Archaeology 8.

Yentsch, A. 1991. The Symbolic Divisions of Pottery: Sex-Related Attitudes of Anglo-American Household Pots. In *The Archaeology of Inequality*, eds. R.H. McGuire and R. Paynter, 192-230. Oxford: Blackwell.

Young, J. 2008. Ceramic Vessels. In *Finds from the Well at St Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln*, ed. J. Mann, 27-36. Oxford: Lincoln Archaeological Studies 9.

Young, J. and Vince, A. 2005. *A Corpus of Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Pottery from Lincoln*. Oxford: Lincoln Archaeological Studies 7.

Young, P. and Emberton, W. 1974. *The Cavalier Army: its Organisation and Everyday Life* London: George Allen and Unwin.