Vandalism and Social Duty:
The Victorian Rebuilding of the 'Street Parish' Churches, Ryedale, North Yorkshire

2 Volumes

Volume I of II

David C Smith

PhD

University of York

Archaeology

December 2014

Abstract

The mid-19th century saw the greatest change to the material culture of Anglican worship since the Reformation. Yet despite the singular importance of this period to the life of the parish church, archaeologists have rarely engaged with these buildings. This thesis proposes an archaeological methodology for the examination of parish churches heavily restored or rebuilt during the 19th century. This innovative and flexible archaeological methodology integrates metric recording, systematic visual and stratigraphic analyses, 3D reconstruction, and a detailed synthesis of documentary resources. The 'Street Parish' churches in Ryedale, North Yorkshire, which were restored between 1855-1872, are utilised as case studies to test this methodology. Rather than being wholly dictated by national trends, the Victorian restoration of parish churches is shown to be a complex negotiation between these trends and local factors, including local personalities and the existing fabric. Indeed this thesis demonstrates that Victorian rebuild churches are heavily influenced by the earlier structures on the same site, often retaining the medieval plan form and architectural development. This study shows that through the archaeological study of 19th-century restoration, it is possible to recover a huge dataset which represents a significant thread of evidence about the character and development of the medieval church as well as post-medieval church investment, which have hitherto been missed or deliberately ignored by existing academic discourses. This research informs our understanding of these under-valued buildings, in order to enable their strategic future management.

Table of Contents

List of Illustrations (Volume II)

Acknowledgements

Author's Declaration

I certify that all material in this thesis which is not my own work has been identified and that no material has previously been submitted and approved for the award of a degree by this or any other University.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

1.1 Introduction

It has been argued that "The hand of the 19th century lies particularly heavily across the landscape of Britain" (Reed 1997, 340) and nowhere is this more true than on its parish churches. England's parish churches had undergone regular alteration and repair throughout the medieval and post-medieval periods, but the 19th century saw an unprecedented level of restoration and rebuilding. This programme of work resulted in the radical alteration of the vast majority of England's parish churches, with 7,144 churches being restored or rebuilt between 1840 and 1876 (Reed 1997, 334). Today it can be difficult to find a church that was not restored or rebuilt by the Victorians; as noted by John Betjeman: "It is still possible to find an unrestored church. Almost every county has one or two" (Betjeman 1980, 32).

The Victorian restoration phenomenon reflected changing liturgical requirements and architectural taste, and flourished in England from the 1830s until well into the 20th century. 'Restoration' saw the repair, extension, alteration, reordering, and rebuilding of parish churches, cathedrals, and historic buildings of all types. By the late 1870s this restoration zeal was tempered by a strong counter-reaction. What earlier Victorians had viewed as acts of piety, generosity, and social duty were recast as wanton acts of vandalism by the anti-restoration writings of the Society for Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB), John Ruskin, William Morris, and many others. Today, the Victorian restoration of parish churches is often derided and the perceived loss of medieval churches is lamented. Alec Clifton Taylor, perhaps generously, suggested, "today's attitude towards the Victorians, in the context of the parish churches, is an odd mixture of gratitude and indignation" (Clifton Taylor 1974, 10). Therefore it is perhaps not surprising that the Victorian restoration of churches has received little modern academic attention. Victorian churches – at least those by minor architects – have generally been considered to be of little significance, and often no distinction is made between new build and rebuilt churches (see Chapter 2 for discussion). Where scholars have engaged with heavily restored and rebuilt churches, they have done so assuming a disjunction between the medieval and Victorian fabric. John Betjeman noted that "Many of those [medieval parish churches] have been so severely restored in the last century [the 19th] that they could almost be called Victorian" (1980, 14), and modern academics have generally treated them as such. Consequently, rebuilt churches have not been utilised by

scholars as a resource for elucidating the medieval parish church, nor for exploring its post-medieval iterations. Furthermore, the academic study of heavily restored churches, such as it is, has been seen as the purview of architectural historians, who have concentrated on the Gothic Revival and its role in church design (e.g. Clark 1964, Fawcett 1976a) but have paid little attention to the actual fabric of restored churches. Buildings archaeologists have been similarly neglectful. They have shown little interest in 19th-century fabric, and where medieval elements remain within these churches, whether in situ, as reused architectural spolia, or in Victorian 'treasuries', they have been dismissed as having minimal value due to the loss of original context (see Section 2.4 below).

The mid-19th century saw the greatest change to the material culture of Anglican worship since the Reformation, yet despite the singular importance of this period to the life of the parish church, we know remarkably little about the Victorian restoration and rebuilding of individual parish churches, and there has been very little archaeological investigation undertaken on this large and significant dataset. While there has been some intellectual direction towards the archaeological study of the post-medieval developments of parish churches (Crossley 1990, 88; Rodwell 1996, 90; Gilchrist and Morris 1996), this research agenda has not yet been fulfilled. This neglect is particularly problematic when we consider the significance of the parish church as a building and social space. From the medieval period onward, it was arguably the most important structure in the village community, and the local church was integral to the key moments and stages of life, marking birth, marriage and death. Although the parish church remained a significant building throughout the post-medieval period, its long-established role in community life was affected by a number of wider developments, including economic and population expansion, new outlets for religious expression and identity (e.g. Non-Conformity), national liturgical and spiritual reform movements (e.g. the Oxford Movement), and the investment of moral, cultural and spiritual values in specific architectural styles (e.g. Pugin and others), all of which were materially influential on the fabric of the parish church.

This thesis builds on previous work on 19th-century churches from art historical, conservation, and archaeological perspectives, but sets out new research agendas and an innovative interdisciplinary methodology. The study combines detailed archaeological recording and analysis of five geographically linked churches in North Yorkshire with archival and documentary research, focusing particularly on the fabric of these under-

studied buildings. This systematic archaeological approach allows for the process of Victorian restoration to be explored, and sheds light on how national trends were manifested at the level of the rural parish church. The comprehensive study of each church's architectural fabric will not only illuminate 19th-century alterations, but also reveal valuable clues about the character and development of the medieval church as well as post-medieval church investment, which have hitherto been missed or deliberately ignored by existing academic discourses. The huge body of existing historical and archaeological research on the 19th century, which thus far has largely ignored the fabric of church buildings and the people who invested in them, will be valuably augmented by this focus on church building and restoration, as the amount of energy and wealth expended on restoring England's parish churches demonstrates that they were fundamental to Victorian society's concept of themselves, their religion, and the structure of society. This exploration of 19th-century parish churches will better inform our understanding of the active choices made during Victorian church restoration, and the people making those choices, revealing rebuilding and architectural recycling to be meaningful processes that reflect local, regional, and national identities and trends.

1.1.1 'The Street' benefice

In 1877 Sidney Colvin, the art and literary scholar, published an article entitled 'Restoration and Anti-Restoration', which explored the debate. Colvin was heavily influenced by John Ruskin (Mehew 2006) and 'Restoration and Anti-Restoration' sets out to justify the anti-restoration stance. To demonstrate the near ubiquity of church restoration and its impact on the medieval churches of England, Colvin used *Murray's English Handbook* to list the church restorations in the "small district of the Pickering and adjacent country in Yorkshire" (Colvin 1877, 451). Within this short list, Colvin detailed the restoration and rebuilding of the churches at Hovingham, Slingsby, Barton-le-Street, and Amotherby (fig. 1.1).

These four villages and their respective parish churches, along with Appleton-le-Street, form the core of the modern 'The Street' benefice and are known as the 'Street Parish' churches. These five rural villages follow the line of an old Roman vicinal way running west from Malton to Hovingham. From west to east this road passes the churches of St Helen, Amotherby, All Saints, Appleton-le-Street, St Michael, Barton-le-Street, All Saints, Slingsby, and finally All Saints, Hovingham. In the space of just over a decade,

(1860-1871) four of these churches underwent major campaigns of restoration and rebuilding, with All Saints', Appleton-le-Street, remaining the only substantially medieval church. These campaigns spanned the breadth of restoration approaches, from partial rebuilding through to the razing of the existing church and construction of a new building. The restoration of the 'Street Parish' churches took place during a period of intense national debate and these churches offer a lens for looking at how that debate diffused down to the level of the rural parish church.

In recent years Ryedale and the Vale of Pickering have been the focus of a significant amount of research. In 2012 the English Heritage-commissioned *Vale of Pickering Statement of Significance* was released. A number of academic research programmes have centred on the early construction of churches in the area, including Dr Aleksandra McClain's work on social space and commemorative monuments in North Yorkshire churches (2005). Dr Thomas Pickles has researched the network of Anglo-Saxon monasteries in Ryedale (2010, 2012), while Philip Rahtz & Lorna Watts have published a number of archaeological papers on churches in the Vale of Pickering, including two of the churches covered in this thesis (1998, 2001[1], 2007[2]). This research narrative has focused on the construction of early churches and their early medieval to Norman hey day, not their later, Victorian merits, which have thus far been ignored by archaeologists.

Forming a tight geographical grouping, these churches have been chosen as case studies to demonstrate the potential of an archaeological methodology for the study of Victorian restoration and rebuilding. As will be demonstrated, an archaeological approach challenges the assumption that Victorian rebuild churches can be assessed without reference to their earlier incarnations, and the assumption that reused material is always without context. This research has the potential to reveal the significance of these parish churches to inform their current statutory designations and statements of significance.[3] Peter Bowes' (2012) research elucidated the challenges faced by the Church of England in the near future, and especially the difficulties facing rural

---

[1] With Kelly Saunders.

[2] With Tony Pacitto.

[3] The designations of All Saints, Slingsby (Chapter 5) and St Michael, Barton-le-Street (Chapter 6) have already been re-assessed by English Heritage on the basis of this thesis research.

churches like those explored in this thesis. Such parish churches are increasingly at risk of redundancy and closure, highlighting the importance of understanding their significance to inform strategic decisions about their future through initiatives like the Church of England's 'Closed and Closing' (Church Care 2012). The Victorian restoration and rebuilding of churches like those in the 'Street Parish' has affected their perceived significance and their level of protection in the planning system, and therefore the potential future of these buildings. This thesis will help redress this imbalance in our understanding of the significance of these churches and their role in the ecclesiastical landscape of the 21st century. In order to understand the intersection between 19th-century intervention and modern policy, we must first look at what restoration meant to the Victorians and how that differs from modern definitions. Therefore the next section of this chapter will seek to provide both a definition and discussion of the concept of restoration through a synthesis of the significant quantities of art historical and conservation literature.

1.2 Context and definitions – Victorian 'restoration'

"Could not the word 'restoration' be expunged from the
architect's dictionary and 'preservation' substituted for it?"

Heath 1911, 146

The restoration debate itself and the varying 19th-century notions of authenticity and perceptions of the past, whilst significant and complex, are not explored here as central to this thesis (see Miele 1992 for a detailed analysis). However, the methodological approach employed in this thesis might make a significant contribution to this sphere of research through highlighting the importance of a close analysis of building fabric. This section will provide an overview of the development of the Victorian restoration movement and the eventual backlash against it, in order to provide context to the modern discourse on the Victorian restoration of parish churches. It aims to broadly establish what the word 'restoration' meant to Victorian architects, writers, and antiquaries, as well as what it means within the context of modern scholarship and policy.

1.2.1 The Eighteenth Century - 'necessary repairs' versus 'improvements'

By the 18th century, the vast majority of parish churches presented a palimpsest of accretion, repair and alteration created over many hundreds of years, usually in the prevailing architectural style of the time. During the later medieval period this generally meant successive Gothic styles, which were in turn supplanted by Neo-Classical and eventually Gothick forms during the 17th and 18th centuries. It is commonly held that many churches fell into disrepair following the 16th-century Reformation, and it is certainly the case that personal investment in church fabric (for example the construction of chantry chapels) dwindled (Whiting 2010, xvi). However the extent to which post-Reformation alterations were made to parish churches is difficult to gauge as later Victorian restorers swept away so much of the evidence. Consequently we have a much better knowledge of new build churches in the 17th and 18th centuries (see Clarke 1963) – especially by prominent architects like Christopher Wren and Nicholas Hawksmoor – than we do of the day-to-day Georgianisation of medieval parish churches. Reflecting liturgical change in the post-Reformation Church and the increased need for accommodation, the Georgian investment in parish churches primarily appears to have related to fixtures and fittings (box pews, pulpits, altar rails, reredos, Baroque organ cases, etc.) most of which were swept away during Victorian restoration. Although fabric disrepair does appear to have been an issue following the Reformation, the majority of parish churches continued to be used, repaired and altered to reflect changing fashion in both architectural style and liturgy. It was not until the 1780s that this tradition of alteration came to be seriously challenged, but it was the major campaigns on cathedrals that contributed to a developing discourse on restoration, not the modification of parish churches.

The late 18th century saw the continued development of antiquarianism alongside a rising awareness of the need to preserve, rather than simply study, medieval architecture (see: Frew 1979; Sweet 2004; Pearce 2007). From the late 1780s a circle within the Society of Antiquaries of London, including its president, Richard Gough, championed this developing agenda of preservationism in England. In 1786 and 1788 Gough anonymously published letters in *The Gentleman's Magazine* (Anon. 1786, 1048; Anon. 1788, 689-691) calling for the Society to take an active role in the preservation of ancient structures, with Frew describing Gough's 1788 letter as offering "the first coherent preservationist manifesto" (Frew 1979, 367). The principle battleground for the nascent preservationist cause was to be James Wyatt's 1789 restoration work at

Salisbury Cathedral. For the Georgians, the term 'restoration' encompassed two clearly defined types of work, being 'necessary repairs' and 'improvements' (Frew 1979, 368), with the latter covering alteration for stylistic coherence and liturgical function (Reeve 2007, 75-6). Wyatt's restoration work at Salisbury focused almost entirely on 'improvements' (Reeve 2007, 75-6), whilst largely ignoring pressing repair needs (Frew 1979, 370). The resulting controversy saw the emergence of "two prominent and diametrically opposed discourses… each justifying its perspective by aligning it with one side of the bifurcated eighteenth-century view of "restoration"" (Reeve 2007, 58). Numerous letters of complaint were published in *The Gentleman's Magazine* (Clark 1962, 63), and Rev John Milner wrote *A Dissertation on the Modern Style of Altering Ancient Cathedrals, as exemplified by Salisbury Cathedral* (1798), a work entirely dedicated to lambasting the "taste and propriety" (Milner 1798, v) of Wyatt's work. James Wyatt's 'improvements' to Salisbury Cathedral are "often cited as an important event in the history of English antiquarian study, and more broadly, in the development of a preservationist mentality towards ancient buildings" (Reeve 2007, 75). Later generations demonised and vilified Wyatt, particularly the Gothic architect A.W.N. Pugin, and Wyatt was widely labelled as "the Destroyer". However, as Frew (1979, 372) points out, the hostile response to Wyatt's work at Salisbury Cathedral did not reflect an unusual or extreme intervention – Wyatt's restoration was not uncommonly extreme and arguably represented a continuation of the medieval tradition. Instead this first great 'Restoration Debate' reflected the changing contemporary views of antiquarians towards preservationism. The controversy over the restoration of Salisbury Cathedral reveals the increasing antiquarian interest in church fabric as a source for exploring their architectural development, and an increased interest in their 'medievalness', reflecting an emerging shift in both architectural fashion and the appropriateness of both style and material choice in church restorations.

1.2.2 Early Victorian church building

From the close of the 18th century, interest in medieval architecture continued to rise, with Clark noting that from the 1780s *The Gentleman's Magazine* was "gradually transformed: Giant Fungi and Greek Inscriptions begin to yield to Gothic architecture as a subject of the illustrations; and in the 1783 volume there is an article on Gothic practically every month" (Clark 1962, 59). Authors and antiquaries such as John Britton (*Cathedral Antiquities of England* (1814–1835)) and Thomas Rickman (*Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of English Architecture* (1817)) published extensively on medieval architecture,

particularly on the Gothic, contributing to both the professional and wider public's increasing interest in, and appreciation of, medieval ecclesiastical architecture. Despite the continued awareness of medieval architecture, the ideas of preservation espoused in the Salisbury 'Restoration Debate' appears to have remained a minority agenda, particularly for parish churches.

England's rising population and increasing urbanisation during the early years of the 19th century prompted the construction of new churches, particularly in the larger towns and cities. The Church Buildings Acts of 1818 and 1824 established Government funds for the construction of new churches in England. Partially in response to requiring more accommodation, these new churches were also a reaction to both political and social upheaval in the aftermath of the French Revolution, and to the increasing rise of Non-Conformist worship (see Clark 1964 for a detailed discussion). Later named the 'Commissioner's Churches' or 'Million Churches', they were initially constructed in the Neo-Classical style that had dominated Georgian architecture (see Port 2006). Often extremely expensive, the Commissioner's Churches made only a small impact on the lack of accommodation in Anglican churches, resulting in pressure to enlarge and adapt existing historic parish churches. In the battle to re-establish the primacy of the Church of England and halt the rise of Nonconformism, parish churches also came under increased pressure to be made more comfortable. The anonymous *Hints to Some Churchwardens* (1825) provides a scathingly sarcastic judgement of the repair and alteration of historic churches during the Regency period (fig. 1.2). Written in the years immediately preceding the Victorian restoration phenomenon, this small booklet amusingly highlights a perceived lack of sensitivity to the historic architecture of medieval parish churches, and heaps scorn upon the employment of neoclassical architectural styling.

1.2.3 The Anglican Revival and the return of Catholic tradition

The *Tracts for the Times* were a series of theological publications released between 1833 and 1841. Written by High-Church Anglicans who collectively became known as the 'Oxford Movement' or 'Tractarians', they represented a major Anglo-Catholic revival within The Church of England. The Oxford Movement originally rose as a reaction against perceived political interference in the Irish Church through the Irish Church Temporalities Bill of 1833 (Faught 2003, 33). More broadly, the disillusionment and revulsion evoked by the French Revolution lead many to seek solace and stability in the

traditions of the past, especially those represented by medieval worship (Davies 1961, 342). Whilst the 'Tractarians' were a liturgical movement rather than a church restoration movement, they precipitated a wider debate about liturgy in Victorian England which resulted in a significant shift in Anglican worship. The resulting return towards medieval forms of worship had a profound impact on the use of space in parish churches, including their internal arrangement and fixtures and fittings (see Addleshaw and Etchells 1948).

In 1836, the architect, Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin, published his great polemical work *Contrasts* (1836), which argued for a return to the faith and social structures of an imagined pre-Reformation England. A highly rhetorical work, it represents a nostalgic reaction to the uncertainty of a rapidly changing world. Pugin was highly influential in casting Gothic architecture as a reflection of medieval faith and purity. *True Principles of Christian Architecture* followed in 1841, where Pugin again argues strongly for the use of Gothic architectural style as opposed to "all the bad architecture of the present time" (Pugin 1841, 1). Stressing the middle-pointed Gothic of the thirteenth-century as the ideal architecture of Christian faith, Pugin also pushes the agenda for 'honesty' of materials and structure. *True Principles* received a welcome four-page review in the leading periodical *The Gentleman's Magazine* (Jan 1842, 59-62). These two works by Pugin are particularly significant for driving the shift in architectural fashion away from Neo-Classical to Gothic, thus demonising much of the post-medieval architecture to be found in churches. The desire to sweep away unfashionable Neo-Classical (i.e. post-medieval) architectural elements was to become a key motivator in the restoration and rebuilding of parish churches throughout the later 19th-century (Ferriday 1964, 90).

1.2.4 The Ecclesiologists and Victorian church restoration

In 1839 a group of Cambridge University undergraduates formed The Cambridge Camden Society. Expanding on many of Pugin's ideas (Reed 1997, 336), their primary interest was the architectural setting of Anglican worship. The Society grew quickly during its early years and soon counted amongst it members many of the Anglican elite, including bishops, canons, and prominent theologians (see Hill 2007, 215). Following a move to London in 1845, largely to escape accusations of popery, the Cambridge Camden Society was rebranded as The Ecclesiological Society. From its inception in 1839 the Society was one of the key drivers for, and arbiters of, the Victorian restoration of parish churches. Indeed the Society's first law stated its object was "to promote the

study of Ecclesiastical Architecture and Antiquities, and the restoration of mutilated Architectural remains" (quoted in: White 1962, 225).

Given the multi-phase development of the majority of medieval parish churches, a number of restoration options were available to restorers. In *Plea for the Faithful Restoration of Churches,* the architect George Gilbert Scott (1850, 22) discusses the three categories of restoration as defined by the Society, being: Conservative, Destructive and Eclectic. "A conservative restorer would reproduce the exact details of every piece of ancient work which presented itself at the time of the restoration. A destructive restorer would do what the medieval architects did – disregard the work of the past, destroy what was there already, and rebuild it in the best style of art. An eclectic would take a middle course: in some cases restoring and in other remodelling" (Clarke 1969, 231).

The Ecclesiologists, as members of the Society were known, "unhesitatingly recommended the second" choice (Clark 1964, 156), advocating the combination of repairs with alterations to return the parish church to a perceived earlier state. The Society, along with Pugin, G.G. Scott, and many others, firmly held the Decorated Gothic style of the late 12th to mid-13th century to be the spiritually and aesthetically correct architectural style for churches. The Decorated Gothic style contained the "wealth of decorative detail and [included] all the appurtenances of ritual" (Brine 1991, 12) necessary to provide an architectural setting for the reinstated medieval liturgy of the Victorian Anglican revival. This style also dated from a period when the Church held supremacy over the State and was untainted by Protestant notions (Brine 1991, 2). Underpinning the Gothic Revival, these ideas were in marked contrast to the Neo-Classical architecture employed in 17th and 18th centuries, which were now deemed to have pagan overtones.

The Society's ideas on restoration in terms of 'correct' architectural style, liturgical arrangement, and ecclesiastical fixtures and fittings were primarily transmitted through their journal, *The Ecclesiologist.*[4] Published monthly between 1841 and 1868 *The Ecclesiologist* contained a section entitled 'Church Restoration', where often scathing judgements were passed on proposed and completed restorations of ecclesiastical architecture. It is important to note that the Society's ideas on restoration developed

---

[4] The Cambridge Camden Society also published a number of influential pamphlets, including: *A Few Words to Church Builders* (1841), and *A Few Words to Churchwardens on Churches and Church Ornamentation* (1842).

and changed throughout the mid-19th century. From the 1840s the Society's agenda was to return churches to the Decorated Gothic architectural style at the expense of all, especially later, styles, including Perpendicular Gothic and post-medieval Neo-Classical elements. For example, an 1845 article advocated the removal of 15th-century clerestories in favour of reinstating steeply pitched earlier rooflines (Anon. 1845, 103-5). However by the 1860s commentaries on church restoration had become markedly more cautious in their restoring zeal, often arguing for the retention of late medieval clerestories. In its early incarnation, the Society's notion of 'restoration' was to return a church to a perceived perfect architectural and spiritual state: one which may never have existed. By the 1860s their restoration agenda had shifted towards greater retention of fabric and encompassed restoration based on the available medieval architecture, although still biased towards the Decorated Gothic style and predicated on the removal of post-medieval elements.

Miele (1992, 253-4) highlights that despite the common perception that Victorian architects privileged the Decorated Gothic at the expense of earlier and later work, most parish churches were not actually restored to this single style. Instead a more complex negotiation occurred between the perceived superiority of the style, and the desire to elucidate the history of a medieval church through its newly understood architectural historiography. Indeed Miele states that the desire "to elucidate the history of a medieval church as defined by the new scientific historiography was as important to Victorian restorers as the adaptation of the structure to new liturgical requirements" (Miele 1992, 252). This approach can be seen in the archaeological approach to understanding buildings employed by architects such as GG Scott, JL Pearson and RJ Johnson. As will be seen, Miele's contention is supported by the findings in this thesis. Quiney encapsulates this negotiation when he suggests, "Restorations were to be acts of faith – faith in archaeological findings, and faith in the moral superiority of Middle Pointed [Decorated Gothic]" (Quiney 1979, 42).

Following the liturgical developments spearheaded by the Oxford Movement, the Ecclesiologists also campaigned through their journal for the reinstatement of chancels to churches.[5] As well as influencing the addition or reinstatement of architectural

---

[5] Following the Reformation, the liturgical significance of the chancel greatly diminished and many medieval chancels were ruinous or in a poor state of repair. Post-medieval parish churches were often constructed without chancels – for example many of Sir

elements to parish churches, the Society also campaigned strongly for the removal of some elements. Chief amongst these were box pews, on which the Society declared "war" (Anon. 1842, 145) as early as 1842. White, who noted that "a pew, in the nineteenth-century sense, is almost a forgotten item, so wholesale was the destruction of them engendered by the Society", encapsulates the ubiquitous success of this campaign (White 1962, 7).

Although often heavily criticised by the Ecclesiologists, Victorian England's most prominent church architect, Sir George Gilbert Scott, believed them both to have shared values. Written in the context of the now-rampant Victorian restoration of churches, Scott's *A plea for the faithful restoration of our ancient churches* (1850), urged caution and argued for a more conservative, archaeologically-informed restoration approach – an approach which Scott has often been accused of rarely following himself (e.g. Clarke 1969, 234). In practice, "neither he [G.G. Scott] nor the many other architects who restored churches through the nineteenth century could confine themselves to conservatism: they were eclectic or destructive" (Clarke 1969, 234). This thesis seeks to test that hypothesis and will argue that there is far more evidence of conservatism in Victorian restoration than has been previously assumed.

It is important to note that during the 19th century 'restoration' could mean a lot of different things in both theory and practice, and could encompass: repair, alteration, conservation, and reconstruction of historic fabric. When we see the term 'restoration' used in a 19th-century context we need to look very carefully at what was done – it is not possible to assume what has happened without looking carefully at the fabric. Clarke notes restoration could "mean simply preservation, or it may mean preservation with a certain amount of unnecessary reconstruction; it may even mean complete rebuilding on a new design" (Clarke 1969, 229), revealing that in a 19th-century context even complete rebuilding came within the scope of restoration. By exploring the decisions made at individual parish churches in this study, this thesis will explore which approaches were employed during the Victorian restoration of the 'Street Parish' churches and whether these reflect contemporary trends, or modern perceptions of those trends and how they manifested on the fabric of historic parish churches.

Christopher Wren's London churches. See: Addleshaw and Etchells (1948) for a discussion.

1.2.5 Transmission and diffusion

The main debates about both architectural taste and restoration philosophy occurred largely in London and were reported in the national journals, such as *The Ecclesiologist and The Gentleman's Magazine*. As already discussed *The Ecclesiologist* became enormously influential (Reed 1997, 336) in transmitting restoration doctrine to architects, patrons and vicars, but what impact might these writings have had in a rural area like Ryedale? Beyond journals, dissemination of these debates also took place through the national and regional learned societies, such as the Yorkshire Architectural Society and the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland. Luminaries of both the Gothic Revival and the protagonists of the Restoration Debate visited and lectured at many of these regional societies, often with transcriptions published in the corresponding society journals. Society members, often including local architects, landed gentry (patrons) and clergy, undertook regular excursions to visit historic buildings including church restorations, and often offered advice or judgement (for example: *York Herald* 23/06/1855, 6). The role of both gentleman's clubs and learned societies in the dissemination and spread of changing attitudes to architecture and church restoration throughout the 19th century requires significantly more study.

1.2.6 Backlash - The anti-restoration movement and the redefining of 'restoration'

> "The clumsy restoration of so many medieval buildings in
> the middle years of the nineteenth century provoked its
> own inevitable reaction"
>
> Reed 1997, 338

Although parish church restoration had become ubiquitous by the mid-19th century, all did not share in the value of restoring historic architecture. "The reaction against restoration was complex. There had always been protests against the worst sort of mutilation, but in these protests loopholes were left" (Ferriday 1964, 93). Initial attacks tended to focus on the disparity between the words and actions of restoring architects such as G.G. Scott and G.E. Street (Ferriday 1964, 93). One of the earliest critics was the Rev J.L. Petit, who argued against destructive restoration and rebuilding in his 1841 work *Remarks on Church Architecture,* for which he was "upbraided by critics for writing too much by aesthetic and not enough by antiquarian standards" (Betjeman 1968, 42).

A key figure in challenging the value of restoration was the art critic John Ruskin, whose publications *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (1849) and *The Stones of Venice* (1851-3) detailed strong misgivings about restoration, instead highlighting a value for the antiquity of fabric and the patina of age. Neither of his works had much impact on publication, for "Ruskin's opinion counted for little, as he was not a churchman and had an opinion on everything" (Ferriday 1964, 93). Despite this, Ruskin's writings (in particular *The Lamp of Memory;* a volume of *Seven Lamps of Architecture)* were to have a "persuasive and persistent" (Chitty 1996, 6) legacy in shaping British conservation philosophy and practice. They also contained the ideas and rhetoric that would become central to the emerging anti-restoration movement (see Glendinning 2013, 116-184).

It was in 1877 that the anti-restoration, or anti-scrape (in reference to the stripping of plaster from church walls) campaign truly gathered momentum, with the formation of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB). The SPAB Manifesto was written for the society's inauguration in 1877 by William Morris and Philip Webb and was heavily influenced by Ruskin. Its strong language, which gave primacy to historic fabric, was to challenge every restoration: "We think that those last fifty years of knowledge and attention have done more for their destruction than all the foregoing centuries of revolution, violence and contempt" (SPAB Manifesto 1877). The Manifesto goes further, stating that restoration was "a strange and most fatal idea" (SPAB Manifesto 1877), equating the process with the stripping of history from a building. Ruskin's most famous quote encapsulates the shift towards demonising the word 'restoration' in the later 19th century: "Do not let us talk then of restoration. The thing is a lie from beginning to end" (Ruskin 1849, 243). Despite this strong antiquarian reaction parish churches continued to be restored and rebuilt throughout the late 19th-century and into the early 20th century – clearly the transmission and diffusion of the ideology of the 'anti-scrape' movement at a regional and local level requires further study.

1.2.7 Legacy – Early 20th Century

By the end of the 19th century the term restoration started to appear in texts within inverted commas, denoting its changed meaning. Early 20th century discourses on church restoration tended to be highly nostalgic and aesthetically focussed, clearly demonstrating the influence of anti-restoration values (see: Hardy 1906; Willis Bund 1910; Heath 1911). For example Heath describes Victorian restoration as "a feverish

anxiety to smarten up the building by scraping and plastering, until all the beauty and charm of the old weather-worn surfaces have vanished" (1911, 142). He discusses Victorian restoration in terms of churches losing their "air of mystery and romance" and becoming "mainly regarded as archaeological museums and architectural records" (Heath 1911, 141). The discourse of this period rarely makes mention of the ecclesiastical and liturgical roots of Victorian church restoration, focussing instead on the resultant loss of atmosphere and historic fabric. Interestingly, Heath does differentiate between the earlier '"appalling mutilations" of the Regency period (e.g. Wyatt), from later "legitimate restoration, in so far as any restoration can be called legitimate", claiming the latter were informed by architectural principles "which did not ignore entirely the artistic claims of the earlier work" (1911, 142). Indeed, works from the early 20th century feature regret but understanding, suggesting that that Victorian restorers were "victim rather of ignorance than of wilful destruction" (Bund 1910, 1) or that work was done "with far too little reflection" (Heath 1911, 142). Infused with nostalgia for a lost medieval past, in particular for lost medieval parish churches, 20th century discourse continued to reflect the influence of Ruskin and Morris' values of physical antiquity and the patina of age - an inheritance that remains evident in numerous publications throughout the 20th century, and is epitomised by John Betjeman in the posthumously published *In Praise of Churches* (1996).

The first half of the 20th century saw a broader conversation develop around restoration and conservation, especially as applied to towns and cities in an industrialised and urbanised Britain (see Glendinning 2013, 179-184). This debate was amplified in the aftermath of the two World Wars, but largely focused around secular buildings, although the restoration of ecclesiastical architecture still prompted some heated debate around notable monuments, including Temple Church, London (see Park and Griffith-Jones 2013; Whyte 2010) and Coventry cathedral (see Spence 1962). The restoration of parish churches was generally less contentious, with a 1944 publication entitled *Bombed Churches as war memorials* (Architectural Press 1944) advocating the retention of some bombed-out ruins for use as war memorials, thus providing visceral reminders of the impact of war.

1.2.8 Conclusions

Today, terms such as "architectural conservation" and "historic preservation" dominate modern discourse on dealing with historic structures, and "restoration" is comparatively

rarely employed. From the later 20th century restoration has increasingly referred solely to the process of returning an historic building to a previous known state; a technical definition distinct from either conservation or preservation. Modern definitions of restoration emphasise the process as a return to a known state only, as opposed to any perceived or idealised state in the past, as encompassed by Victorian use of the word. Such a shift in definition and emphasis reflects the lasting anti-restoration rhetoric influence of Ruskin, Morris and the SPAB. It is clear that this understanding continues to underpin both the policy framework and the tone of modern philosophy. The profound effects these authors had and have on the foundation of the modern heritage industry is highlighted by Dr Keith Emerick, who in advocating new uses for historic ruins, suggests that such would "end the tyranny of Ruskin and Morris" (Emerick 2014, 236).

The term 'restoration' is one whose meaning has altered significantly over the past two hundred years, as cultural heritage values, technologies and material have changed. Today those buildings that underwent 'destructive' restoration, in the form of complete rebuilding, are considered as Victorian structures akin to new build churches, rather than as restored medieval churches. The line between Victorian 'restoration' and 'rebuilding' remains blurred. For the purposes of this thesis, the term 'restoration' will be used to cover the broad spectrum of works undertaken as part of the 19th century alteration, repair and reordering of parish churches. Where Victorian restoration has resulted in the near total demolition and reconstruction of the church, the terms rebuilt and rebuilding will be employed for clarity.

This chapter has sought to provide both a chronological and analytical discussion of some of the underlying concepts of this thesis, particularly restoration. It has shown that restoration must be understood as a fluid and changing concept and that 18th and 19th-century debates form the focus of modern conservation philosophy. It raises a series of questions about how such high-level ideas filter down and impact on regional and local contexts and on what actually happens to the fabric of the parish church, which will be explored in the case studies of this thesis. Having provided the concepts and chronological framework, the following chapter of the thesis will explore the legacy and impact of these issues on the scholarly agenda and intellectual and critical frameworks in church studies.

Chapter 2 – Review of Relevant Literature

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will critically engage with the research frameworks of those disciplines generating modern scholarship on Victorian parish churches and their 19th-century restoration and rebuilding. This scholarship has primarily been the product of three academic disciplines, being art history, conservation, and archaeology in its guises of church archaeology and post-medieval archaeology, each of which has its own methodologies and research agendas. These three disciplines have all fallen short when considering 19th-century parish churches in their own right, each for different reasons and in ways specific to the discipline. In art historical discourse, the narrative of the Gothic Revival has obscured the material culture of restored churches. The focus instead has been on using new-build Victorian churches as a lens for the study of taste, style and genius; an approach lacking any detailed analysis of fabric or critical engagement with restoration and rebuilding. While art historians relate the positive story of the Gothic Revival, there is a parallel, largely negative, narrative for the period, exploring the strong reaction against the restoration of historic structures (which we have seen in the previous chapter). This negative story of 19th-century churches has been driven by the conservation and heritage disciplines, and the discourse focuses on abstract intellectual and biographical narratives that again fail to engage with the actual physical impact of restoration on individual parish churches. The inherent value judgements against Victorian restoration have also put up an impediment to the study of these churches.

The relatively recent emergence of church archaeology as a discipline was largely driven by attempts to recover the early origins of churches, for which no documentary evidence survives. The discipline's focus on the early story of parish churches continues within archaeological discourse today (see *Church Archaeology*). Indeed, archaeologists have tended to view Victorian restoration solely in terms of how it has compromised our understanding of the medieval church. Where archaeological discourse has engaged with the post-medieval period, the narratives have generally been concerned with developments in industry, agriculture and contemporary architecture (see for example Newman et al 2001; and Crossley 1990). When ecclesiastical architecture has been

studied, the debate has focussed on new building types emerging at the time, such as Non-Conformist chapels. As we shall see, this is a function of both periodisation issues and narrative issues within the discipline. Parish churches have not been viewed as a big part of the grand narratives of Empire, industry, and economic and political developments – however, as we will see, they are actually intimately connected to those stories (see Chapter 9). The time has come for a critical reassessment in order to set the agenda for an archaeological understanding of the impact of Victorian restoration on parish churches.

2.2 Art History: Style and the Cult of Personality

Dana Arnold has noted that modern art historical discourse tends towards two distinct themes, being the study of the evolution of style, and the study of artistic genius (see Arnold 2002). In the case of 19th-century ecclesiastical architecture, the narrative of style has centred on the Gothic Revival, both to explore the new forms of architectural innovation in the period, and to develop a systematic way of dating architectural style. The other, linked, narrative revolves around biographical works on the principle architects of the Gothic Revival (and the occasional patron) and utilises key buildings to explore their creative genius.

A Style Fetish

Chapter one has outlined the rise in publication on Gothic architecture during the 19th century, much of which sought to characterise, typologise, and date medieval Gothic architecture. Antiquarians of the late 18th and 19th centuries sought to understand the development of medieval architecture through the detailed recording and analysis of the architectural style of surviving structures, in particular ecclesiastical churches. Thomas Rickman's *Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of English Architecture* (1817) represents one of the first attempts to establish a systematic, chronological typology of medieval architecture. During the 19th century most aspiring architects and antiquarians sought to publish on medieval architectural style, either as monographs (e.g. A.W.N. Pugin 1841; R.J. Johnson 1864) or in the many learned periodicals of the time, such as *The Builder* and *The Gentleman's Magazine*. Medieval Gothic architecture quickly developed as the most fashionable style, and the popularity of works on the Gothic can be seen in Bloxam's (1829) much reprinted *The Principles of Gothic Architecture* and John Henry Parker's *Introduction to Study of Gothic Architecture*, which was first published in 1849 and had reached 14th editions by 1902. Robert Willis, who pioneered the structural

understanding of Gothic architecture, was arguably also the father of building biographies (Crossley 2000, 23-4), producing detailed and systematic monographs on the architectural development of medieval structures (see also Buchanan 2013).

Much of 20th-century academic discourse on Victorian ecclesiastical architecture has carried on this antiquarian tradition of tracing the development of architectural style through the 19th century. Generally termed the 'Gothic Revival', art historians have published extensively on the evolution of style in Victorian ecclesiastical buildings (e.g. Eastlake 1870 (edited and reissued by Crook 1978); Clark 1964; Macaulay 1975; Lewis 2002). The Gothic Revival label has been further compartmentalised and codified into sub-style categories "based on a perceived consensus in the process of design" (Arnold 2002, 87) such as 'High Victorian' and 'Late Victorian', with publications detailing the buildings and architects typifying each style (for example Muthesius 1972; Smart & Denham 1989). Due to their narrative focus on demonstrating design progress, many of these works offer little consideration of Victorian buildings beyond their aesthetic value; the buildings become "no more than the stylistic analysis of their facades – their aesthetic is their history" (Arnold 2006, 232). Indeed, the vast majority of scholarly work on 19th-century ecclesiastical building contains no consideration of the ability of these buildings to inform our understanding of the people who worshipped in them or the communities within which they sat. In essence, there is a tendency for art historical discourse to reduce churches to being solely artistic objects. One extreme example of this mindset is Alec Clifton Taylor's (1974) *English Parish Churches as Works of Art*. Following an introduction in which Clifton Taylor takes great pains to detail every perceived artistic failing of the Victorians, especially Victorian church restoration, the volume goes on to celebrate parish churches and their contents as purely aesthetic and artistic objects. Discourse that approaches Victorian ecclesiastical architecture solely as designed works of art precludes any exploration of the structures beyond their initial construction, and importantly, largely excludes the thousands of medieval churches altered and restored during the 19th-century.

The Cult of Personality

> "The cult of personality – the named author genius – has
> then been fundamental to the construction of histories of
> western architecture from post-medieval times to the present.
> But this excludes much of the built environment and restricts
> our understanding of architecture."
>
> (Arnold 2002, 43)

As well as exploring the artistic and stylistic development of architecture through the 19th century, architect biographies also feature strongly within the art historical scholarship on Victorian church studies. Library shelves are stacked with volumes dedicated to the key architects (and the occasional patron) of the Gothic Revival, with their architectural accomplishments offered as evidence and illustration. Colvin's (1978) *Biographical Dictionary of British Architects 1600-1840* and Clarke's (1969) *Church Builders of the Nineteenth Century* exemplify this biographical focus in telling the story of architecture. These biographical narratives have predominantly gravitated towards those architects identified as major figures in the evolution of architectural history (Arnold 2002, 35), including: AWN Pugin (Hill 2007), GG Scott (Cole 1980), William Butterfield (Thompson 1971), and GF Bodley (Hall 2014). As new material on the luminaries of Victorian architecture becomes exhausted, scholars are increasingly turning to the later and the less well known Victorian church architects, as demonstrated by recent biographies of Sir Ninian Comper (Symondson & Bucknall 2006) and Sir Charles Nicholson (Bundock 2012). A similar trend has emerged for regional architects and their buildings, including Ferry's (2009a) *Powerhouses of Provincial Architecture 1834-1914*, and Brandwood's (2010) *The Architecture of Sharpe, Paley and Austin*. The move towards discussing lesser-known architects has broadened the discourse to include more parish churches, but whilst they acknowledge that these structures are of regional or even national significance, they do not consider their local significance within their setting or the communities who built, used, and lived with these buildings. These recent trends within art historical discourse reveals that the overriding narrative remains focused on personalities, but might this shift towards lesser architects help us to see how these ideas diffuse down through to rural parish churches?

This use of biographical narrative within art historical discourse has been likened to the 'Cult of Personality', where the architect is deemed the author genius (see Saint 1989; and Arnold 2002, 35-50). A serious consequence of the biographical approach to studying parish churches is that it privileges buildings designed by renowned architects over buildings by less celebrated architects or where the designer is unknown (Arnold 2002, 37). Indeed parish churches by unknown and uncelebrated architects are "pushed to the sidelines of history" (Arnold 2002, 35). This equates to the vast majority of parish churches, almost all of which were restored or rebuilt by regional or lesser-known architects. Indeed, such a bias is embedded within the English designation process where the historical and associational value is often the first thing to be described in a church and directly informs their designation (see: English Heritage's (2008) *Conservation Principles* and (2011) *Listing Selection Guide: Places of Worship*). The outcome of this bias is clearly visible in English Heritage's statutory lists of heritage assets, where churches by famous architects (Scott, Bodley etc.) inevitably have a higher designation (and thus greater protection) than those by 'lesser' architects, irrespective of their individual merits or the wider significances of the buildings. This privilege is neatly summarised by Arnold (2002, 37):

> Buildings in the post-medieval period are usually seen as more
> important if they have a named author, and if that author is recognised
> as part of the established canon of architectural history the building's
> status is commensurate with that of its architect.

The modern scholars' obsession with the cult of personality, of telling the story of big men and big buildings, also precludes any discussion of these churches as used and experienced spaces. This "separates 'architecture' from the function of the building, the theory of the process of architecture and the broader social and cultural significance" (Arnold 2002, 41) and denudes it of much of its meaning. This biographical approach to exploring the Gothic revival has removed art historical discourse from any examination of the material culture of the churches. More importantly, by privileging the genius of the architect, scholars fail to engage with church fabric as a negotiated outcome between architect, patron, incumbent and parishioners.

Recent Developments

More recently this discourse has been re-evaluated to include the wider literary, political, religious and social context of the Gothic Revival (e.g. Germann 1973; Worsley 1993; Scotland 1997, Hall 2000). Since the mid-20th century the Victorian Society has campaigned to raise the profile of the period by championing its architectural contributions, and has recently highlighted changing perceptions of Victorian architecture (Hill et al 2010). These developments are part of the discourse on the Gothic Revival broadening its context, re-engaging audiences with what Gothic means, reflecting a wider cultural shift. Whilst these fascinating works go a long way towards elucidating the major themes influencing the restoration of churches during the 19th century, Ferry (2009b) is perhaps exceptional in using an individual parish church to explore the applicability and ramifications of these more abstract narratives. Her unpublished conference paper explores the 1892 rebuilding of the chancel at St. Michael's church, Cropthorne, Worcestershire to investigate how far physical changes to the church fabric reflected a more profound social and cultural transformation, particularly the rise of the Anti-Scrape movement. There is also an emerging subtle shift in art historical discourse away from its focus on "aesthetics, design and authorship" towards building histories (Saint 1989, ix), but the resultant narrative is still focussed on elite buildings and renowned personalities (for example Barnwell & Pacey's (2008) telling of *Who built Beverley Minster?*). However, this change in emphasis has thus far largely failed to progress beyond the cathedrals and greater churches. The art historical study of the parish church (at least those not by famous architects) essentially remains the purview of enthusiastic amateurs and local historians.

The art historical focus on architects and the progress of style excludes the majority of parish churches from serious study. Crucially, the research agenda's focus on individual genius demonstrated through design and style omits critical discussions of restoration / rebuilding, or of immediate medieval influence on Victorian parish church design. This has resulted in 19th-century churches being uniformly viewed as new design builds, without reference to their earlier iterations on the same site. By contrast, this thesis is interested in the lesser-known architects and the dynamic of their relationship with patron and parish, which offer insights into the parish church and 19th-century society. It is also interested in the restoration of existing structures, and the relationship between Victorian church buildings and earlier structures on the same site, not only in churches that may be viewed as artistic productions of a single mind.

2.3 Restoration and the Evolution of Modern Conservation

Art Historical narratives have generally not been interested in the everyday details of what happened to the fabric of individual churches. Instead, the focus has been on understanding the chronology and stylistic development of both medieval and Victorian Gothic architecture on a larger scale. As discussed in Chapter 1, the late-19th-century 'anti-scrape' reaction against restoration has left a significant negative legacy on modern popular and scholarly perceptions of the Victorian treatment of historic buildings. Despite parish churches today largely being a product of 19th-century intervention, this story rarely features in church building histories, architectural descriptions, or the wider academic discourse. Indeed, most church guidebooks inevitably note the church was 'restored in x year by the Victorians', but unless the work involved a highly regarded architect, who is then named, little other information is given and further analysis is almost never undertaken. In fact the entire post-medieval story of parish churches is rarely considered in most church histories or archaeologies.

Where church restoration has featured in popular art historical discourse, it often appears as a short section at the end of the work, divorced from the wider debates and themes explored (e.g. Clarke 1969). This failure to engage with restoration can be clearly seen in Kenneth Clark's seminal *The Gothic Revival* (1964), in which church restoration is only referenced tangentially through the perceived negative impact of the Ecclesiologists and Ruskin on the Gothic Revival. Clark's opus, originally published in 1928, contains a distinct note of antagonism towards anti-restoration agendas, implying that anti-restoration as promoted by Ruskin ended the Gothic Revival (Clark 1964, 292). Basil Clarke (1969), who engages more readily with Victorian restoration, also makes no effort to hide his own anti-restoration sympathies, opening his chapter on it by stating that nothing could "induce us to regard with favour the work that was done" (Clarke 1969, 227). Tellingly, *The Faber Guide to Victorian Churches* (Howell & Sutton 1989) is one of the few art historical works to explicitly differentiate between wholly Victorian (new build) structures and 19th-century restorations, by actively excluding the latter. A rare work to fully engage with the restoration of parish churches (as opposed to new architectural design) is Christopher Miele's 1992 PhD thesis *The Gothic Revival and Gothic Architecture: The Restoration of Medieval Churches in Victorian Britain.* This highly theoretical work offers a comprehensive overview of Victorian church restoration, and 19th-century notions of the past and authenticity.

This chapter has already discussed how the prevailing art historical narrative has often focussed on the cult of personality; this is equally true of narratives dealing with the evolution of conservation. Academic discourse on the restoration debates of the late 18th and 19th centuries have largely been told through biographical accounts of the key figures involved, rather than exploring the impact of restoration on individual parish churches and cathedrals. Modern scholarship has explored the evolution of the restoration debates through biographical narratives on the individual contributions of notable personalities, such as John Carter (Crook 1995), James Wyatt (Turnor 1950; Dale 1956), Richard Gough (Frew 1979), Jacob Schnebbelie (Reeve 2007), John Ruskin (Brooks 1989; Chitty 1997; Daniels & Brandwood 2003), and William Morris (Mari 2010). Even *Visions of Antiquity: The Society of Antiquaries of London 1707-2007* (Pearce 2007) is arguably a biographical work in the same vein, highlighting the role of the Society of Antiquaries and its overlooked figures in shaping the foundation of modern conservation theory. Such biographical works place the development of 'restoration' within wider social and political contexts, but offer little analysis of how the period has been researched or how its impact has been perceived.

Modern Conservation

The majority of this modern scholarship on the Victorian restoration of medieval buildings has been produced by the conservation and heritage disciplines. The academic research agenda traces the rise of modern conservation theory and technique in the UK from its nascent roots in the restoration debates of the late 18th and 19th centuries, using this development of ideas to justify modern practice. The majority of these publications (e.g. Tschudi-Madsen 1976; Fawcett 1976b; Jokilehto 1999; Earl 2003; Sweet 2004) outline the historical development of western restoration and conservation theory. The key battlegrounds of preservation and conservation ideology are chronologically explored, along with the leading protagonists on both sides of the debate. The focus of this research has tended to be purely theoretical, with individual buildings, usually the greater churches and cathedrals, only considered as markers in the debate, with little or no consideration or analysis of the structures or their alteration. As with the art historical discourse, there is a strong focus on key individuals and buildings, and the overarching intellectual debate of Victorian church restoration. During the 20th century, conservation theory came to be dominated by Charters rather than individual champions, and even these, such as the Venice Charter and Athens Charter, have been treated in a biographical sense, representing the Ruskins and Morrises of today. Recent

discourse has turned towards appraisals of changing values across the 20th century and how they impacted on views of heritage and restoration (see Emerick 2003 & 2014; and Thurley 2013). However, these abstract intellectual and biographical narratives again fail to engage with the actual physical impact of restoration on individual parish churches.

The strong legacy of the anti-restoration agenda of the late 19th-century has driven the research agenda within conservation, justifying modern approaches through their historical development, and thus casting Victorian restoration as the bad example from which modern conservation has emerged. Academic discourse on the Victorian restoration of churches has primarily focused on chronologically mapping out the development of restoration philosophy, leading to modern conservation ethics. This narrative occasionally illustrates the discussion by noting how the restoration debate was manifested in individual cathedrals or greater churches, but the impact of the restoration debate on parish churches is rarely considered. In tracing modern conservation philosophy directly from the anti-scrape movement, there has been little critical analysis of Victorian church restoration and rebuilding. This thesis will focus on the fabric of individual parish churches to critically explore the impact of these national debates and trends on Victorian church restoration. This approach reveals a much more complex narrative of 19th-century restoration, in which these national trends, rather than dictating restoration, actually formed part of blend of different factors including the existing fabric, individual personalities, social relationships, and community values.

2.4 Church Archaeology

The negative value judgements of Victorian restoration have also profoundly influenced archaeological approaches to 19th-century church developments, and the biographical and stylistic narratives of art historical and conservation discourse have predicated archaeological methods for engaging with ecclesiastical architecture. The fabric-focused, stratigraphic approaches employed by buildings archaeologists may be viewed in part as a reaction to the fetishisation of style and genius by art historical and conservation agendas. Archaeologists have been influenced by negative presentation of Victorian restoration driven by conservation narratives, viewing 19th-century church intervention solely as obfuscation to be worked around in order to get to the medieval fabric, rather than viewing Victorian restoration as an integral chapter in a continuous story of parish church development. It must also be noted that the discipline of history has been hugely

dominant in the study of the 19th-century, and archaeology is very much an interloper without a strong research agenda for the period. Parish churches are one of the most commonly surviving material elements of 19th-century society, and represent a prominent expression of Victorian ideals. With its focus on parish church developments, this thesis offers one way in which archaeologists can give a very particular disciplinary insight into 19th-century studies.

Archaeological specialisms and 'Questions that Count'

As a discipline, archaeology is divided into a number of different specialisms and interest groups, often with a period focus. During the late 20th century, several archaeological specialisms developed covering the historical period, namely: Historical Archaeology, Post-Medieval Archaeology, Industrial Archaeology, and Contemporary Archaeology. At a disciplinary level the way in which archaeologists study and divide up the past in this way has worked against the study of parish churches during the 19th century. For example post-medieval archaeology has traditionally dealt with the "period between c. AD 1450-1750" (Hicks and Beaudry 2006, 3), and this periodisation is clearly visible in over-arching volumes on post-medieval archaeology. For example Crossley's (1990) *Post-medieval archaeology in Britain* covers 1500-1800, notably excluding the 19th century. Contemporary archaeologists have engaged with the archaeology of the more recent past; however their research focus rarely extends beyond the immediate present and the 20th century (e.g. Schofield and Johnson 2006). Such periodisation and specialism within archaeological discourse has resulted in the archaeology of the 19th century being essentially "left to 'industrial archaeologists'" (Hicks and Beaudry 2006, 3). The traditional divisions in overarching volumes on post-medieval archaeology focus entirely on what is perceived to be important about the 19th century – namely the Industrial Revolution, and to a lesser extent the Agricultural Revolution.

In an attempt to not be seen as handmaidens to other historical disciplines, archaeologists of the post-medieval period have tended towards telling these grand narratives (Hicks 2004, 934-935), asking what Deagan labelled the "Questions that Count" (1988, 7). Within the context of the 19th century, the principle research agendas pursued by archaeological discourse have been centred on the Industrial Revolution and the rise of Non-Conformity. These narratives reveal a bias towards working-class interests, reflecting the climate of liberal ideology in which the archaeological discourse operated (Gerrard 2003, 128-129). Parish churches have been perceived to not fit these

narratives because they are part of an inherited landscape of feudal power, and therefore do not reflect industrialisation, or agricultural revolution, etc. Archaeologists have ignored parish churches, presumably assuming they do not contribute to our understanding of these 'big questions' of the 19th century; however this is not the case. The Victorian restoration of churches was in part a direct reaction to the industrialisation of the landscape. The Industrial Revolution and agricultural improvements are also fundamental to enabling the restoration of churches, by providing the wealth for their construction and the infrastructure necessary for restorations to take place. The huge wealth garnered by the aristocracy as a result of empire and agricultural improvements (and the resulting inequality and urbanisation of the poor) is reflected in the rise of Victorian paternalism, which is a key factor in the patronage of parish church restoration. Finally, the arrival of the railways was fundamental to bringing both people (architects and workers) and raw materials to rural churches, thus allowing restorations to be undertaken. The Victorians clearly valued parish churches – it has been estimated they spent over £15 million (~£1 billion in modern terms) restoring medieval churches (Ferriday 1964, 96) – by not studying them, we are ignoring one of the key material manifestations of Victorian society, and a fundamental part of Victorian identity.

Church Archaeology

While issues of periodisation and focus have generally excluded 19th-century ecclesiology from being a focus of research, the one specialism within archaeology that should be interested in 19th-century churches is that of Church Archaeology. Deriving from a long tradition of antiquarian ecclesiastical scholarship, church archaeology emerged as a truly archaeological specialism in the 1970s, arising largely as a response to the threat of redundancy to many parish churches in the wake of the *Pastoral Measure 1968* (Rodwell 1997, 6). This practical need informed the initial research agenda for church archaeology produced by the Council for British Archaeology (Addyman and Morris 1976). Reacting to resources under threat has driven much of what has been done in church archaeology, which has been necessary, but has also in some ways hampered the intellectual discourse by dictating the research agenda. Church archaeology was initially preoccupied with questions about the origins and early medieval development of churches (Crossley 1990, 98), demonstrating that it could recover proto-history for which documents didn't survive, and thus it was able to provide a link between below- and above-ground archaeology to tell the story of the

origins of settlements, communities, and medieval society. This focus on the early foundation of churches enabled the fledgling specialism to be taken seriously within the discipline (see Gerrard 2003, 109; Rodwell 2012, 27-31).

Research undertaken by church archaeologists was characterised by a distinctive archaeological method, namely the combination of excavation with the recording and stratigraphic analysis of standing fabric, for example at St Mary & All Saints, Rivenhall (Rodwell and Rodwell 1985), St Mary's Priory, Deerhurst (Rahtz and Watts 1997), St Peter's Church, Barton-upon-Humber (Rodwell and Rodwell 1982). These projects demonstrate a shift in church studies away from elite (cathedral and monastic) structures, towards the study of the parish churches. Church archaeological methodologies soon expanded out from an excavation-only focus, towards a more integrated approach, exploring churchyards and associated structures, as well as working with art historians to examine fixtures and fittings (Gerrard 2003, 142). This was soon followed by considerations of churches and landscapes, highlighting the social setting of parish churches within the village community (e.g. Blair 1988; Morris 1989). The examination of St Martin's church, Wharram Percy (Bell & Beresford et al 1987), as part of the wider exploration of the deserted medieval village, provides a classic example of this more integrated approach to understanding medieval settlements and communities. These large projects prompted concern about the viability and practicality of archaeological 'total recording', but it was gradually accepted, (see for example the heated exchanges in Ferris 1989 & 1991, Wrathmell 1990, Fernie 1988, and Stocker 1992).

Church archaeologists have also been accused of focussing too much on individual building studies rather than broader comparative or interpretative approaches (Nussbaum 2011, 143). While detailed analyses of single buildings do dominate archaeological scholarship, Stocker and Everson (2006) have demonstrated the potential of more comparative and regional approaches in their archaeological interpretation of Lincolnshire's Saxo-Norman church towers. This focus on undertaking regional studies is important to this study, highlighting as it does that parish churches were not constructed (or restored) in isolation. As church archaeology matured as a specialism, an acceptance of more selective approaches to recording went hand in hand with development of new techniques for analysing the growth, decoration, use, and meaning of churches in the later medieval period. Several authors have approached ecclesiastical architecture as meaningful, experienced, and sensory spaces, including Pamela Graves

(1989, 1997 and 2000), Anthony Masinton (2006), and Simon Roffey (2007). These authors have expanded traditional archaeological approaches to incorporate spatial analysis, 3D modelling, and other "sociological theories concerning perceptions of use of space, visuality, memory, and even sound and movement" (McClain 2011, 476). Masinton's (2006) use of 3D modelling and digital reconstruction as an analytical tool has particularly informed the method undertaken in this study. Despite these advances, church archaeology's research focus has remained firmly on the medieval parish church, telling the rich story of the rise of the medieval church into its heyday, but not beyond.

From the 1980s, post-medieval archaeologists started to acknowledge an interest in ecclesiastical buildings. However, this interest was primarily in the construction of new churches and new additions to existing buildings (e.g. Butler 1983, 92-3), rather than the alteration and repair of medieval parish churches. The principle focus of this interest has been Non-Conformist chapels and meeting houses (e.g. the RCHME series 1986-2002; Lake et al 2001; King & Sayer 2011). This new research agenda represented a rising awareness that these buildings had received no academic attention, and without legislative protection, they were under threat from significant development pressure. More importantly, the chapels also represented subaltern/radical alternatives to the organised, institutional religion of the Church of England, and therefore linked into the wider stories of the industrialisation of communities and the alienation of agricultural workers. Non-Conformist buildings thus fit into the social histories which archaeological discourse wished to explore. In contrast, new 19th-century parish churches were considered the territory of art historians (Gilchrist and Morris 1996, 112) as they were not felt to speak to 'interesting' social history, and they lacked the stratigraphy of multiple building phases with which archaeologists could engage. As noted above, this is a misconception, because although the physical form of churches may have been connected to the elite (financed by patrons and vicars), the church was equally important to the entire parish community, influencing their religious experience, their feelings about the building, and the identity of their village. Although built with elite money, the parish church remained a community building, so anything done to the church impacted on all levels of the community.

By the 1990s there was recognition that existing research agendas in both cathedral and parish church studies needed expansion to encompass their post-medieval structures and life stories. In 1996 Warwick Rodwell noted "there has long been a tendency in cathedral studies for scholars and popular commentators to deprecate not only recent

53

restorations and changes, but often also to condemn and dismiss out-of-hand the whole evolutionary process since the Reformation. Thus the post-medieval archaeology of British cathedrals is a virtually untouched field" (Rodwell, 1996, 90). In 1990, David Crossley (1990, 88) acknowledged that the post-medieval development of parish churches were worthy of more attention. Gilchrist and Morris (1996) again highlighted the dearth of engagement with the post-medieval archaeology of regional and local churches. Their review of "approaches to material culture of churches in England 1660-1880" (Gilchrist and Morris 1996 112) proposed a series of research directions to "encourage a distinctly archaeological approach" to the study of parish churches. This article proposed the combination of survey, analysis and documentary research in order to reconstruct attitudes towards churches during the post-medieval period, allowing wider social issues to be explored, and gauging the extent of uniformity or diversity in belief and practice in worship. The research directions and suggested methodology outlined by Gilchrist and Morris represent the springboard from which this thesis study was undertaken. Although a number of key scholars have set out research directions for post-medieval churches, these agendas have not been followed up in recent scholarship. Despite representing the greatest change to church fabric since the Reformation, *Church Archaeology* does not contain a single article directly related to the 19th-century restoration and rebuilding of ecclesiastical architecture. A similar dearth of coverage can be found in a review of the past 20 years of *Post Medieval Archaeology*, where funerary monuments and graveyard studies represent the few ecclesiastical articles. Post-medieval fixtures and fittings have also received some attention, including a recent volume on pew, benches and chairs (Cooper and Brown 2011). *The Archaeology of Post-Medieval Religion* (King and Sayer 2011) demonstrates the gradual shift in archaeological discourse to embrace the post-medieval story of ecclesiastical architecture; however a strong focus remains on new build architecture, especially Non-Conformist chapels. Despite its title, none of the articles in the volume engage with the full palimpsest of parish church development from the medieval period, through Victorian restoration, and into modern conservation. The building biographical approach remains largely mired in the medieval period. Conservation and heritage policy is similarly neglectful of 19th-century churches and restoration. The early 21st century saw the production of regional archaeological research agendas, but where they engage with post-medieval religious buildings, the focus remains on the Reformation, 17th and 18th-century church building, and the rise of Non-Conformity (e.g. Petts and Gerrard 2006, 179; Cooper 2006, 243; Newman & McNeil 2007, 122-124;). Indeed 19th-century

ecclesiastical developments do not feature in any of these research agendas, with the closest acknowledgement being "There has been very little work on parish churches of the 17th to 19th centuries in the region" (MOLAS 2002, 69). Similarly, the National Heritage Protection Plan (NHPP), which outlines English Heritage's research agenda to 2015, does not explicitly engage with Victorian churches, instead focusing primarily on 20th-century churches and non-Christian, Non-Conformist, and Roman Catholic buildings (English Heritage n.d.(a)). The NHPP notes that Anglican churches account for nearly half of the listed buildings in the country, implying that they have been fully researched and their significance understood. This study will demonstrate that by ignoring the post-medieval and Victorian phases of parish churches, archaeologists have failed to reveal the full significance of these buildings. Systematic archaeological investigation of Victorian restored and rebuilt parish churches will provide valuable insights into the 'lost' medieval church and its 'eradicated' post-medieval investment, while also revealing the complex story of Victorian restoration.

One of the key impediments to the study of post-medieval investment in parish churches has been the belief that "many changes made in the sixteenth-eighteenth centuries were lost during nineteenth-century restorations" (Crossley 1990, 103). The Victorian eradication of post-medieval fabric, fixtures and fittings has been noted by many authors, including Clarke (1969, 227), Butler (1983, 92-3) and Morris (1989, 400-3). This thesis will demonstrate that through the combination of systematic archaeological survey with full documentary research, both the medieval church as well as much of the 'lost' post-medieval investment in parish churches can be digitally reconstructed and analysed. As will be seen, Clarke is correct in positing that "probably far more [post-medieval] work was done than is commonly imagined" (Clarke 1969, 227).

Where archaeologists have engaged with Victorian parish church rebuilding, it has usually been in relation to the study of survival rates of medieval fabric (e.g. Ryder and Gwilliam 1993). Post-medieval, and in particular Victorian, interventions have been treated simply as something to be peeled away in order to reveal the interesting material, i.e. the medieval fabric. Some studies, such as the Royal Commission's *Churches of South-East Wiltshire* (1987) have endeavoured to consider the full story of parish churches, including developments and changes in the post-medieval and Victorian periods. Allen (2008) authored one of the only archaeological publications to directly focus on the 19th-century rebuilding of a parish church. This volume utilises documentary sources to explore the construction of a parish church within a rural

settlement in the mid-19th century. Using St Mary the Virgin, Stratfield Mortimer, Berkshire as a case study, Allen only briefly touches on the earlier structure, noting that "taken in conjunction with general views of the interior and the exterior, it is clear from the surviving ground plan that, except for the tower, Armstrong modelled the building on the church it was to replace on the same site" (Allen 2008, 7). This represents Allen's sole engagement with the earlier structure and its relationship to the Victorian church. Indeed, that the research explored a rebuilding rather than a new build is scarcely mentioned again. Instead, Allen's research focuses on the wider social and economic impact of church construction in a rural community in the mid-19th century. Archaeological attempts to engage with post-medieval and Victorian intervention in parish churches have been almost entirely descriptive, lacking any thoeorisation or analysis of the decisions or significance of Victorian intervention. There have not yet been any attempts to explore how Victorian restoration or rebuilding responds to the earlier buildings.

Archaeological approaches to destruction and reuse

One of the great challenges of exploring the material legacy of Victorian restoration, as with the Reformation of the 16th century, is the accusation that it is "restricted solely to evidence of destruction" (Gaimster and Gilchrist 2003, 1). Archaeologists have understandably not wanted to tell the negative story of loss and destruction embodied by the Reformation and 19th-century restoration. Relying on negative evidence – what was lost – makes such narratives both complex and initially uncompelling. Stocker highlighted this when he noted that despite being the "single most profound upheaval in the spiritual life of the nation," archaeologists had rarely engaged with the impact of the Reformation (Stocker 1990, 18). The potential of employing archaeological methods to engage with this negative evidence at a parish church level was first explored by Stocker (1990, 18-32), who combined documentary and archaeological evidence of the dissolution and demolition of ecclesiastical buildings following the Reformation to explore the redistribution of material, including a conjectural reconstruction of a lost medieval chapel from recycled fragments. The next major call to acknowledge and explore the impact of the Reformation came in *The Archaeology of Reformation* volume (Gaimster and Gilchrist 2003), which sought to demonstrate that archaeology had the ability to provide new insights into popular responses to the Reformation. It argues that through the synthesis of results from excavation, survey, and architectural recording that "archaeologists inject a vital qualitative and quantitative dimension into the questions of

pace and penetration of the Reformation process" (Gaimster and Gilchrist 2003, 2). Such research makes the case that destruction in itself can be interesting, and that we can also reconstruct what happened through the combination of archaeological and documentary research. Despite this call to arms, little work since been done in the field. One of the few exceptions is a recent article by David Stocker (2013, 35-46), which examines the Works Chantry Screen at Lincoln Cathedral. Stocker's research set out to establish whether the chantry screen represented an intact 14th-century screen, or later confection, and concludes that it was likely substantially demolished in September 1644 before being reconstructed following the Restoration of the bishops of Lincoln in the1660s or 1670s (Stocker 2013, 44). This research explored a high-status internal fixture of an elite building, and initially sought primarily to establish its medieval credentials. However, crucially, Stocker acknowledges that the screen's reconstruction was "of interest in its own right" and that that "the interest of the structure is enhanced - rather than reduced - by the fact that it has been demolished and rebuilt" (Stocker 2013 44).

Throughout the medieval and post-medieval periods, building material was often retained or recycled during the alteration and rebuilding of ecclesiastical buildings. Beyond visible elements, such as recycled Romanesque doorways, significant amounts of reused material were uncovered during the 19th-century restoration and rebuilding of parish churches. Rising antiquarian interest during the period resulted in much of this reused material, particularly Anglo-Saxon and Romanesque sculptural elements, being reincorporated within Victorian restorations, either within the fabric of the rebuilt church or as architectural treasuries. Where scholars have engaged with this material, including masonry, sculpture, funerary monuments, and fixtures and fittings, they have tended to consider them as context-free, appearing within gazetteers and thematic studies – for example funerary monuments (e.g. McClain 2007), or sculptural fragments (e.g. Cramp (ed.) 1984-2008). In many such thematic studies, a strong bias towards early material is often discernable, and where, when, and how the material has been reused is rarely considered, and little attention is given to what that reuse may reveal about post-medieval decisions and values.

One of the few attempts to engage with the reuse of building material is Stocker & Everson's (1990) 'Rubbish Recycled: A Study of the Re-Use of Stone in Lincolnshire'. This article categorise three patterns of reuse (Casual – "where the original function of the stone is disregarded in its new use" (Stocker & Everson 1990, 84); Functional –

"those pieces which have been reused for the purpose for which they were originally cut" (Stocker & Everson 1990, 90); and Iconic – where material was reused for a specific meaning or association, e.g. to provide antiquity or to appropriate an earlier connection or meaning). One area that has seen some research attention is the reuse and redistribution of architectural material in the early post-medieval period, following the Dissolution of the monasteries and the Reformation (e.g. Stocker 1990; Doggett 2002). Architectural fragments and spolia have also been used extensively by archaeologists to inform the reconstruction of monastic churches and cathedrals, notably by Stuart Harrison (e.g. Harrison 2004). Despite the potential exhibited by these studies, this methodology has rarely been employed for parish church reconstruction, and has seemingly never been applied in the context of the Victorian restoration and rebuilding of parish churches. Neither art historians nor church archaeologists have engaged with the study of the architectural recycling process within parish churches, despite it being identified nearly 20 years ago by Rodwell (1996, 199) as an area of research requiring attention. The reuse of material has been acknowledged as meaningful and purposeful in the medieval past, so it is surprising that no interesting questions have been posited about the choices being made by Victorian restorers. This study seeks to reconceptualise destruction and reuse by considering it as the result of deliberate choices being made by Victorian restorers, informed by a range of social contexts, ideologies, and motivations – the 19th-century church is a product of what they specifically choose to preserve, replicate, and destroy.

This chapter has critically engaged with the research frameworks of the three disciplines generating modern scholarship on Victorian parish churches and their 19th-century restoration and rebuilding. It has detailed the strengths of all three disciplines (being art history, conservation, and archaeology), and has highlighted that they have all fallen short of considering 19th-century parish churches in their own right. The majority of modern discourse precludes critical engagement with restoration and has not done justice to the full range of material culture at parish churches. The parish church was the most significant building in any community during the medieval period. Although that identity was challenged and made more complex during the post-medieval period, the sheer amount in investment in church restoration shows that parish churches remained valued and significant buildings throughout the 19th century. This Victorian restoration phenomenon is immensely important, marking the greatest change to the material culture of Anglican worship since the Reformation. Despite this, Victorian parish church developments remain the least studied aspect of these significant

buildings. In order to critically engage with the Victorian restoration and rebuilding of parish churches, this thesis will employ a fabric-focused archaeological methodology to explore what happened to the material culture of individual parish churches when they were restored and rebuilt.

Chapter 3 – Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will outline the different techniques and resources utilised in this study and the intellectual and methodological approaches employed. Art historians have generated the vast majority of scholarly work on 19th-century ecclesiastical buildings. The art historical discipline has predominantly relied on visual analysis and photographic survey methods to inform comparative analyses of standing fabric (Giles and Holton forthcoming). In contrast, archaeological recording combines these methods with measured survey, stratigraphic analysis and virtual reality modelling, allowing the generation of "a wealth of small-scale observations" (Giles and Holton forthcoming). Despite being highlighted as lacking from research agendas since the 1990s (Crossley 1990, 88; Rodwell 1996; Gilchrist and Morris 1996), archaeological discourse has rarely engaged with post-medieval developments in ecclesiastical architecture, especially the Victorian restoration and rebuilding of parish churches.

This thesis will employ an archaeological methodology in order to explore parish churches rebuilt or heavily restored during the mid-19th century. This methodology will build on well-established buildings archaeology methods which combine measured survey, visual and stratigraphic analyses and documentary research (see for example Morriss 2000; Rodwell 2012). More specifically, the approach of this thesis springs from the methodology outlined by Gilchrist and Morris (1996), in which they argue that the application of an archaeological method to explore post-medieval church developments has the potential to reconstruct attitudes towards churches in any period, as reflected in patterns of modification and maintenance. In order to elucidate the 19th-century restoration and rebuilding of parish churches, this study will employ a systematic archaeological methodology, incorporating measured survey, detailed visual and stratigraphic analysis, comprehensive documentary analysis, and virtual reality modelling. The integration of buildings survey with documentary evidence, as advocated by Parkinson (1996, 146) has also been informed by the historical archaeology approach outlined by Hicks and Horning (2006, 273-292). The use of virtual really modelling to digitally reconstruct earlier phases of parish church development are inspired by the work of Anthony Masinton (2006), who used similar techniques to explore the experience of space, sound and light in medieval parish

churches. The intellectual approaches to destruction, reuse and reconstruction of material fabric follow those employed by David Stocker (1990, 2013).

This methodological approach was piloted in the author's MA dissertation (Smith 2009), in which a combination of systematic recording and visual analysis was integrated with extensive documentary research in order to explore the recycled 12th-century sculpture in the Victorian church of St Michael, Barton-le-Street. That project highlighted the effectiveness of the methodology employed for unpicking Victorian restoration and rebuilding, allowing the pre-Victorian church to be recovered and the reused Romanesque to be digitally returned to its original context. Although the author's MA project focused on the medieval decorative scheme, the methods employed also revealed the complexity of Victorian restoration, highlighting the value of examining 19th-century parish churches on their own terms.

Five parish churches have been chosen to form the case studies for this thesis, being: All Saints, Hovingham; All Saints, Slingsby; St Michael, Barton-le-Street; All Saints, Appleton-le-Street; and St Helen, Amotherby. These five churches were felt to provide a tightly defined and manageable sample set, yet provide a comparative sample of 19th-century parish church intervention. Each of the churches will be addressed slightly differently, reflecting their individual 19th-century developments, allowing common trends and discrete variations to be identified and explored.

3.2 The Study Area - the 'Street Parish' churches

"The highroad from Malton to Hovingham is almost an open-air 'museum', as well as being a fine view-point for the Vale of Pickering and the North York Moors".

(Taylor 1924, 58)

The case studies explored in this thesis form a geographically distinct group of five rural parish churches in the Ryedale District of North Yorkshire. Forming the core of the modern 'The Street' benefice, these churches are located in a series of villages following a former Roman vicinal way (modern B1257) to the immediate west of Malton. The villages are all located along the northern edge of the Howardian Hills, which form the south-western flank of the Vale of the Pickering. Running west to east, the five parish churches forming this thesis are located in the villages of: Hovingham, Slingsby, Barton-le-Street, Appleton-le-Street, and Amotherby. The following section will briefly outline

the topographical, geological and historical context of the villages and their immediate surrounding area.

The Vale of Pickering is a cultural landscape "of regional, national, and international significance" (Cooke 2013, 13), and is characterised by a wide, shallow valley bordered to the north by the North York Moors, to the south by the Yorkshire Wolds, to the west by the Hambleton and Howardian Hills, with the coast to the east. Historically filled by glacial lakes and marshland, the Vale is today dominated by wide, flat pastures, with occupation sites mostly situated around the periphery, including several market towns (e.g. Malton, Helmsley, and Pickering), and numerous small villages and hamlets (see: Hodgson 1969; Hamilton-Dalrymple 1984; & Cooke 2013 for a discussion of Ryedale settlement patterns). Historically an intensively utilized human landscape, the Vale of Pickering features occupation evidence from the Palaeolithic onwards, with significant archaeological research currently being undertaken at the Early Mesolithic site of Star Carr, towards the eastern end of the Vale (see: Milner et al 2013). Within the immediate landscape context of this thesis, numerous Bronze Age barrows have been located along the ridges of the Howardian Hills above the villages. For example thirteen prehistoric barrow mounds have been identified around Slingsby and Fryton, all of which were excavated during the 19th century by Canon Greenwell and their contents given to the British Museum (Page 1914, 557). Nearby, Malton was established as a Roman legionary fortress by AD69, and is the apparent meeting place of six Roman roads (Corder & Kirk 1928, 72). These prehistoric sites are significant to this study in not only demonstrating the time depth of human activity in the area, but also because they brought Victorian antiquaries and archaeologists to the region during the church restoration campaigns.

All five villages in this study are of early foundation and follow the route of one of those Roman roads, which ran along the northern edge of the limestone outcrop of the Howardian Hills above the swampy lands of the Vale of Pickering. Aerial evidence of ladder settlements in the area (Cooke 2013, 37) raises the possibility that the Roman road may have replicated the path of an existing Iron Age trackway. A Roman villa site was discovered at Hovingham in 1745 (Murray 1874, 268), suggesting a possible continuation of settlement at the site since the Romano-British period. The villages themselves all appear in Domesday of 1086 and are recorded as Anglo-Saxon manorial sites.

Church Context

The Vale of Pickering is also a significant early ecclesiastical landscape, with a high density of pre-Conquest crosses, and early church and monastic foundations, with those originating in the 6th or 7th centuries "possibly being related to the kingdom of Deira" (Cooke 2013, 25). In the immediate region of this thesis, Wood identifies five known early monastic sites[6], and "three probable or possible ones, within a very tight area" (Wood 2008, 18). Falling into the latter group, Hovingham has been tentatively identified as an early monastic site mentioned in 8th-century correspondence (Morris 1989, 122).

There are also numerous early parish church foundations in the area, as particularly evidenced by the survival of Saxo-Norman west towers (see: Cambridge 1994; Stocker & Everson 2006). Two of the churches covered in this thesis have surviving west towers dating from the 11th century. The five "Street" churches are all of early foundation, with most being recorded in the Domesday survey of 1086. Varying between light restoration and reordering through to total demolition and rebuilding, none of the five churches was restored by a 'significant' architect or patron. This is not in itself remarkable, indeed during the latter half of the 19th century, virtually every parish church in the area, and the country, saw some form of Victorian intervention. Despite Sidney Colvin's (1877) article noting the ubiquity of parish church restoration around Malton and Pickering, a review of church restorations in the surrounding area reveals that a further 17 parish churches were restored or rebuilt between the 1871 re-opening of St Helen's, Amotherby, and the end of the 19th century (see Appendix 1 for details).

Temporal Context

The defined scope of this study is a discrete period of church restoration within the modern 'Street' benefice, commencing with minor window replacement at Appleton-le-Street in 1855 and finishing with the restoration and partial rebuilding at Amotherby in 1871. This thesis will highlight the continuity of church repairs and alteration throughout the medieval and post-medieval periods. However, this window (1855-1871) represents a period of unparalleled intervention into the fabric of these parish churches. Most of these churches experienced other repairs and alterations both earlier and later in 19th century, but the 1855-1871 campaigns may be viewed as interconnected, and

---

[6] Coxwold, Gilling East, Kirkdale, Lastingham, & Stonegrave.

offering insights into the wider restoration debate and its impact on the fabric of parish churches. As discussed in the earlier chapters, these campaigns also form part of a restoration movement which has been viewed separately by scholars, affecting modern perceptions, research agendas, and ideas of significance.

3.3 Technical and intellectual methods

3.3.1 Documentary and archival research

This thesis draws extensively on archival and documentary sources in order to elucidate the 19th-century restoration process and to inform reconstructions of the case study churches prior to their Victorian interventions, as well as to inform understanding of the present structures. Sadly, little direct documentation survives relating to the decision making process in the five restoration campaigns explored in this thesis, although a variety of archival sources do exist which provide various clues and insights.

Archival Sources

The importance of exploiting documentary and archival sources to inform our understanding of parish churches, particularly post-medieval and Victorian alterations to parish churches has been established by Butler (1983, 92-3), Parkinson (1996, 146), Gilchrist & Morris (1996, 118), and Rodwell (2012, 54-65). The examination of parish records and faculties is therefore not a new process, but most authors have directed their use solely towards understanding the pre-Victorian (medieval) church, thus ignoring the documents which elucidate the actual process of Victorian restoration, and thus missing what those documents also reveal about the medieval church, post-medieval investment, and the Victorian church. This thesis will employ a much broader sweep of documentary sources, from church records and faculties, to early photographs, maps and drawings, as well as antiquarian surveys, newspaper reports and personal correspondence. These are further supplemented by secondary sources, such as English Heritage list descriptions, Pevsner's *Buildings of England* series, the Victoria County History series, and church guidebooks. The archival research can then be interrogated against measured survey and systematic recording of the standing structure, and vice versa.

The collection of faculty documents held by the Borthwick Institute for Archives (BIA) were an invaluable source of information relating to Victorian parish church restoration. Faculty jurisdiction is an application to the Church of England, usually to

an Archdeacon, for permission to alter church fabric. The faculty procedure dates to at least the early 17th century and by the mid 19th-century applications normally included architect's drawings, normally 'proposed' but occasionally also 'existing'. The faculty records and their associated plan and elevation drawings for the five case study churches are critical to this thesis, as they document the intended extent of alteration and rebuilding at each church. Through the use of different shades of ink, the plan drawings often indicate fabric intended to be retained, thus providing evidence for the pre-restoration plan. Differences between the approved design drawings and the churches as built reveal the fluidity of the design process, offering insight into the restoration process, including contemporary ideas on fabric retention and architectural style. The 1869 faculty for the rebuilding of St Michael, Barton-le-Street, unusually contained a full set of 'as existing' drawings for the church prior to its demolition. These measured drawings, including a plan, elevations and sections, enabled an unparalleled reconstruction of the parish church prior to its rebuilding, allowing detailed analysis of the reuse of material, as well as revealing the internal fixtures and fitting of the church. Additional archival documents pertaining to the churches and their Victorian restorations were also located within the private archives of the descendants of the Victorian patrons, including the Castle Howard Archive (CHA) and the Worsley Archive (WA), although unfortunately virtually all of the private papers and correspondence of these patrons has since been lost. Additional archival material and parish records were also located in the North Yorkshire County Record Office, the National Archives, and the British Architectural Library.

Written Sources

The documentary evidence employed in this study may be categorised as being either written sources, or visual sources, including photographs, etchings and architectural drawings. Written sources, such as those found in gazetteers and topographical dictionaries, often contain early descriptions of the villages and churches explored in this study. Reports and descriptions by antiquarian visitors, such as Sir Stephen Glynne, which typically date from the early to mid-19th century, also reveal changing attitudes to ecclesiastical architecture. Although often difficult to decipher, personal correspondence between patrons, architects, and incumbents offer unique insights into the negotiated development of Victorian church restoration and social hierarchy in 19th-century England.

Local and regional newspapers, such as *The Malton Messenger* and *Yorkshire Gazette*, represent one of the richest written sources for this thesis, detailing events at the church throughout the 19th century, including their restoration process. The earliest newspaper article used in this study dates from 1838 and details the installation of a clock into the medieval church tower at Slingsby (*Leeds Mercury* 27/10/1838, 4). Articles reporting the restoration campaigns often revealed valuable information about the understood architectural development of the churches, and provide, directly or indirectly, the location of elements, such as funerary monuments, prior to their relocation and reuse in the Victorian church. As well as documenting the process of church restoration, these newspapers often include descriptions of the pre-restoration churches, and architectural and archaeological discoveries make during the works. Crucially, they can also provide clues about the decision making process of Victorian parish church restoration.

All of these written sources were handled critically, as their agenda and veracity was often unknown. Where possible information was cross-referenced with other written sources and against results from measured survey and stratigraphic analysis. Antiquarian descriptions and especially gazetteers often appear to have been written up at a later date, sometimes by a third party, and examples were identified of descriptions confusing the location and even existence of architectural elements and fixtures and fittings. In one case it appears an antiquarian has even confused churches, having visited several in a day, and attributes features from one building to another (see Section 6.3.4).

Visual / Photographic Sources

A number of early visual representations exist for the parish churches explored in this thesis. These include early maps, etchings, and plans, ranging in date from the 17th to the early-19th centuries. The importance of integrating map regression and visual sources with measured recording and analysis of historic buildings is highlighted by Hicks & Horning (2006, 276). There are very few surviving pre-restoration photographs of any of the churches in this study, which is perhaps unsurprising given their remote location and the comparative infancy of photography when the churches were restored. Three images of the exterior of St Michael's church, Barton-le-Street, all dating to c1869, are the only known surviving photographs of any of the churches prior to their Victorian interventions. The derivation of these photographs is unknown, however two were reproduced in the periodical, *The Reliquary and Illustrated Archaeologist* (1900, 217, 219). The third image, almost identical to one in *The Reliquary*, appeared in the *Yorkshire*

Archaeological Journal (Glynne 1909, 264). An 1860s photograph of All Saints, Slingsby, is recorded as being placed within a time capsule beneath the present east window (see Section 5.4.1), but it has not been possible to extract this cache and the photograph's survival is unknown[7]. Several photographs dating from the later 19th and early-20th centuries provide clues as to how the churches appeared immediately following their restoration, thus allowing later alterations to be identified.

A small number of early etchings, maps and topographical drawings also provide valuable clues as to the form and detailing of the churches prior to their Victorian restoration. A c.1840 etching of All Saints' church, Slingsby, by Miss Henrietta Walker provides the only visual evidence for the architectural detailing of that church prior to its 1867 demolition. A drawing of All Saints' church, Hovingham, found on a village plan of 1696 provides similar evidence for that church prior to its restoration in 1860. A number of early maps, including estate maps and 1st edition OS maps provide valuable information about the plan form of the churches and the size and arrangement of the churchyards prior to mid-19th century.

Visual and photographic sources are used extensively in this thesis primarily as a source for the pre-restoration parish churches. As with the written sources, all of these visual sources need to be treated critically, especially the etchings and maps, which may not accurately represent the churches or their churchyards. Similarly, lighting and processing may cause early photographs to deceive (Gilchrist and Morris 1996, 118). There are a number of safeguards to allow these sources to be employed more securely, such as cross-examination with surviving elements and written sources.

3.3.2 Archaeological Recording and Analysis

The five churches explored in this study are all of relatively modest scale and are open to the public during daylight hours, making them suitable for aboveground archaeological recording. A number of different archaeological methods were employed for this study, including: direct measured survey, photographic recording, and visual and stratigraphic analysis. Rectified photography and photogrammetric techniques were also employed where appropriate. Systematic archaeological recording and interpretation of the current church structure was undertaken for a number of reasons.

---

[7] Permission was granted in late 2014 for the extraction of this time capsule, which is likely to take place in early 2105.

The production of an accurate measured plan of the church allowed for wall thicknesses to be examined and for the identification of any alignment changes. These are both indicators of a change in construction phase, revealing the potential survival of earlier fabric within the present structures. A variety of archaeological survey techniques was employed, both for the analysis of the present fabric and for the reconstruction and modelling of the pre-restoration churches presented in the case studies.

Photographic Recording

A detailed photographic recording exercise was undertaken for each church, in line with an English Heritage Level 4 survey (English Heritage 2006, 14). This included photographs taken perpendicular to each elevation, externally and internally, plus photographs of details and any anomalies identified. Photography was combined with measured instrument survey (see below) in the production of rectified photographs where appropriate, allowing for representative stone by stone elevation drawings to be produced.

Instrument-Based Metric Survey

Metric survey was undertaken at each site using a Leica Reflectorless Electronic Distance Measurer Total Station Theodolite (TST). Requiring an average of two days of fieldwork at each site, the TST was used to produce accurate measured plans of the present churches, and to collect control point data for the rectification of photographs. Each measured survey involved a number of stations and wherever possible these formed a closed traverse to maintain a high level of overall accuracy (English Heritage 2009, 7-8). This maintained a high level of accuracy, allowing all metric surveys to be completed within the standard error margin of <10mm. The point data collected with the TST was exported as a spreadsheet of point coordinates. During site recording, a list was maintained of related points, which informed the coding of string, or line, data. The resultant line data was then imported into Vectorworks 2011, a CAD software package, for processing. Processed drawings were produced to a standard scale and were represented in accordance with standard drawing conventions (English Heritage 2005; English Heritage 2006, 19-21). The principal limitation of this form of survey for creating a plan is that the recording is restricted to a single (horizontal) plane and therefore could not identify vertical changes in wall thickness. This limitation was ameliorated through the taking of series of points to allow for the production of simple elevation frameworks of the present churches to facilitate the creation of 3D models.

A limited amount of rectified photography was employed in order to undertake stone by stone recording of elevations. These rectified images enabled analysis of masonry dimensions and coursing, as well as aiding in the identification of building breaks or changes in phasing. As such, this method was particularly valuable for investigating the extent of reused masonry within the Victorian elements of the churches. Photo rectification is the process of using software to remove the angular distortion from a planar surface photograph. A Canon EOS20D digital single-lens reflex (DSLR) camera fitted with a 10-22mm lens was mounted on a tripod and used to take photographs parallel to the face of each elevation to be recorded. Combined with reference point data collected with the TST, the photographs were rectified using the ArcGIS 9 software package. Imported into Vectorworks 2011, the rectified photographs were then traced to produce accurate, measured stone by stone drawings of each chosen elevation. These drawings were produced in order to undertake stratigraphic analysis of the stonework and identify any building breaks or anomalies in the fabric. The primary limitation of rectified photography is that it can only rectify to a single plane. This meant that while it was possible to produce accurate drawings of the primary masonry, it was not possible to record anything on a different plane, such as the projecting decoration and sculptural elements.

More controversially, the same rectified photography process was employed on several of the early photographs, plans and etchings of the churches prior to their restoration. In lieu of measured control points, the images were rectified into wireframe models which were produced using plan drawings and measurement information garnered from documentary sources. Once rectified into these frameworks, the images were used to model architectural elements and, in one case, to attempt stone-by-stone elevation drawing of a wall demolished over 144 years ago (see Chapter 6). Although this was unable to generate accurately measurable results, it did allow for conjectural reconstructions of elements of the pre-restoration churches (Hovingham, Slingsby and Barton-le-Street). This process of modelling and rectification was adequate for establishing building breaks, fabric types and construction methods, where metric accuracy was not of critical importance. The metric accuracy of the model was also compromised by the need to manually scale the hand drawn plans and elevations. Overall, these flaws were deemed inconsequential, as the purpose of the 3D model and of the stone by stone drawings was illustrative and did not rely on metric accuracy.

Visual and Stratigraphic Analysis

Systematic visual and stratigraphic analyses were important methods in this study. The examination of geology, coursing, construction methods, weathering, graffiti, and tooling marks informed the differentiation between the 19th-century fabric and reused architectural and sculptural spolia. Stratigraphic analysis was employed to determine the extent of surviving in situ fabric, which was critical in those churches where the pre-Victorian church was not entirely razed and rebuilt. Stylistic dating of both Victorian architectural and decorative elements, and surviving earlier features was implemented at all of the churches. The stylistic dating of retained medieval and post-medieval elements helped inform the chronological development of the parish churches, while the architectural styles employed for 19th-century fabric offered insights into the Victorian restoration process. Visual and stratigraphic analyses enabled the identification of the extent of rebuilding, and the survival and reuse of earlier fabric. This thesis treats Victorian restoration as meaningful and this identification allows for an examination of the choices made by the Victorians as to what they retained, replicated, and replaced. These choices were informed by social context, at both a national and, more importantly, a local level.

Virtual Reality Modelling and 3D reconstruction

Measured survey data was processed in the Vectorworks (2011) CAD software package to produce two-dimensional survey drawings, including plans and elevations. These drawings, particularly the current plans, then formed the basis of reconstructing the pre-Victorian plan forms, based on descriptions, recorded dimensions, and identified reused architectural elements. These reconstructed plans, and in some cases, elevations, then provided the framework for reconstructing internal arrangements and fixtures and fittings, such as box pews and galleries. Identified architectural fragments, such as pieces of window tracery, were measured and reproduced in CAD, allowing for conjectured reconstructions of medieval windows, informed by contemporary descriptions of the windows prior to their removal during Victorian restoration campaigns. The detailed reconstruction of earlier phases of the parish churches allows for the relationship between that earlier church and its Victorian replacement to be critically examined. Where multiple sources of data were available, such as at St Michael's church, Barton-le-Street, photographic evidence, plan, elevation, and section drawings were all incorporated with documentary evidence to digitally construct detailed 3D wireframe

models. This allowed for both the architectural detailing and interior fixtures and fittings of the pre-Victorian church to be explored in detail, recapturing both the 'lost' medieval church and its post-medieval investment. Such reconstructions not only inform our understanding of the pre-Victorian parish church, but also allow for an examination of the choices and decision being made by Victorian restorers.

3.4 Conclusion

This chapter has detailed the methods and interpretation models employed within this study. The synthesis of different archaeological methods and documentary sources, which challenge and/or corroborate each other, generates a wealth of small-scale observations, enabling a nuanced exploration of the 19th-century restoration and rebuilding of parish churches, raising questions about 19th-century values, influences, and restoration techniques. Bringing the fabric to the fore, this methodology not only elucidates the choices made as part of the Victorian rebuilding process, but also reveals the medieval parish churches and their post-medieval iterations, which were previously held to have been lost through Victorian intervention. The method employed is cohesive, but has internally variability between the five case studies, allowing for comparison and contrast. Together they will offer a better understanding of local, regional and national trends in Victorian church movements.

The following case studies will systematically record and analyse the present parish churches, establishing their dimensions, plan form and architectural detailing. Stratigraphic and visual analysis will be employed in order to determine the extent of Victorian rebuilding, and thus any in situ or reused architectural spolia. Identified earlier fabric will be used in combination with comprehensive documentary research to inform digital reconstructions of the parish church prior to the Victorian restoration campaign. This reconstruction will allow for the relationship between the earlier church and its Victorian replacement to be critically examined. This will provide insight into the choices being made by individual church restorers, and test the assumption that church restorations were solely informed by national trends (such as the Gothic Revival and the Cambridge Camden Society). It will also recover the 'lost' medieval church and reveal the extent of post-medieval intervention. The return of context to reused material will allow for its significance to be reassessed, and allow meaning to be sought in Victorian decisions about retention, replication and replacement. The decision-making process of restoration offers insights into Victorian social relations and hierarchies, and how these impact on the material fabric of parish churches.

Chapter 4 – All Saints, Hovingham

4.1 Introduction

This first case study will examine the church of All Saints, Hovingham, which was substantially restored in 1860 under the patronage of Captain Marcus Worsley. Of the five churches explored in this thesis, All Saints, Hovingham (Grid Reference: SE 66570 75742) is located in the most westerly village on the former Roman vicinal way from Malton, and was the second of "The Street" parish churches to be restored, after Appleton-le-Street (see Chapter 7). The 1860 campaign included the complete rebuilding of the body of the church, with the 11th-century west tower being the only surviving in situ element from the earlier structure.

Today the church is known primarily for its reused pre-Conquest sculpture[8] and surviving Saxo-Norman west tower (Taylor & Taylor 1965, 326-8). The reused early sculptural elements in the church have received particular academic attention, especially the 9th-century 'Annunciation' panel currently employed as a reredos in the Lady Chapel (e.g. Taylor & Taylor 1965, 328; Lang 1991, 148; and Collingwood 1907, 337). Unplanned archaeological watching briefs were carried out during repair works in 1977 and 1990 by archaeologist and local resident, Tony Pacitto, the findings of which were published posthumously by Lorna Watts (Pacitto & Watts 2007). That article focused on establishing the footprint and early development of the medieval church.

Whilst the known medieval elements of All Saints' church have been described and discussed at length, the 19th-century narrative of the church, including the story of its rebuilding, has received virtually no attention, academic or otherwise. The Victoria County History (Page 1914, 509) briefly notes the 1860 rebuilding as an introduction to describing the earlier features, and tellingly, the Victorian body of the church does not feature at all in Pevsner's (1966, 193-4) description of the church's architecture. The most detailed description of the Victorian rebuilding can be found in Vaughan's (2006) church guide, although this remains cursory. The church is designated at Grade II*, primarily on the basis of its surviving Saxo-Norman west tower and reused pre-

---

[8] Five pre-Conquest carved stones were incorporated in the exterior of Saxo-Norman tower, including fragments of three crosses, and the 'Annunciation' panel. Several of these stones were removed from the tower in the mid-20th century and are displayed within the church.

Conquest sculpture, as demonstrated by their prominence within the List Description (Appendix 2.1). Scholarly discourse on Hovingham has focused almost exclusively on the surviving medieval elements of the church. In the rare instances that the Victorian rebuilding of the body of the church is acknowledged, this is done with no analysis. This has led to differentiation of the in situ west tower as representing the medieval church, whilst the 1860 All Saints has been treated as an unrelated new-build church, rather than a continuity of church building on the same site. This has precluded any academic consideration of the earlier church and its possible influence on the design and detailing of the Victorian structure.

This case study, and those that follow will demonstrate the potential of an archaeological methodology to reveal the 19th-century narrative of Victorian parish church restoration, as well as illuminating the pre-restoration church structure. Exploration of the 1860 rebuilding at All Saints also provides valuable insight into the patronage of Victorian restoration, which at Hovingham took place during a long-running feud between the vicar and the lord of the estate. While little is known about the decision making process of this rebuilding, analysis of the pre-restoration church reveals the importance of changing architectural fashion in the Victorian desire to restore and rebuild parish churches.

Following an overview of the historical context of the village and church, this chapter is structured into three distinct sections. The first section contains a detailed description of the current church fabric based on archaeological recording undertaken in Spring 2011. The second section presents a description of the church prior to its 1860 restoration and rebuilding. Based primarily on archival and documentary sources, this reconstruction will allow for the relationship between the pre-1860 building and its Victorian replacement to be explored. The final section will analyse the rebuilding of the church, revealing a complex narrative of people and motivations.

4.1.1 Historical Background - Hovingham village

The village of Hovingham lies approximately 8 miles to the north-west of Malton on the B1257, and is the most westerly of the parish churches following the former Roman vicinal way (fig. 4.1). The picturesque village is largely owned by the Hovingham Estate, with Hovingham Hall being located in the heart of the village, immediately adjacent to the church. Sitting at the south-western end of the Vale of Pickering, the parkland of Hovingham Hall stretches westward through the Coxwold-Gilling Gap. As well as All

Saints' church, the village contains both a Wesleyan chapel and a Primitive Methodist chapel.

As discussed in Section 3.4 (above), there are numerous indications of prehistoric activity in the area of the 'Street Parish'. In 1745 the remains of a Roman bath complex with an impressive mosaic floor were discovered in the grounds near Hovingham Hall, close to the site of the church (Murray 1874, 268). Generally held to be a large villa site, Dominic Powlesland (pers. comm. 2012) hypothesises that the site may represent Emperor Constantine's lost 'Palace'. The earliest confirmed documentary evidence for Hovingham comes from the Domesday of 1086, which records that the pre-Conquest 'manor' had been held by Orm, and became part of the Mowbray Fee under William I (Williams & Palliser 1992, 305V). Over the following four hundred years the manor at Hovingham descended from Geoffrey de Mowbray through a succession of related families (see Page 1914, 506 for details). On 22 June 1563, Sir Robert Worsley purchased the Hovingham Estate from the Rt. Hon. Lord Berkeley for £2050 (ZON/1/2/8). The Worsleys were an old, if not particularly wealthy Lancastrian family, and Sir Robert made Hovingham his principal seat. At Hovingham the fortunes of this branch of the Worsley family rose slowly through the later 16th and 17th centuries (W. Worsley pers. comm. 27/8/12). Thomas Worsley (1710-78) built a new hall at Hovingham in c.1750, immediately to the south west of the church. As the local gentry, the Worsleys have maintained a close connection with All Saints' church over the past 450 years, a connection that visibly continues today.

Hovingham village expanded significantly during the 19th century, initially with the construction of Hovingham Spa in the late 1830s. Although the spa complex was located north-west of the village proper, an 1835 plan (ZON 17/2/1/218) reveals significant parallel development in the village, including the construction of a large inn (fig. 4.2). Further expansion occurred following the arrival of the Thirsk and Malton railway line in 1853 (fig. 4.3), although Hovingham station was later moved to Hovingham Spa in 1896 (Caftford 2010).

4.1.2 Historical Account – All Saints' Church

The earliest firm documentary evidence for a church at Hovingham comes from Domesday, which records the presence of both a church and a priest in the village by 1086 (Williams & Palliser 1992, 305V), although Morris (1989, 122) tentatively attributes Hovingham as a monastic site mentioned in 8th-century correspondence

between Pope Paul I and Eadberht, King of Northumbria. In 1145 Roger Mowbray founded the nearby Newburgh Priory, endowing it with the church at Hovingham (Page 1914, 510). The patronage of the church remained with Newburgh Priory until the Dissolution in 1538, after which it passed through several hands and was held by Sir Charles Cavendish in 1594 (Page 1914, 510). Enclosure documents from 1661 state that the "owner and proprietor of the rectory and tithes of Hovingham" (ZON/3/5/2) was then William Cavendish, Marquess of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. By 1771 the advowson had passed to the Earls of Carlisle of Castle Howard Estate (ZON/3/5/4), who held it until its purchase by William Cayley Worsley of Hovingham Hall in 1860 (ZON/1/1/39), the same year the church was restored. The Worsley family remain the patrons of All Saints to this day.

The church living was a Perpetual Curacy, as opposed to a Rectory or Vicarage, meaning the incumbent derived their income from a stipend rather than tithes. Perpetual Curacies were generally a poor living, and at Hovingham it had to be subsidised on several occasions (Whellan 1859, 862). In 1823, Allen (1823, 475) valued the living at £57, but following augmentation, by 1859 it was worth about £110 a year (Whellan 1859, 862). It is interesting to note that during the 19th century several members of the Worsley family became vicars at nearby Stonegrave, a parish church with a much wealthier living than Hovingham.

4.2 Description of the Current Church

The present church (fig. 4.4) is the product of a major Victorian restoration campaign carried out in 1860, which involved the demolition of the body of the church. The architect for the 1860 rebuilding is generally given as 'Rhode Hawkins' (e.g. Vaughan 2006, 4; English Heritage List Description). It is presumed this refers to Major Rohde Hawkins (1821-1884).[9] The patron for the restoration was Captain Marcus Worsley, brother of Sir William Worsley, Bart. of Hovingham Hall. Captain Worsley commissioned the restoration in memory of his late wife, Harriet, who had died two years previously, and the building work was carried out by Mr Teale of Malton (*Yorkshire Gazette* 03/11/1860, 3). The current All Saints' church comprises a nave with north and south aisles, chancel with north chancel aisle, and west tower (fig. 4.5). The body of the church is predominantly in the Decorated Gothic style of the late 13th century, with extensive use of Geometric window tracery. The body of the church is constructed

[9] Major was a forename, not a rank.

largely in limestone ashlar, although with several other geologies present, and has Westmorland slate roofs throughout. By contrast, the west tower demonstrates almost exclusively Romanesque architectural styling and is constructed in roughly coursed masonry of varying geology and stone sizes.

4.2.1 Setting of the Current Church

The church sits within a large churchyard dotted with gravestones, with some of those clustered near to the south porch dating from the 18th century. The churchyard is bounded to the south and west by the high masonry wall marking the grounds of Hovingham Hall (fig. 4.6), and to the north and east by a low stone wall. Access to the churchyard is through a simple wooden gate near the south-east corner, with a gravel path leading to the south porch. To the immediate north of the church is the semi-subterranean Worsley mausoleum, which dates to c.1750 and was presumably constructed concurrently with Hovingham Hall (Vaughan 2006, 12).

4.2.2 Nave

The nave comprises four bays beneath a relatively steep-pitched roof in the style of those constructed during the late 13th-century. Externally little of the nave is visible and there is no clerestory. Internally (fig. 4.7) it is connected to the tower and chancel by arches, each of which is described in their corresponding section below. The key architectural features of the nave are the two arcades connecting it to the north and south aisles. Each arcade comprises four arches sitting on three piers with moulded capitals and water-holding moulded bases (fig. 4.8). The piers alternate along the nave arcade between clustered columns of four shafts and single piers, and also alternate across the nave creating a syncopated rhythm. The tall two-centred arches are of two plain-chamfered orders, and the arcades spring from large and elaborate foliated corbels projecting from the responds at either end of the nave. Above the arcades on the nave side are chamfered hoodmoulds that terminate at the west on foliated label-stops and at the east on winged-figure label-stops. The columns and arch voussoirs are carved from limestone, while the nave walls are whitewashed with the exception of east wall of the tower (west wall of nave), which is bare stone; this wall will be described within Section 4.2.9 below. The principal rafters of the timber nave roof rest on wall posts terminating on foliate corbels. The nave measures ~15.11m in length east to west, ~5.7m in breath north to south, and the arcade bays are equally spaced, with each measuring ~3.15m.

The floor of the nave is largely covered by two rows of square-ended oak bench-pews running across the nave and aisles, all sited on a raised timber floor. The remainder of the floor, including the central avenue between the pews, is laid with large rectangular stone flags. At the west end of the nave, on a raised step in the central avenue, is an elaborate Victorian font (fig. 4.9). An 1898 plaque in the south aisle, a memorial to the churchwarden William Walkington, notes the raising of the font as a memorial, thus dating the stepped font platform in the nave. The square, veined white marble font bowl has chamfered sides, and rests on four squat, red marble columns with white marble stiff-leaf capitals and corresponding water-holding bases. At the east end of the nave are two simple oak pulpits, one either side of the chancel arch, which date to the re-ordering of the chancel in the 1980s (Vaughan 2006, 9).

4.2.3 South Aisle

The south aisle (fig. 4.10) consists of four bays with the south porch projecting from the second bay from the west. The remaining three bays each contain a single window of two cusped-lights beneath Geometric Gothic style tracery. Each window is contained within a two-centred arch with hoodmould terminating on foliated label-stops (fig. 4.11). The pattern of the geometric tracery varies in each window, all based on differing trefoil designs. There is a diagonal stepped-buttress at either corner of the aisle, and a stepped buttress delineates the eastern-most bay. The western wall of the south aisle is coterminous with the nave and contains a single window of two cusped-lights matching those of the south elevation. The eastern elevation contains a large window of three cusped-lights beneath geometric tracery with two trefoils and a large central quatrefoil. This window is in a two-centred arch with a hoodmould terminating on head-stops. At the top of the wall, the mono-pitch roof rests on a simple moulded cornice. The aisle walls stand on a low, chamfered plinth but feature no other architectural detailing. Within the porch, the second bay contains the main doorway into the church. The studded timber door is located within a round-headed Romanesque arch of two orders, each with a wide chamfer and broach-stops (fig. 4.12). The outer order sits on nook shafts, with a waterleaf capital on the west and a shallow, banded cushion capital on the east.

Internally, the south aisle, which measures ~15.11m x 3.05m, is separated from the nave by an arcade, as described in Section 4.2.2 above. Oak bench pews running through from the nave fill much of the south aisle, leaving only a narrow passage

running beside the south wall. The west window contains a mixture of clear and stained glass dating from 1949, which features the names of the 'Seven Churches of Asia' from the Book of Revelations (fac. 1949/69A). The window in the western-most bay of the south wall is filled with opaque glass quarries. On the wall, between this window and the south doorway is a simple bronze plaque commemorating Susan, Lady Worsley, who died in 1933. Mounted on the wall to the east of the doorway is a large marble funerary monument commemorating William Schoolcroft Esq., who died in 1802. Schoolcroft was steward to Thomas Worsley and assisted in managing the Hovingham estate after Thomas' death in 1778 (Worsley 2006, 296). Immediately below this is a small commemorative tablet for a former churchwarden, William Walkington, who died in 1898. The window in the third bay of the south aisle is filled with bright stained glass commemorating the 1913 death of Frederica Ann Munby, daughter of the incumbent at the time of the 1860 restoration. The eastern light features the Virgin Mary, the western light, Dorcas, and the trefoil contains an Agnus Dei. Mounted on the wall to the east of this window is a large marble tablet recording the restoration of the church in 1860 by Captain Marcus Worsley in memory of his wife Harriet. This tablet is contained within a red-veined marble surround in the form of a richly decorated and plumed trefoil-arch (fig. 4.13). Immediately below is small brass plaque to Charles William Smeeton, who died in 1928.

The fourth and eastern-most bay of the south aisle forms a Lady Chapel, although internally the space is not architecturally delineated. The window in the south elevation, which contains stained glass depicting the local saints St Ethelburga and St Hilda, commemorates Dame Augusta Mary Worsley, who died in 1913. The three-light east window contains stained glass depicting St Aidan, St Paul and St Paulinus beneath the Worsley heraldry (fig. 4.14). Beneath this window is an altar created from a 17th-century oak communion table (Page 1914, 510). A reredos is formed from the heavily weathered Anglian 'Annunciation' panel, containing eight figures beneath arches (fig. 4.15). With the exception of the Romanesque south doorway, the south aisle and Lady Chapel are uniformly constructed in the late 13th-century style of the Geometric Decorated Gothic, as demonstrated by the arched windows with trefoil-based geometric tracery. Much of the stained glass and funerary monuments in the south aisle post-date the 1860 restoration campaign.

4.2.4 Porch

Projecting from the second bay of south aisle is a porch, marking the main public entrance to the church (fig. 4.16). The porch is accessed through an entranceway comprised of a two-centred arch with a single, large roll-moulding with fillet, beneath a hoodmould terminating on foliated stops. The coping of the gabled south elevation is topped by a three-lobed apex stone, and the porch walls rest on a continuation of the south aisle plinth. The east and west elevations, which are both blind, have a low, hipped buttress which is coterminous with the south wall. Internally measuring ~2.45m east to west by ~1.83m north to south, the porch walls are whitewashed and the wall plate and timber roof structure are exposed. The simple porch, with its foliated label stops, hipped buttresses, and filleted roll mouldings, is stylistically of the late-13th-century, matching the architectural design employed for the south aisle.

4.2.5 North Aisle

The north aisle corresponds closely to the south aisle in terms of plan, arrangement, and architectural detailing (fig. 4.17). It consists of four bays, with each bay containing a window with Geometric Gothic style tracery. As with the south aisle, each window is in a two-centred arch with hoodmould and foliated label-stops. The windows in the first, third and fourth bays are of two-lights beneath differing geometric tracery based on a trefoil. The three geometric tracery patterns employed in the north aisle windows match those of the south aisle windows. However, their arrangement does not directly correspond across the church. The second bay of the north aisle is gabled, loosely mirroring the form of the porch in the corresponding bay of the south aisle. This bay contains a larger, three-light window with geometric tracery, and hoodmould with head-stops. Immediately to the east of this window is a projecting stepped-chimney for the subterranean boiler room. The north elevation sits on a high plinth, or weathering offset, which steps around the window in the first bay from the west, but drops at the window of the second bay to run straight beneath the remaining windows. Immediately after the window in the eastern-most bay, the plinth steps back up to its originating level. To the east, the north aisle is delineated from the vestry by a large stepped buttress. The mono-pitch roof rests on the same simple moulded cornice employed on the south aisle. The north-west corner of the aisle contains large side-alternate quoin stones, especially in the three courses below the plinth / weathering offset (fig. 4.18). The west elevation contains a two-light window matching those in three of the bays of

the north elevation, but has no plinth or other architectural detailing. The west elevation contains a distinct vertical building break approximately 620mm from the termination with the tower (fig. 4.19). The masonry is noticeably different in this section of wall, which measures ~620mm wide and ~3220mm high, with the stones being much larger and less regularly coursed.

Internally, the north aisle matches the measurements of the south aisle (~15.11m x 3.05m) and is similarly separated from the nave by an arcade, as described above in Section 4.2.2 (see figs. 4.7 & 4.8). To the east it is architecturally delineated from the north chancel aisle by a chamfered two-centred arch of two orders springing from roll-moulded corbels. As with the south aisle, the north aisle is filled with bench seating, continuous from the nave, leaving a passage against the north wall. The exposed principal rafters of the roof are set into the wall, with the exception of those abutting the west wall, the eastern arch, and either side of the second-bay gable, all of which have wall posts resting on roll-moulded corbels. The window in the west elevation contains deeply coloured stained glass (fig. 4.20) with text in the base recording that it was moved here from the east window of the chancel in 1899. On the western respond of the nave arcade is a small marble memorial tablet, set immediately above the springing of the arch, which commemorates Elizabeth Hammon, who died in 1791, and her son James, who died in 1792. The window in the first (western-most) bay of the north elevation contains leaded quarries of clear glass in a diaper pattern. To the east of this window is a small brass memorial tablet commemorating two soldiers who died in 1900-1901, presumably as part of the second Boer War.

The large three-light window in the second bay of the north aisle contains striking modern painted glass (fig. 4.21) which was installed in memory of Winifred Mary Colegate (sister of William Arthington Worsley), who died in 1955. The window includes depictions of an Agnus Dei and several figures on horseback. To the east of this is mounted an elaborate marble memorial in remembrance of Arthington Worsley, son of Sir William Worsley, Bart., who died in 1861, aged 30. The window in the third bay contains leaded quarries of clear glass in a diaper pattern. To the east of this window is mounted another large marble plaque commemorating Thomas Worsley Esq. (d.1778), his wife Elizabeth Lister, and nine of their children. They are all recorded as being buried in the adjacent mausoleum, with the exception of the five youngest children, who were interred at St Marylebone church, London. The window of the forth, eastern-most bay contains stained glass, with one light depicting St Francis, and the other St Anselm.

This stained glass window commemorates Sir William Cayley Worsley, Bart., who died in 1897. Immediately to the east, awkwardly squashed between the window and the archway into the north chancel aisle, is the church's most imposing funerary monument. This large tomb is executed in various coloured marbles and is dedicated to Thomas Worsley Esq. (d.1715) and his wife Mary Arthington. It comprises a sarcophagus resting on lion's feet above a tall plinth, (fig. 4.22). With its geometric window tracery, the north aisle is again uniformly constructed in the late 13th-century style of the Geometric Decorated Gothic. The majority of the stained glass and funerary monuments post-date the 1860 restoration, although two monuments are pre-1860.

4.2.6 Chancel

The two-bay chancel sits on a low plinth, matching that of the nave and aisles. The architecturally diverse south elevation of the chancel contains three small windows and a Priest's Door (fig. 4.23). Starting at the west is a single lancet window, occasionally described as a "low side window" (e.g. Butler 2007, 226). In the Early English style of the late 12th-century, this window features a simple chamfer, and is formed by a mix of geologies with some stones featuring significant weathering, especially the sill. This suggests the window is a reused medieval feature, although significantly restored. Immediately east is a very narrow Romanesque-style window with a round-headed arch formed from a single stone. Again, based on geology, architectural style, and weathering, this window is likely a reused medieval element dating to the early 12th century. Slightly to the right of the centre of the elevation is the Priest's door, which features chamfered jambs with a roll-moulded, round-headed arch springing from narrow abaci. To the east of the Priest's door is a Romanesque style window. It comprises two chamfered lights with round-headed arches, separated by a squat shaft with a scalloped cushion capital, with a chamfered oculus light above (see fig. 4.23). There is a stepped diagonal buttress at both eastern angles of the chancel. A large window of three lights with geometric tracery dominates the eastern gable elevation. Unusually high, this window is surrounded by a hoodmould terminating on crowned head-stops (female on the south and male on the north). The gabled roof has an apex stone in the form of a large cross, which surmounts the eastern coping. The northern elevation is almost entirely obscured by the north chancel aisle.

Inside, the chancel, which measures ~8.98m east to west x ~4.17m north to south, is connected to the nave by a tall two-centred arch of two moulded orders. The inner

order features filleted roll-mouldings, and springs from elaborate corbels in the form of a short shaft with foliated capital, and a foliated corbel base (fig. 4.24). A hoodmould surrounds the western (nave) side of the arch and terminates on head-stops comprising praying winged figures. The outer order springs directly from the wall and is decorated with a simple chamfer that continues down the arch jamb before stopping slightly above floor level. A single step and an altar rail with wrought iron brackets further delineate the chancel from the nave. The six principal rafters of the timber roof each spring from complex foliated corbels projecting from the wall below the wall plate.

The three windows in the south elevation sit within deeply splayed openings and each contains clear glass with a modern leading pattern based on the architectural design of the windows. Text painted in the base of the lancet window records that the glass was installed in memory of Arthington Worsley, who died in 1943 (fig. 4.25). A solid timber door sits within an arched recess for the Priest's door. The east window contains bright stained glass commemorating Sir William Cayley Worsley, Bart., which is stylistically very similar to the glass commemorating him in the north aisle (fig. 4.26). Beneath the east window is a stone reredos carved in a Perpendicular Gothic style. In fine grey limestone, it comprises blind cinquefoil arch panels with crocketted finials at the top and quatrefoil panels at the base. A moulded stringcourse filled with widely spaced four-leafed flower mouldings runs across the east wall, stepping up around the reredos and running beneath the east window. A freestanding oak sedilia sits directly beneath the reredos, against the east wall of the chancel. This modern seating contains a coat of arms and text commemorating William Arthington Worsley, who died in 1973 and Joyce Morgan Worsley, who died in 1979. The chancel is separated from the north chancel aisle by an arcade of two arches, each of two orders with wide chamfers. The arches spring from foliated capitals, each of which sits on a foliated corbel (fig. 4.27). The central pier is clustered, being made of four columns in a four-leaf clover arrangement, with a foliated capital and moulded abacus.

The predominant architectural style employed in the chancel is again the Geometric Decorated Gothic style of the late 13th-century. This is demonstrated by the geometric tracery in the east window, and the foliated capitals and corbels employed throughout. Stylistically, the south elevation of the chancel contains the most architectural diversity of any area of the present church, with two windows and a doorway in the Romanesque style, and an Early English-style lancet window. The Perpendicular Gothic styled reredos dates to a later Victorian alteration (see Section 4.2.9). The chancel has clearly

been internally reordered in the late 20th century, and all of the window glass post-dates the 1860 rebuilding.

4.2.7 North Chancel Aisle

The north chancel aisle comprises two bays and is externally delineated from the north aisle by a stepped buttress and a separate roof, which is gabled and slightly higher than the north aisle's mono-pitch roof (fig. 4.28). There is a diagonal stepped buttress at the north-east corner and the north elevation sits on a high plinth, or weathering offset, continuing from the north aisle. Each bay contains a two-light window with geometric tracery, as does the east elevation, all of which match the aisle windows. An apex stone in the form of a Celtic cross surmounts the coping of the eastern gable and the east wall of the north chancel aisle is recessed slightly from the east wall of the chancel.

Internally, the north chancel aisle is separated from the chancel by an arcade, as described above. The church organ is housed in the western bay, while the eastern bay forms the modern vestry. Sitting back from the chancel arcade these spaces are delineated by a timber parclose screen, which contains a doorway from the chancel into the vestry (see fig. 4.27). To the east of the doorway (the vestry), this screen features blind geometric tracery, while to the west (the organ chamber) it features open perpendicular tracery. The freestanding organ, which was given by William Cayley Worsley in 1860, fills the majority of the floor space of the western bay. It was remodelled in 1897 as memorial to Harriet Philadelphia Worsley, 1st wife of William Cayley Worsley (Vaughan 2006, 12). Both windows in the north elevation are filled with leaded quarries of clear glass in a diaper pattern. Sitting within the window reveal of the western window is a section of Pre-Conquest cross-shaft with interwoven decoration, dating to the 9th-century (Lang 1991, 149). The eastern bay window was not initially drawn on the 1860 faculty application plan, but there is a pencil notation indicating that a window should be added (fac. 1860/2). Mounted on the wall between these two windows is a pair of elaborate marble funerary monuments. The plaque to the west commemorates Mrs Frances Arthington, who died in 1716 (fig. 4.29), while the other is dedicated to the memory of Mrs Ann Arthington, who died in 1692 (fig. 4.30).[10] The eastern memorial has been partially set into the wall, and the putto that crowns the monument sits within a rectangular niche in the wall. The window in the east elevation is filled with rich, deeply coloured stained glass, similar to that found in the west window

---

[10] The Arthington family were related by marriage to the Worsleys.

of the north aisle (see Section 4.2.5 above). The glass within the quatrefoil at the window's apex contains the words "My Sister", suggesting that these two pieces of stained glass post-date the 1860 restoration.[11] Immediately beneath this window is an intricately carved panel comprising the phrase "Do This In Remembrance of Me" in Gothic lettering on a background of low relief foliage and berries. This panel was commissioned by Rev Munby during the 1860s and originally stood above the communion table (V.1865 Ret.). The architecture of the north chancel aisle matches that of the north aisle, and is uniformly decorated in the Geometric Decorated Gothic style. It contains several reused early funerary monuments, as well as glass and monuments post-dating the 1860 rebuilding.

4.2.8 Tower

The rectangular west tower (fig. 4.31) is divided into three stages by narrow square-section stringcourses, and with generally large quoins laid in side alternate fashion. Several of these large quoin stones contain large semi-circular indents, suggesting they are reused window heads (fig. 4.32) and possibly a reused door head. The first stage is significantly taller than the subsequent stages, and each stage is slightly narrower than the one below it. The tower is constructed of roughly coursed masonry of varying geologies and stone sizes. It has a low pyramidal roof covered in lead, dating to 1970 (*English Heritage Buildings File BF095444)*, with a weathervane fixed at its apex. The upper stage of each elevation contains double belfry windows, comprising narrow, round-headed openings separated by a simple shaft with a through impost. A low parapet surmounts the tower, resting on a simple roll-moulded corbel table.

The lower stage of the south elevation contains a very small rectangular window immediately beneath the stringcourse. Slightly off-centre in the middle stage is a double-splayed single-light window. The top of the round-headed, Romanesque arch of this window appears to have been chiselled out to form a crude lancet. Set into the stonework above the belfry window in the top stage is a 10th-century wheel cross with interlaced decoration (see Lang 1991 for detailed description). An impressive round-arched doorway of four orders dominates the lower stage of the western elevation (fig. 4.33). The arch of the door springs from chamfered imposts and the innermost order is

---

[11] The 1860 rebuilding commemorates Harriet Worsley nee Hamer (who appears to have been an only child). Stylistically dating to the late 19th century, it is not known whom these stained glass windows were intended to commemorate.

recessed. The third, inner, order features a thick angle roll above freestanding nook-shafts. Above the doorway is set a crude Anglian cross, carved in high relief and believed to date stylistically to the 9th century (King 1970, 64). Between this cross and the stringcourse is a single course of herringbone masonry. The second stage of the west elevation also features a small rectangular opening immediately beneath the stringcourse, similar to that in the lower stage of the south elevation. The lower stage of the north elevation is blank, although one of the north-east quoins contains a blocked hole within it, possibly a putlog or a scar from a later, now lost, construction against the tower. The middle stage features another rectangular opening, matching that on the west elevation. A large clock face is mounted into the tower's eastern elevation, squeezed between the apex of the nave roof and the belfry openings. The stringcourse dividing the second and third stages of the tower cuts off to either side of the clock face. On the north side of the clock, this stringcourse cuts off on a diagonal, possibly indicating an earlier roofline, although no other roof scar indications are visible.

Internally the tower is connected to the nave by a narrow, round-headed arch, springing from chamfered imposts that run right through the depth of the opening. Pacitto and Watts (2007, 53) suggest that one stone in the north respond of this doorway may be the reused base of a stone chair. There are a number of infilled holes within the archway, suggesting it may have had doors or a screen set within it at some point. The east wall of the tower, within the nave, contains a series of filled holes, around the height of the arch springing, representing a later, now lost, gallery or singer's loft (fig. 4.34). At the line of the ceiling wall posts is a course of herringbone masonry, matching that found of the exterior west elevation. Several courses above this, the line of the wall steps back slightly, presumably denoting the narrower second stage of the tower. Above and partially obscured by the ceiling rafters is a doorway or blocked opening whose original function is unknown. Inside the tower, the lower stage is divided into two stories by a timber floor. In the lower chamber, which measures ~3.7m square, the west doorway is filled by a modern timber and glass door, while the south elevation contains two large legacy boards recording late 17th and 18th-century gifts to the village. There is what appears to be a putlog hole in the north elevation, near the wooden ladder that provides the only access to the upper chambers of the tower. The next level of the tower contains the ringing chamber and has whitewashed walls. A sliding timber screen is used to cover the rectangular opening in the south elevation, which has only a very small splay. The chamber in the second stage of the tower is relatively empty, but contains some early plaster surviving on the walls. An old timber door blocks the opening into the nave near

the roof. The large window in the south elevation is deeply splayed and is filled with clear glass. Inside the head of the arch again appears to have been altered, almost forming a trefoil-headed lancet window (fig. 4.35). The upper chamber contains the bell frame with six bells and the clock. Three of the bells were added in 1878, at which time the three existing bells were recast (Ph.45: *Hovingham Parish Magazine* **9,** September 1878). The tower is constructed in a Saxo-Norman Romanesque style, although its style has not led to a concrete stylistic dating. The latest consensus is that the group of towers to which Hovingham stylistically belongs all date to shortly after the Conquest (see McClain 2011; Stocker & Everson 2006; Cambridge 1994; Morris 1989).

4.2.9 Features/fabric altered, added or removed 1860-Present

Having described the church of All Saints, Hovingham as it appears today, the following section will briefly outline known alterations that have occurred since the church reopened in 1860. These are based on a combination of documentary evidence, principally Faculties, and physical evidence within the structure. The Borthwick Institute for Archives holds 16 faculty applications pertaining to the church since 1860, however not all of these were approved, nor all of the works carried out. Most of the Faculties for the church relate to ephemeral changes to fixtures and fittings, or to minor fabric repairs. The majority of alterations to church since 1860 relate to the addition of funerary monuments and to the insertion of commemorative stained window glass. A newspaper report on the newly restored church (*Yorkshire Gazette* 22/09/1860, 9) notes different stained glass to that found today in the four windows in the chancel, east window of the south aisle, and in the second bay of the north aisle (facing the south door). None of the described stained glass survives in the church today. This newspaper article also records that the vestry was initially housed in the base of the west tower and that the organ was then located at the west end of the church. Three bells were added to the tower in 1878, at which time it appears the bell frame was either replaced or substantially restored (Ph.45: *Hovingham Parish Magazine* **9**, September 1878).

A faculty from 1878 (fac. 1878/24) proposed the construction of a south chapel, although this was never executed. In 1892 the base of the east window was raised by three feet in order to accommodate the insertion of a sanctuary step and the Perpendicular Gothic style stone reredos (fac. 1892/4). It records that the existing stained glass was to be retained and the stringcourse altered to accommodate. The architect for this work was Charles Fowler Hodgson. In 1981 the chancel interior was

reordered although no alterations were made to fabric (Vaughan 2006, 9). An 1863 description of the church notes there was a "low pulpit of stone, and a reading desk having marble columns" (Butler 2007, 227), both of which are now lost, although the pulpit is visible in earlier photographs (fig. 4.36).

4.2.10 Analysis of Current Church

With the exception of alterations to fixtures and fittings, such as window glass and memorials, the church today is architecturally very close to the building that emerged from the 1860 restoration campaign. The only significant fabric alteration to the church has been the truncation of the east window in 1892. The present church is constructed in a uniform Decorated Gothic architectural style, featuring geometric window tracery, stepped buttresses, and typical late 13th-century style arches and mouldings. The exceptions to this uniformity are the Saxo-Norman west tower, Romanesque south doorway, and the south wall of the chancel, with its Early English lancet window, Romanesque-style windows, and priest's door. The ashlar employed for the body of the church is mostly limestone, with some pieces of sandstone (presumably reused, and possibly even Roman in origin [12]), all of which display uniform tooling marks throughout. Presented as thick rectangular marks from a wide chisel (fig. 4.37), this tooling appears commonly on many of the 18th and 19th century buildings in the region. The west tower with its Romanesque architectural styling is constructed in roughly coursed masonry of varying geology and stone sizes. This masonry displays very rough tooling (where visible), possibly created using an axe or adze (fig. 4.38). There is a clear building break in the west wall of the north aisle, near where it meets the tower, with the masonry and tooling matching that of the tower (see fig. 4.19). This surviving stub of west wall is constructed from similar masonry to the tower, consistent with a Saxo-Norman date, although it is not bonded with the tower, suggesting it may date from a separate phase of construction. There is another building break where the wall of the nave has been attached onto the existing south wall of the tower (fig. 4.39). The four walls of the tower vary slightly in thickness, but all measure approximately 980mm near the base. The walls of the body of the church measure approximately 650mm thick, with the exception of the north and west walls of the north aisle, which are ~750mm

---

[12] Pacitto & Watt (2007, 58) identify possible reused roman sandstone in the chancel wall foundation.

thick. The archaeological survey of the current structure confirms that the church was entirely rebuilt in 1860 with the exception of the Saxo-Norman west tower (fig. 4.40).

4.2.11 Reused material in the present church

Beyond the west tower, the present church of All Saints, Hovingham appears to contain very little fabric reused from the earlier building. This section contains a discussion of reused material identified through detailed visual analysis, supplemented or confirmed by archival and documentary research. Although limited in quantity, this reused material ranges from architectural details to sepulchral monuments and is found throughout the church. Figure 4.41 shows the identified reused material mapped onto a plan of the current church.

Funerary monuments

The vast majority of the reused material found in the church today is in the form of funerary monuments and memorials. These are located throughout the church, with the exception of the chancel and tower, and are readily identified by their date inscriptions. The faculty application for the 1860 rebuilding specifically stipulates on the treatment of funerary monuments, stating: "care being taken to preserve the Monuments situate in the said Church and to refix them the same in the said Chancel when restored" (Fac.Bk.5, pp.22-4). This original plan to install the existing monuments in the chancel was not followed, although it seems that the retention of earlier memorials was well-established practice. It is also worth noting that almost all of the reused monuments relate directly to the Worsley family or their retainers, so even without the faculty stipulation, it is perhaps unsurprising that they were reinstated. It must also be noted that it is unknown if the pre-1860 church contained additional memorials not associated with the Worsley family, which did not get reinstated following the rebuilding of the church.

In total there are six monuments that predate the 1860 rebuilding, including the imposing memorial to Thomas and Mary Worsley in the north aisle. Most of these monuments are mentioned in early 19th-century descriptions of the church, confirming their presence in the pre-1860 church. In 1824, Rev Eastmead described the monuments to Thomas Worsley and to Ann and Frances Arthington, stating they are on "the same side of the church" (Eastmead 1824, 203), but gives no more precise detail as to their location. He then separately describes William Schoolcroft's memorial as

being on the south wall, allowing it to be inferred that Thomas Worsley's monument was located on the north. Interestingly, this is the same spatial arrangement as found in the present church, suggesting the monuments may have been returned to near their earlier positions.

Architectural and sculptural spolia

Hovingham is surprisingly sparse in reused architectural elements. The majority of the identifiable reused architectural fragments date to a much earlier phase of rebuilding and can be found incorporated into the 11th-century west tower. There are also several pieces of early sculptural stonework in the tower, which will be discussed below. The largest reused architectural element in the 1860 church is the south doorway, which dates to the 12th century. Other reused elements incorporated into the 1860 structure include the two windows in the south wall of the chancel, being: a tall early 13th-century lancet window and a narrow 12th-century Romanesque window (see fig. 4.23). The elevation drawings associated with the 1860 faculty for rebuilding reveal that both these windows have been reinserted close to their previous positions. Based on their condition, both windows appear to be partially reused and partially reconstructed. An early 20th-century phased plan of the church by the S.D. Kitson (fig. 4.42) claims the priest's door is also reused, however there is no evidence to support this suggestion. Some of the masonry is likely to have been reused in the construction of the 1860 church, although if so, it has been re-tooled. The exceptions to this are the three lower quoin stones in the north-west angle of the north aisle, which based on their larger size, differing geology and tooling, are likely early masonry reused in its original form (see fig. 4.18). Whilst not technically architectural spolia, the altar in the Lady Chapel is formed from a 17th-century table (Page 1914, 510), which likely served as the church's communion table up to the 1860 rebuilding.

Most of the reused sculptural fragments in the church are to be found embedded in the walls of the tower. Those located elsewhere in the church were all removed from the tower fabric during the early 20th century for protection from the elements (fac. 1924B/21). All of these sculptural elements pre-date the 11th-century tower and include the famous 9th-century 'Annunciation' panel currently acting as the reredos in the Lady Chapel, which was previously located in the exterior south wall of the tower (fig. 4.43). Since at least the 18th-century, this has been, and remains, the most celebrated and discussed feature of the church (see Hawkes 1989 for a detailed discussion).

4.3 Reconstruction of the Pre-Restoration Church

Having explored the construction and architectural phasing of the present church, including the reused earlier fabric within it, this second section will endeavour to describe the church of All Saints, Hovingham immediately prior to the restoration campaign of 1860. After a discussion of the available sources, the church and its components will be explored and accompanied by reconstruction drawings. The final part of the section will attempt to present the phased development of the church from its earliest development through to its form immediately prior to the Victorian rebuilding. An understanding of All Saints prior to the 1860 restoration will allow for the architectural relationship with the present church, if any, to be explored.

4.3.1 Sources

There are surprisingly few contemporary descriptions of Hovingham prior to its near total demolition in 1860. Thankfully, however, a number of plans of the church survive that provide details as to its form and layout from the late 18th century onwards. The earliest visual depiction of All Saints can be found on Thomas Worsley's 1696 survey of the village (Hovingham Hall), which also provides the only known elevation drawing of the pre-restoration church (fig. 4.44). A detailed 1793 plan of the church (ZON 17/3), created for the purpose of allocating pews, provides invaluable insight into the spatial (and social hierarchical) layout of the church interior at the time (fig. 4.45). Curiously, this plan also includes simple projected drawings of the church's fenestration. A measured drawing created for the construction of a north gallery in 1821 (fac. 1821/6) provides the plan of much of the north aisle and corroborates the fenestration arrangement shown on the 1793 plan (fig. 4.46). Two later plan drawings of Hovingham, dating to 1824 (Hovingham Hall) and 1835 (ZON/17/2/1/218) respectively, broadly confirm the size and form of the earlier church. None of the above represents a detailed architectural survey, meaning that some interpretation and analysis has been required. The 1860 faculty application for the rebuilding of the church (fac. 1860/2) originally involved a far greater degree of fabric retention, resulting in the associated drawings providing further glimpses of the earlier church.

Prior to its Victorian remodelling, the church of All Saint's, Hovingham appears to have been a complex, multi-phase structure. Antiquarian sources agree the church comprised a west tower, nave with north aisle, and chancel with north chancel aisle. Several

sources also record that the church had once possessed a south aisle, which was removed in 1725 (e.g. Gill 1852, 251).

4.3.2 Setting of the Earlier Church

Thomas Worsley's 1696 survey of the village (see fig. 4.42), and the 1824 & 1835 plans of Hovingham village all reveal aspects of the size and layout of the church and churchyard. Sadly, no detailed descriptions survive so little is known of the churchyard walls or the extent of burial markers. There are a number of early grave markers located near to the south porch which predate the present church, including the listed chest tomb to members of the Stockton Family, which dates to at least 1798 (see Appendix 2.2). The Grade II listed Worsley mausoleum (see Appendix 2.3), dating to c.1750, was described in 1824 as being surrounded by "a massy iron railing, and a row of appropriate evergreens" (Eastmead 1824, 203).

The 1696 plan shows numerous paths crossing the churchyard, connecting the church and four entrances to the churchyard. Three of the entrances opened into the village, with the fourth providing access from the grounds of the adjacent Hovingham Hall. From this is can be inferred that the churchyard was walled or at least clearly delineated within the landscape. All of the early plans show that the former boundary of the churchyard was slightly larger than it is today, with a major encroachment from Hovingham Hall, presumably in response to the 19th-century expansion of the hall, now mostly demolished. The 1696 plan also shows a line of trees along the former southern boundary of the churchyard, in what is now part of the grounds of Hovingham Hall.

4.3.3 Nave & South Aisle

Eastmead (1824, 202) records that the south front of All Saints' church was rebuilt in 1725. With frustrating obscurity, Gill (1852, 250) also notes the 1725 rebuilding of the "south front", and separately states that "at the commencement of the last century" the south aisle was removed and a new south wall was constructed. It is reasonable conjecture that these two events are one and the same, with the south aisle being demolished in 1725 and a new south wall being built to enclose the nave. The only surviving evidence for this lost south aisle comes from Thomas Worsley's survey of 1696. This simple image portrays the south elevation of the church and suggests the aisle comprised four bays with a porch projecting from the western bay. The walls

appear very high and there seems to be a single, low-pitched roof over the body of the church, with its apex being level with the stringcourse delineating the upper stages of the tower. The church's windows are all shown as wide, tall and with segmental arch lintels, with a truncated version shown in the western bay above the porch. As the tower and reused chancel windows, which are still readily visible today, bear no resemblance to their depiction, all the windows shown on this 1696 drawing must be considered suspect. Thomas Worsley's image of the church is a small part of his survey of Hovingham, and is simply a representation of the building, rather than an accurate portrayal of its architectural elements.

Gill notes that along with the 1725 demolition of the south aisle, "the original windows were all removed from the body of the church" (1852, 250). Whellan also records that the original fenestration was removed, noting that it occurred "when the building was being repaired" (1859, 862). It can be surmised that a major repair and remodelling of the church occurred in 1725 in which the south aisle was removed and a nave south wall constructed containing contemporary refenestration. Presumably this remodelling also resulted in the reroofing of the nave. Excavations on the south side of the present nave revealed fragments of medieval painted and stained glass, some of which were tentatively identified as 13th century in origin, hinting at the possible fenestration prior to 1725 (Pacitto & Watts 2007, 57). The 1793 plan for the allocation of pews (ZON 17/3) provides a glimpse of the post-1725 fenestration (see fig. 4.45). The south elevation is shown as four bays, with the windows being large single-lights with segmental-arch heads and no keystones. Interestingly, a matching window is shown in the porch bay, suggesting a window above the porch as depicted in the 1696 drawing (see fig. 4.44). This plan highlights that the north aisle was of three bays (see below), while the nave south wall was of four bays – presumably preserving the bay rhythm of the lost south aisle. It is assumed that the current reused late-Romanesque doorway served as the south door to the nave, and thus that it was reused within both the lost south aisle and the 1725 south nave wall. This offers a good example of the continued reuse of Romanesque doorways within both medieval and post-medieval church remodelling.

The 1793 plan also gives a detailed picture of the interior layout of the nave as it appeared into the early 19th century. It reveals that the nave was filled with bench pews and a small number of box pews, with a narrow passageway down the middle (see fig. 4.45). Overall the nave arrangement was not dissimilar to the present layout. A small

pulpit and reading desk were located in the south-east corner, while the font was situated in the middle bay of the north arcade, against the western pier. Interestingly, the record associated with this plan (ZON 17/3) reveals that these seats were allocated to the men of the parish and to widows, but the women of the village otherwise sat on the benches at the west end of the church. The lord of Hovingham Hall, Thomas Worsley Esq., had a large box pew in the north-east corner of the nave, near the chancel, and immediately opposite the pulpit and reading desk. In February 1793 a faculty was granted for the construction of a singer's loft or gallery at the west end of the nave (Fac.Bk.2, pp.520-1). This singer's gallery was to measure ~18ft north to south x ~9ft east to west, starting at a height of 7ft above ground, and to be attached to the south and west walls of the nave. At its north-eastern corner it would sit in front of the existing western arch of the north arcade, and so a supporting pillar was constructed. These dimensions confirm the width of the nave as approximately eighteen feet. The 1793 plan shows the north arcade as being of three bays, with two pillars and responds at either end. The depiction of the piers is curious to say the least and suggests the piers were quite different, and on an odd alignment. The eastern pier is drawn as a compound pier of four columns in a quatrefoil design. Also shown is what is presumably the base (and/or the capital), which appears to be moulded. The western pier is depicted as two columns in a figure of eight pattern, with a circular base or capital. A measured plan associated with an 1821 faculty application (fac. 1821/6) for a north gallery also depicts these piers, but shows them as matching compound piers aligned to the church (see fig. 4.46). As the 1821 faculty plan was intended to guide construction, it can be assumed to provide the more accurate survey of the north arcade.

The interior of All Saints' church underwent a scheme of repair and reordering in 1821, with Eastmead recording that the interior of the church had "recently undergone a thorough repair, having been repewed, underdrawn, and handsomely fitted up" (1824, 202-3). He further noted this was done at the expense of the parishioners, and that Miss Worsley, of Hovingham Hall, provided "new ornaments, coverings, and cushions for the pulpit, reading desk, and communion table" as well as having "the communion plate richly chased and embossed" (Eastmead 1824, 202-3). It is interesting to note that the parishioners, rather than the Worsley family, funded this restoration scheme. Gill (1852, 250-1) notes that Miss Worsley was the daughter of the late Thomas Worsley, and as Thomas & Elizabeth Worsley had two surviving daughters, the patron must have been either Amelia (eldest) or Frances Worsley. This repair and reordering work is confirmed by the 1821 faculty application for the installation of the north aisle gallery (Fac. Bk.4,

pp. 108-110), which also sought permission to "make such other repairs and alterations as might be found wanting and necessary towards the improvement" of the church. This faculty states that the new gallery was to be "supported by the three present pillars" (Fac.Bk.4, pp.108-110), confirming the additional pillar for the 1793 singer's gallery, although this is not shown on the associated plan (fac. 1821/6). Unfortunately, there are no surviving plans or descriptions of the interior of the church after the 1821 repewing, so it is not known how much the arrangement changed from the detailed plan drawn in 1793. Given the unknown extent of the 1725 remodelling, it is impossible to suggest a predominant architectural style demonstrated by the nave of the pre-1860 church. Such a low-pitched roof is associated with the 15th-century Perpendicular Gothic, and the quatrefoil compound pillars of the north aisle could date from any time between the 13th and 16th centuries. With large segmental-arch windows, it appears that the south elevation of the nave – built following the 1725 demolition of the south aisle - was constructed in a classically inspired 18th-century style.

4.3.4 North Aisle

The north aisle of the previous church also appears to have undergone significant alteration in the Post-Medieval period. Gill (1852, 250) and Whellan (1859, 861) both record that the 1725 campaign of rebuilding, discussed above, also included the rebuilding of the north aisle wall, although it is not known if this was a full rebuilding or the partial repair of the wall. Gill (1852, 250) also notes that the north aisle windows were all replaced in 1725, so the 'rebuilding' may simply refer to this refenestration. The 1793 plan (see fig. 4.45) shows that each of the aisle's three bays contained a square-headed window with a dropped central keystone. The detailing of these windows is different from the segmental-arch windows of the nave south elevation, suggesting they may represent different phases of remodelling. The 1860 faculty application (fac. 1860/2) includes a proposed north elevation drawing showing the north aisle much as it is today (fig. 4.47). The associated plan however, reveals that the intention was to retain the north aisle wall but with new windows inserted and buttresses added. This suggests that the proposed north elevation depicts the fabric of the earlier wall with those alterations. If so, this drawing reveals the earlier north aisle wall was constructed of coursed ashlar and sat upon a low chamfered plinth.

Internally, the north aisle was separated from the nave by an arcade, as described above (Section 4.3.3), and from the north chancel aisle by an arch which will be described in

Section 4.3.5 below. According to the 1793 plan there was an open passageway on the south side of the aisle, while a line of box pews lined the north wall. The north-west corner of the map is missing, but presumably contained pews no. 24, 25, 29 & 30 heading westwards. This places the two pews in the back corner, farthest from the pulpit, as being those allocated to Thomas Worsley's servants (29), and the Churchwardens (30) (ZON 17/3). A faculty from 1802 reveals that the Churchwardens' pew had been rather quickly moved up into the north chancel aisle (Fac. Bk.3, pp.337-8), revealing some power politics at play. The 1793 singer's gallery at the west end of the nave was accessed by a staircase built in the south-west corner of the north aisle. As discussed above, All Saints' church was re-pewed throughout in 1821 (Eastmead 1824, 202-3), at which time a large gallery was also installed, filling the entire north aisle (fac. 1821/6). The plan of this gallery reveals the precise arrangement of the gallery and the existing 1793 staircase. As the new gallery was to fill the entire north aisle the faculty provides the dimensions for the aisle, which was 44 feet (east - west) by 12 feet (north - south including the north arcade). This new gallery was to be fixed to the north wall 10 feet above the ground, by which it can be inferred that the earlier north aisle was significantly taller than the present one, perhaps matching the tall south aisle depicted by Thomas Worsley in 1696 (see fig. 4.44). Based on the information available, there were two predominant architectural styles demonstrated in the north aisle. The north wall and fenestration appear to have been in the Classical style of the early 18th century, while the arcade, as discussed above, was in an unknown medieval Gothic style.

4.3.5 Chancel

Thomas Worsley's 1696 drawing of the church shows the nave and chancel as being contained beneath a single roof, although this small drawing cannot be relied upon too heavily. It also depicts the south elevation of the chancel as containing three windows similar to those in the nave. The chancel is also shown with a small, central priest's door with flat lintel, similar to that at nearby All Saints, Appleton-le-Street (fig. 4.48). Thankfully, the south elevation of the chancel is relatively well known, as it appears in a number of other plans and drawings. The 1793 plan confirms the presence of a priest's door, but little else. The drawings associated with the rebuilding of the church (fac. 1860/2) reveal the initial intention had been to retain the earlier chancel walls, including the original fenestration in the south elevation. This elevation drawing shows the two windows that have been reused within the current structure (fig. 4.49), along with a two-light Perpendicular Gothic style window to the east, and importantly, a

second, now lost, narrow 12th-century window, matching the one preserved in the present chancel south elevation. The Romanesque-style priest's doorway is revealed by the faculty plan to be a proposed 1860 reworking, presumably of the simpler doorway depicted by Thomas Worsley in 1696. The positioning of these two matching Romanesque windows, roughly balancing the doorway, suggests they are the original fenestration, corresponding to a two-bay 12th-century chancel. Little is known about the east elevation of the chancel, other than that the 1860 faculty plan shows the planned east window was to be fitted within the existing window reveal (fac. 1860/2). This provides the dimensions of the earlier window, with the internal reveal measuring ~2350mm (approximately 7 feet 8.5 inches), but nothing is known of its design or tracery.

The 1793 plan suggests the interior of the chancel was sparsely furnished at the end of 18th century. The sanctuary was delineated by an altar rail and contained a Communion Table, most likely the same one employed in the Lady Chapel today. The chancel was separated from the north chancel aisle by an arcade, which will be described in Section 4.3.6. Beneath the eastern arch of the arcade, a doorway provided access from the vestry into the sanctuary. Little is known about the chancel arch, which the plan of 1793 (ZON 17/3) reveals as springing from responds and being approximately 2.94m wide. Given the limited information available, any summary of the predominant architectural styling of the chancel would be highly speculative. The chancel likely dated to the 12th century, as preserved in the south elevation, and its windows demonstrate Romanesque, Early English Gothic, and Perpendicular Gothic architectural styling, spanning the 12th to 14th centuries.

4.3.6 North Chancel Aisle & Vestry

There is little detailed evidence for the exterior elevations of the north chancel aisle. The faculty drawings for the rebuilding of the church in 1860 (fac. 1860/2) reveal that the north wall was a continuation of the north aisle and appears not to have been architecturally delineated from it. The 1793 plan (ZON 17/3) shows the east wall as a continuation of the east chancel wall and was again not architecturally delineated. It also suggests the fenestration matched that of the north aisle, with each of the two bays containing a square-headed single-light window with a dropped keystone (see fig. 4.45). Inside the church, the north chancel aisle was separated from the chancel by an arcade of two arches with responds and a central pier. The 1860 plan (fac. 1860/2) reveals this

to be a compound pier of four semi-circular columns separated by casements, possibly suggesting a late 14th-century date.[13] No description of the arcade survives, but it may be conjectured to have consisted of two moulded, equilateral arches. The 1793 plan shows the western bay of the north chancel aisle as containing box pews, while the eastern bay was further divided to form a vestry at the east, with the burying place of the Worsley family in the western portion. The western bay contained four box pews, three of which were much larger than those found elsewhere in the church. The associated pew list (ZON 17/3) reveals a clear hierarchy in the 1793 pew allocation, with these box pews, which were large and located close to the pulpit and the east end, being held by men of high station in the community, including the owners of two minor estates (Scackleton Grange and East Ness Estate) (fig. 4.50). From 1821 a stair was located in the south-west corner of the north chancel aisle, leading up to the north gallery (fac. 1821/6). There is a curious blank space shown on the plan of 1793, between box pews 28 and 19 (see fig. 4.45). This may have been the location of a stove, or possibly relate to the arch delineating the north aisle and north chancel aisle. The 1821 faculty for the north aisle gallery refers to it terminating "behind the *pillars* leading to the Chancel Aisle"[14] (Fac. Bk.4, pp.108-110), possibly indicating that the arch sprang from a pillar or pilaster respond rather than directly from the north wall, although this is not shown on the 1793 plan.

The internal division of the eastern bay of the north chancel aisle dates to before 1694, when Thomas Worsley was granted permission to remove the existing dividing partition between the vestry and his family burial place, replacing it with a solid wall intended for the mounting of monuments (fac. 1694/1). It may be inferred that this work was carried out in preparation for housing Thomas Worsley's impressive marble memorial, which currently resides in the north aisle (see fig. 4.22). The former vestry partition was then re-erected "a little more westward" (ZON 10/4), and was presumably used to delineate the western extent of the burial place (see fig. 4.45). Interestingly, by the start of the 19th century pews were being constructed within this previously closed-off space, with Faculties for box pews being granted to Hugh Marsden in 1802 (Fac. Bk.3, pp.337-8) and to the Widow Prowde in 1820 (fac. 1820/6). This suggests this space was no longer reserved solely as the Worsley family burial place, presumably reflecting its abandonment following the construction of the Worsley mausoleum in c.1750. Several

---

[13] The pier is similar in design to those depicted in Bond 1905, 485.

[14] Author's italics.

early sources on the church (e.g. Gill 1852, 251; and Whellan 1859, 862) recount that a rumoured private chapel of the Crathorne family was once situated in the north chancel aisle, with Gill giving its location as "at the north side of the chancel, on the terminating point of the north aisle" (Gill 1852, 251). This is supported by a note on the 1793 plan where within the vestry is written "Mr Crathorn claims a burying place in it [the Vestry] for his family" (ZON 17/3). The Crathorne family held the manor at East Ness until 1788 (Ginter 1992, 59), although Ralph Cathorne is still recorded as such on the 1793 pew list (ZON 17/3). There is almost no diagnostic information to inform the predominant architectural detailing of the north chancel aisle. The design of the pier for the chancel arcade potentially dates the chancel aisle to the late 14th-century.

4.3.7 Tower

The tower is the only major element of the pre-1860 structure to survive as part of the standing church today. As such, it requires little extra description, however it must be noted that the tower has undergone several changes during and since the Victorian restoration of the church. The principal alteration to the west tower during the 1860 rebuilding seems to have been the replacement of the parapet and roof. Thomas Worsley's 1696 depiction of the church shows the tower crowned by an embattled parapet and flat roof (see fig. 4.44). Gill's 1852 description of the church also noted the church as having an "embattled tower" (1852, 250). A blind parapet and pyramidal roof appear on the 1860 faculty elevations, suggesting they were part of the 1860 rebuilding programme. After his visit to the church in 1863, Sir Stephen Glynne noted that "The tower is surmounted by a pyramidical quasi spire, recently added" (Butler 2007, 226). This 1860 roof structure is visible in early photographs of the church (fig. 4.51). As discussed above (Section 4.2.11), the early sculptural elements on display within the church today were largely removed from the fabric of the tower exterior in 1924 (fac. 1924B/21). Prior to 1878, the west tower contained three bronze bells, with the following inscriptions: (1) JESUS BE OUR SPEDE 1619; (2) ANNO DOMINI 1624; (3) SOLI DEO GLORIA 1721. FR: MASTERMAN. FR: TAYLOR CHVRCH WARDENS (Ph.45: *Hovingham Parish Magazine* **10** October 1877). A parochial account book contains entries relating to the 1721 recasting of the largest bell and reveals that the timber bell frames were renewed at the same time (Ph.45: *Hovingham Parish Magazine* **10,** October 1877).

4.3.8 Architectural Phasing

Through the synthesis and analysis of the available documentary and physical evidence, the above section has described the known elements of All Saints' church, Hovingham prior to the 1860 restoration campaign. While there is good evidence for the plan and layout of the church, there are no surviving images (apart from the simplistic 1696 elevation drawing) and no detailed architectural descriptions of the building. Surprisingly, the restoration and rebuilding of the church at Hovingham received remarkably little attention from the local media. As will be demonstrated in later case studies, contemporary newspaper articles often provided detailed architectural and historical descriptions of parish churches prior to their restoration and rebuilding. Sadly however, only two short entries in the *Yorkshire Gazette* have been identified for the 1860 restoration at Hovingham, both of which were written near to conclusion of the works and which make no reference to the earlier structure. The indefatigable Victorian church explorer, Sir Stephen Glynne, who could be relied upon to describe the architectural detailing of churches, did not visit Hovingham until 1863, three years after the restoration. Despite this dearth of explicit evidence, much of the development of the church can be discerned for the fragments that do survive. Firstly, it must be noted that the pre-1860 church was unlikely to be the first church on this site and that the architectural building sequence at All Saints, Hovingham is a complex one, with the earliest phases necessarily being largely conjectural.

Earlier Churches

All Saints' church contains several pieces of early Romanesque sculpture, some of which date back to the 8th or 9th century, including the high-status Annunciation 'frieze'. These sculptural elements may relate to an early church at Hovingham, possibly on the same site as the present building. As discussed in Section 4.1.2, Hovingham has been tentatively identified as the site of an early monastic church mentioned in 8th-century correspondence (Morris 1989, 122). The incorporation of reused Anglo-Saxon window and door heads into the surviving 11th-century tower confirms that an earlier, stone church existed in the area. It is likely that much of the masonry in the tower is also reused from this earlier structure, although it cannot be readily identified. Pacitto and Watts (2007, 58) also note possible reused Roman stones in the chancel wall foundations.

Medieval Parish Church

Based on the surviving Saxo-Norman west tower, the present church can be traced to the mid 11th century, with the current consensus being that it stylistically dates to immediately after the Conquest. Excavations in the nave in 1977 uncovered two courses of a stone-built wall following the line of the present north arcade, which Pacitto & Watts (2007, 58) identify as the nave north wall of the Saxo-Norman church. This excavated wall aligns with the surviving stub of masonry at the west end of the north aisle. The excavation evidence suggests the 11th-century church comprised a west tower, nave, and chancel. The Victoria County History (Page 1914, 509) states that the 11th-century tower formed part of an "aisled church" of the same date, although no evidence for this statement is provided and it seems most unlikely.

Excavation along the exterior of the chancel south wall in 1990 revealed the wall to be constructed on top of earlier foundations (Pacitto and Watts 2007, 55). These foundations indicate two construction phases, with the chancel being roughly doubled in length to its present dimensions at some stage. Given the two matching Romanesque windows in the south elevation prior to 1860, it may be safely conjectured that the chancel was rebuilt and extended in the late 12th century and that this Romanesque chancel survived through until the 1860 restoration. The reused nave south doorway, which is of a similar date (see fig. 4.12), suggests the chancel extension may have been part of a major late 12th-century remodelling of the church.

Visual analysis of the nave north arcade from surviving plan drawings indicate that the north aisle was likely added during the 13th century. The discovery of fragments of 13th-century painted and stained glass near the site of the medieval south aisle suggests, if tenuously, a similar date for the south aisle. The four-bay south aisle and three-bay north aisle attests to aisles being constructed during different building campaigns. North aisles were often added before south aisles (ref?), although there is no evidence to confirm this was the case at Hovingham. The design of the chancel arcade suggests the north chancel aisle was possibly added in the late 14th or early 15th century. Given the 19th-century rumours of a private chapel in this area, the north chancel aisle can be postulated as having been originally constructed, at least in part, as the Crathorne chantry chapel. The Perpendicular Gothic window shown at the east end of the south chancel wall (fac. 1860/2) may relate to this scheme, as possibly might the east window, although not enough evidence survives to make a credible hypothesis. Although there is

considerable speculation about the precise dating of the medieval development of the church, it can be confidently concluded that by the 16th century, All Saints represented a complex phased development dating from the 11th century onwards.

Post-Medieval Alteration

The multi-phase medieval parish church of All Saints, Hovingham underwent significant alteration during the post-medieval period. Following the suppression of chantry chapels in the 16th century, the north chancel aisle remained in use as a private burial place, but the former Crathorne chantry is seemingly repurposed as a vestry. The next documented event comes from a 1694 faculty application detailing the removal of the partition separating the vestry from the Worsley family burial place, replacing it with a solid wall (fac. 1694/1). As discussed in Sections 4.3.3 & 4.3.4 (above) there was a major remodelling of the church in 1725, representing a very significant loss of medieval fabric, including the south aisle, nave south arcade, and the majority of the church's medieval windows. In 1793 a large singer's gallery was constructed across the west end of the nave (Fac. Bk.2, pp.520-1), the marks of which are still visible in the stonework of the west wall of the nave. In the same year it is likely the church was re-pewed with a mixture of box pews and open benches, or at least that the existing post-medieval pews were redistributed. In the early 19th century further box pews were constructed in the chancel aisle (fig. 4.52), with Dr Hugh Marsden building a large box pew in 1802 within the area previously reserved as the private burial place of the Worsley family. The widow Alice Prowde then constructed a box pew in the former Worsley burial site in the north chancel aisle, in what the faculty described as a "vacant place or space of ground" (fac. 1820/6). This confirms that the Worsley family, who were presumably now using the adjacent mausoleum, no longer protected this private section of the church. Finally, 1821 saw the construction of a large gallery running the length of the north aisle, at which time the church was again repaired, re-pewed, and reordered (fac. 1821/6).

This section demonstrates the wealth of information that can be uncovered through a detailed archaeological investigation, despite the significant rebuilding of the church in the mid 19th century. The above analysis reveals that by the time of the 1860 restoration, All Saints' church, Hovingham contained a complex fabric development spanning the 11th century through to the 18th century. The 11th-century west tower survived relatively unchanged throughout the Medieval Period, while the chancel largely dated to the 12th century, although with alterations to its fenestration. With the

exception of the north arcade, the nave and north aisle were essentially post-medieval. Importantly, this analysis has shown that by 1860, the body of the church was essentially a post-medieval building in terms of fabric, arrangement, and fixtures and fittings. Figure 4.53 presents a reconstructed plan of All Saints', Hovingham prior to its Victorian restoration.

4.4 Analysis of the 1860 Restoration of All Saints, Hovingham

Section two of this chapter comprised a detailed archaeological recording and analysis of the present church. This investigation confirmed the west tower and associated stub of the west elevation of the north aisle to be the only in-situ elements of the church to pre-date the 1860 restoration campaign. It also identified a small number of earlier architectural and funerary elements that were reincorporated into the 19th-century fabric during the restoration. The following section presented a reconstruction of the church prior to 1860, based on a synthesis of the surviving physical and documentary evidence, including an analysis of its historical development. These two sections allow for a discussion of the 1860 restoration campaign and for the relationship to be explored between the post-1860 Victorian church and the pre-restoration structure. The following section will analyse the Victorian restoration campaign, exploring the process which led to the complete rebuilding of the body of the church, the key figures in that decision making process, and the relationship, if any, between the present, largely Victorian church, and All Saints as it existed immediately prior to 1860.

4.4.1 Analysis of the Restoration Process

Interrogation of the documentary records reveals that the restoration process at All Saints, Hovingham was an evolutionary one. The initial faculty application for the rebuilding (Fac. Bk.5, 22-24), which was lodged in June 1859, outlined the planned demolition of the nave, excepting the north wall, and proposed to re-roof the nave and north aisle, and to re-pew and re-floor the existing church. The exclusion of the north wall of the nave from the rebuilding suggests a desire to retain the surviving medieval north arcade. This early scheme focused on the restoration of the nave, along with a typical internal re-ordering in line with the evolving liturgical trends of the mid-19th century. No structural alteration was planned for the tower or chancel, and there is no reference to the reinstatement of the south aisle. The following year, the subsequent plan drawings (fac. 1860/2) show an expansion to include the addition of the south aisle, the construction of entirely new nave (including new north and south arcades),

refenestration throughout, rebuilding of the vestry east wall, replacement of the priest's door, and the addition of several buttresses. These plans demonstrate that with a few exceptions, the 1860 campaign was still intended as the restoration and refenestration of All Saints, rather than a full rebuilding of the body of the church (fig. 4.54). There are no further Faculties to cover the eventual extent of rebuilding, so the work resulting from fac.1860/2 far exceeded that applied for and granted.

No documentary evidence exists to explain this evolution, or indeed for why the restoration campaign was initially embarked upon. There are however, a number of factors that may be considered, including: the condition of the church, changing fashions in architectural taste and liturgy, and social factors such as notions of Victorian patronage. That the church was remodelled in 1725 and further repaired in 1821 makes it unlikely that poor fabric condition was a major contributing factor to the restoration and rebuilding at All Saints. Condition may, however, explain the 1860 decision to demolish and replace the medieval north arcade. The internal works to re-floor and re-pew the church was a ubiquitous feature of church restorations by this period, driven by changing liturgical requirements and the highly influential 'Ecclesiologists', who had been actively campaigning for the reordering of churches since the early 1840s. They were particular champions of the removal of box pews and galleries, which one correspondent described as "the irreconcilable war waged by the Cambridge Camden Society against pews" (Anon. 1842, 145).

As well as adapting to liturgical trends, changing architectural fashion appears to have been a major contributing factor in the decision to restore and rebuild All Saints' church, Hovingham. As detailed in Section 4.3, much of the body of the church was rebuilt in 1725, at which time the medieval windows were removed from the nave and north aisle. Therefore, the fabric of the pre-1860 church dated predominantly to the early 18th-century and was detailed in the Neo-Classical architectural style of that period.[15] Indeed, the south doorway, north arcade, and chancel windows appear to have been the only medieval architectural elements remaining in the body of the church. Throughout the evolution in the extent of restoration at All Saints, the focus remained on those elements of the church dating from the post-medieval remodelling. Initially retaining the medieval north arcade whilst rebuilding the nave of 1725, the scheme expanded to include the insertion of Neo-Gothic fenestration throughout to

---

[15] As seen in the 1793 plan (see fig. 4.45).

replace the Neo-Classical windows of the early 18th century. The Gothic Revival was at its peak by the mid-19th century, and the desire to 're-medievalise' church architecture, and in particular to remove post-medieval architectural details, was ubiquitous. Given the extent of 18th-century features in Hovingham's parish church prior to restoration, this change in architectural fashion would certainly have been a significant factor in the extent of the rebuilding of the church. The 1860 pyramidal roof of the tower replaced a low roof and embattled parapet (both stylistically 15th-century), suggesting an attempt to re-medievalise to a particular style (i.e. that of the late 13th-century), rather than deeming any later medieval style acceptable. The decision to reinstate the south aisle (likely added in the late 13th century and demolished in 1725) is a striking example of Victorian restorers returning a parish church to its medieval plan. The population of Hovingham remained comparatively steady through the 19th-century,[16] so it is unlikely that extra seating was required, especially given the removal of the box pews, and despite the loss of the gallery seating space. The Archbishop's Returns of 1865 (V.1865 Ret., 210-13) give the average church attendance at just ten persons, confirming that space was not the driving force behind the south aisle addition. These low church attendance figures presumably resulted from the extremely strained relationship between the incumbent, Rev John Pigott Munby, and Sir William Worsley, Bart., of Hovingham Hall (see below). Therefore it is hypothesised that a desire to return the church to its medieval plan was the principle reason for the reinstatement of the lost south aisle as part of the 1860 restoration campaign.

While the desire to re-medievalise the church precluded the retention of post-medieval elements, it also influenced those elements of the church retained through the rebuilding. Several 19th-century sources (e.g. Eastmead 1824, 203) note that the tower and chancel were the most ancient parts of the church, and indeed a document of 1871 records that the tower was then thought to date to ~700AD (Ch.Ret.). This confirms a contemporary awareness of the relative antiquity of each element of the church, and in particular that the west tower was known to be early (and indeed thought to be significantly earlier than modern estimates). It is revealing that these are the same two areas of the church that were largely unaffected by both the proposed 1859 and 1860 schemes. While the chancel was eventually rebuilt, two of its early windows were

---

[16] Population of Hovingham in the early 19th century is listed at 649 (Baines 1823, 458; Lewis 1835, 426), rising to 672 by 1842 (Lawton 1842, 521) and 681 by 1848 (Lewis 1848, 566), before falling to 600 by 1881 (Bulmer 1890).

retained, and interestingly, the 1878 plans for the proposed south chapel stated that the same two windows were to be moved into the new chapel south wall, maintaining their reuse within the church (fac. 1878/24). It can only be assumed that the second 12th-century chancel window was not retained on account of its condition. All iterations of the planned restoration showed the late 12th-century Romanesque south doorway was to be reused in the Victorian church. Romanesque doorways were very commonly retained in church restorations throughout the post-medieval period, presumably acknowledging the artistic craftsmanship of such doorways, and reflecting the importance of the main doorway in medieval religious ceremony. The retention of these earlier architectural elements may also reflect Victorian antiquarian interests, with the Saxo-Norman west tower and retained Romanesque elements demonstrating the antiquity of the church and of Christianity's longevity within the cultural landscape.

Patronage is another consideration in the reasons for the restoration and rebuilding at All Saints. Despite the Earls of Carlisle holding the advowson prior to 1860, the Worsley family were "active supporters of their village church" (Royle 2009, 13) throughout the post-medieval period – a patronage that continues to this day. Virtually all of the funerary memorials and stained glass in the church commemorates members of the Worsley family or their retainers, much of which pre-dates the 1860 restoration and was reinstated within the Victorian church. All Saints was in effect the private chapel of Hovingham Hall and the Worsley family, and these memorials are an important part of the family's heritage and a visible connection between the church and Worsley patronage. The Worsley family also defrayed the expense of many of the alterations to the church fabric, including the full cost of the 1725 remodelling. Captain Marcus Worsley undertook the 1860 rebuilding of All Saints in memory of his late wife, and personally defrayed the full cost of £2,252. Therefore the Victorian restoration campaign may be viewed as part of a long tradition of Worsley memorials at All Saints' church, Hovingham. The church itself may arguably be considered as a Worsley family memorial, and that the 1860 restoration and rebuilding was simply the most flamboyant iteration of this. While the Worsley family did not hold the advowson at Hovingham prior to 1860, it did hold it at nearby St Mary's church, Scawton, where Sir William's brother, Dr Thomas Worsley, was rector (Royle 2009, 13). It is interesting to note that this church was neither restored nor rebuilt during the mid-19th century, and its western bellcote was described in 1890 as "much in need of repair" (Bulmer 1890, 715).

[17] This highlights the Worsley family's investment in All Saints Hovingham over and above other churches under their influence.

4.4.2 Analysis of Plan Form

A comparison of the present church plan with that of the church prior to 1860 (fig. 4.58) shows that, with the exception of the added south aisle, All Saints' church retains the plan form and dimensions of the church immediately prior to the 1860 restoration campaign. The slight dimensional variations visible in fig. 4.58 likely represent the error in reconstructing the earlier church from non-measured archival plans. By overlaying the reconstructed 1859 plan on that of the present church (fig. 4.59), it may be seen that the bonding of the nave south wall into the tower (see fig. 4.39), represents an infilling of the scar left by the removal of the 1725 south wall of the nave. Based on this comparison, the 1860 rebuilding of the nave, chancel and aisles conform almost exactly to the arrangement and dimensions of the earlier spaces, including spatial and architectural divisions. The addition of the south aisle, which matches the dimensions of the earlier north aisle, replicates that of the medieval south aisle demolished in 1725, representing a reinstatement of the medieval plan of the church. It may be hypothesised that the transformation of the north aisle from two-bays to three-bays reflects a desire for uniformity, and respects the bay rhythm of the 1725 nave south wall (which itself likely preserved the bay rhythm of the lost medieval south aisle). In conclusion, the 19th-century rebuilding of All Saints' church, Hovingham represents not only a continuity of the earlier plan form of the church, but aimed to reinstate the medieval form and arrangement of the church, effectively undoing the post-medieval alterations to this parish church.

4.4.3 Analysis of Architectural Styling

As has been detailed in Section 4.2, little evidence survives for the medieval architectural styling of the church prior to 1860. This is principally due to the extent of post-medieval alteration to the church, in particular the refenestration of the nave and aisles in the early 18th century. The fragments of surviving evidence point to the north and south aisle having been added to the church during the late 13th century, with later alterations to the 12th-century chancel, and to the north chapel. With the exception of the few retained and reused elements of the earlier church, the body of the Victorian

---

[17] St Mary's, Scawton, remains a near complete 12th-century church.

church is decorated entirely in the late 13th-century architectural style of the Decorated Geometric Gothic. This was the most fashionable architectural style of the mid-19th century, and it has been assumed that there was no relationship between the Victorian styling and the pre-restoration church. As discussed above, the architect, Major Rohde Hawkins designed all of his ecclesiastical architecture in the same Geometric style employed at Hovingham, further supporting the notion that the Victorian church is architecturally unrelated to the earlier church. However, this assumption may be challenged by a reference in a contemporary newspaper account of the rebuilding, which states: "The chancel and nave have been entirely rebuilt, the *original character of the edifice being maintained*." [18] (*Yorkshire Gazette* 03/11/1860, 3). This suggests that the Victorian design for the rebuilt nave, chancel, and aisles, was at least in part influenced by the architecture of the existing church fabric. Given that the 13th-century north arcade was one of the few surviving medieval elements in the nave, this may have influenced the choice the Geometric style for the church, or in the employment of Hawkins as an architect working in that early 13th-century style. Although this remains tenuous, and the extent to which the surviving medieval fabric influenced the Victorian design of the church cannot be confirmed, it is suggested that there may have been an intended architectural continuity in the 1860 restoration and rebuilding at All Saints, Hovingham.

4.4.4 Analysis of the Decision Makers

The four key stakeholder groups who may have played a role in the restoration and rebuilding process discussed above were: the incumbent, patron, architect, and the parishioners. Sadly, little documentary evidence exists to illuminate this decision process or who controlled different elements of the restoration and rebuilding at Hovingham. However, by examining these key stakeholders, some conclusions may be drawn about both the decision-making process and the driving forces that led to the rebuilding.

<u>The Incumbent</u>

The Rev John Pigott Munby was appointed Perpetual Curate at All Saints, Hovingham in 1842. Born 1811 in York to Joseph and Jane Munby, he received a BA from Lincoln College, Oxford in 1833, and was ordained in 1835 (Anon. 1865, 454). Rev Munby was appointed to Hovingham in April 1842 under the patronage of the Earl of Carlisle, who

---

[18] Author's Italics.

held the advowson to the church until 1860 (V/1865: 210-13).[19] As a perpetual curate, he would have had a less secure social standing and significantly lower income[20] than the vicars and rectors of the surrounding parish churches. From his arrival, Rev Munby quickly found himself significantly at odds with Sir William Worsley, Bart., of Hovingham Hall. A fascinating account of Rev Munby's poor relationship with the Worsley family is given by Edward Royle (2009), who describes it as a "severe case of breakdown in relations between squire and parson" (2009, 13). This long running feud is evidenced in the 1865 *Archbishop's Visitation Return*, in which Rev Munby attacks the attitude of William Cayley Worsley (one of the churchwardens) and condemns the construction of a new free school (at the expense of the Worsleys) in the village (V/1865: 210-13).[21] Royle suggests the root of their long-running enmity lay in Rev Munby being "too much of an Evangelical for Sir William's taste" (2009, 14). This hypothesis is supported by Rev Munby's education at Lincoln College, Oxford, which was long associated with Methodism (Iddon n.d.) and, it is interesting to note that Rev Munby's 1838 passport lists him as a "Protestant Minister" (Anon. n.d. (a)). The impact of the feud on All Saints' church was significant, and Hovingham was the only parish in the York Diocese with a population over 1000 to be listed as having a congregation of under 50 (Royle 2009, 14).

Despite his disagreements with the patron's family, Rev Munby appears to have positively engaged with the 1860 rebuilding, and is recorded as one of the applicants for the faculty (Fac. Bk.5, pp.22-4)[22]. In 1865, he described the church as having been "admirably restored" (RD.Ret.1, 1865). Rev Munby also appears to have invested in the church fabric, having installed the carved stone plaque, presently in the vestry (fig. 4.55). Installed some time before 1865, this plaque originally formed a reredos behind the communion table (V.1865 Ret.). Rev Munby's personal correspondence, some of which survives in the York City Archives, may offer further information on his involvement in the rebuilding process; however these were unavailable for inclusion in

[19] William Cayley Worsley purchased the advowson from the Earl of Carlisle in 1860. See ZON/1/1/39

[20] Respective incumbent's incomes were recorded in 1865 as: Barton-le-Street (Rectory): 450*l.*, Slingsby (Rectory): 516*l.*, Appleton-le-Street with Amotherby (Vicarage): 520*l.* versus Hovingham (Perpetual Curacy): 105*l.* (Anon. 1865).

[21] See also correspondence from Rev Munby to Sir William Worsley (ZON/13/11).

[22] Along with William Cayley Worsley and William Cartwright (the churchwardens).

this thesis.[23] However, given his long standing feud with the Worsley family and his insecure status as perpetual curate, is seems unlikely that Rev Munby played any significant role in the rebuilding and restoration process at All Saints, Hovingham.

The Architect

The architect for the 1860 restoration campaign was Major Rohde[24] Hawkins (fig. 4.56), a comparatively unknown Victorian architect today. Born in Reigate, Surrey in 1821, Hawkins was the third son of Edward Hawkins, Keeper of Antiquities at the British Museum. Educated at Charterhouse School between 1831-1837 (Anon. 1884, ix-x), Hawkins' early architectural career included studying in London under both Thomas Cubitt and Edward Blore. In 1841 he was appointed travelling architect to an expedition to Caria and Lycia (in modern Turkey), establishing his own practice on his return in 1844 (Blackburn 2009). From 1854 onwards he served as Architect to the Committee of the Council on Education (Anon. 1884, ix-x).

Hawkins worked on a number of projects in Yorkshire from the mid 1850s through the 1860s, including designing St James the Apostle church, Birstwith, near Harrogate. Constructed in 1857 for his father-in-law, John Frederick Greenwood (Heath-Caldwell n.d.), the prevailing Geometric Gothic styling at St James the Apostle, Birstwith, is very similar to that employed at Hovingham (fig. 4.57). Indeed all of Hawkins' church commissions, including his largest - St Michael and All Angels' church, Exeter, completed 1868 - are similarly designed in a uniform mid 13th-century Geometric Gothic style. Despite his antiquarian roots, Hawkins does not appear to have actively pursued this within his career beyond his early foreign expedition. For example, his name does not appear as a member of the Society of Antiquaries or any regional architectural and archaeological societies. That Hawkins' ecclesiastical oeuvre was the same style displayed at Hovingham, suggests that he was largely, and possibly solely, responsible for the appearance of the 1860 church. His lack of antiquarian connections also hints that he may not have been the driving force behind the re-medievalisation of the church, such as the reinstatement of the lost medieval south aisle. Sadly, without the discovery of more correspondence, this can only remain a tentative hypothesis.

---

[23] The 'Munby Papers' Accession 54. These have not been accessed, as the York City Archives were closed for refurbishment at the time of writing.

[24] Often misspelt "Rhode".

The Patron

The patron for the 1860 restoration at All Saints, Hovingham was Captain Marcus Worsley R.N., brother of the then elderly Sir William Worsley, 1st Baronet of Hovingham Hall. He was also both uncle and father-in-law to William Cayley Worsley, the heir apparent to the Hovingham Baronetcy and a churchwarden at All Saints'. Born in 1794, Marcus Worsley joined the Royal Navy in 1808 and had risen to the rank of Captain by retirement (Crisp 1913, 32). Following his naval career, he was actively engaged in the restoration of several churches, which is perhaps unsurprising, given his father, Rev George Worsley, had been rector of nearby Stonegrave Minster. Whilst living at Conyingham Hall, near Knaresborough, he gave a substantial donation towards the erection of a new church at Knaresborough[25] (Ph.45: *Hovingham Parish Magazine* **3** March 1878). Following his move to Cliff House, Terrington, he also donated a significant sum towards to the restoration of the adjacent All Saints' church in 1868, and shortly before his death in 1878 he also gave a new organ to the church at Terrington (Ph.45: *Hovingham Parish Magazine* **3** March 1878). There are no observable architectural or stylistic comparisons to be made between the three churches Capt. Worsley helped restore, suggesting he was not dictating particular styles or features.

Therefore the 1860 restoration and rebuilding of All Saints, Hovingham sits between two major church restorations in which Marcus Worsley was a financial benefactor, but which he was not directly involved in. That Hovingham was associated with his family's estate, and that the restoration was in memory of his late wife, Harriet, sets this restoration apart. Given Captain Worsley's wealth and the fact that the restoration was undertaken as a memorial, it is unlikely that financial considerations played a significant role in the decision-making process at All Saints, Hovingham. Sadly, no correspondence survives in order to establish Captain Worsley's direct involvement in the decision making process, although he was clearly the driving force behind the restoration being undertaken as a memorial to his late wife.

The Parishioners

Unfortunately, the parishioners are totally silent on the topic of the restoration and rebuilding of All Saints' church. That fewer than 2% of the village population were in regular attendance at the church can only be a reflection of the feud between the Rev

---

[25] Presumably Holy Trinity church, which was constructed 1854-1856

Munby and Sir William Worsley. Given the close ties between the Hovingham Estate and both the church and village, it seems unlikely that the parishioners had much, if any, input into the rebuilding process. The lack of local engagement at the church may also explain the lack of reporting of the restoration in the local and regional media.

The low attendance at the church and the ongoing quarrel between the incumbent and the Worsley family suggests that neither Rev Munby nor the parishioners played a significant role in the restoration process. The initial decision appears to have been driven entirely by the patron, Captain Marcus Worsley. The architectural styling of the church appears solely to be the work of the architect, Major Rohde Hawkins, who designed it, like all of his ecclesiastical commissions, in the early 14th-century Geometric Decorated Gothic style.

4.4.5 Hovingham Case Study Conclusions

The employment of an archaeological methodology to record and analyse All Saints, Hovingham, has revealed the previously unconsidered complex story of its Victorian restoration and rebuilding. Further, it has elucidated the medieval development and post-medieval alteration of the parish church prior to its 19th-century rebuilding. This has demonstrated that the 1860 campaign was not simply a case of sweeping away the old church and replacing it with a new, unrelated Victorian church. The Victorians had an awareness of the antiquity of their church, and the initial restoration plans showed a desire to preserve the medieval elements while removing post-medieval alterations to the church.

Analysis has shown that the original intention was to retain and restore much of the earlier fabric, revealing that this 19th-century parish church restoration was an evolutionary process, reacting to multiple influences, including architectural fashion, changing liturgical requirements, fabric condition, and the relationships between the patron, architect, incumbent, and parishioners. At Hovingham, the lack of surviving medieval architectural detail was a significant factor in the eventual demolition of the body of the church; however those few surviving elements may have influenced the decision to rebuild the church in the 13th-century Geometric Decorated Gothic style. Beyond the influence of the medieval architectural style on the design of the Victorian church, the 19th-century building also closely followed the dimensions and arrangement of the earlier plan, including the reinstatement of the lost medieval south aisle. Reflecting antiquarian interest, where possible, the earliest medieval architectural

elements were retained in situ or reused within the Victorian church, demonstrating the antiquity of the church within the landscape. This case study challenges the assumed disjunction between Victorian parish churches and earlier church fabric on the same site, instead suggesting a continuity of plan, design and fabric through the 1860 rebuilding at All Saints, Hovingham.

Despite the lack of documentary evidence for this restoration campaign, an archaeological methodology has revealed a much richer and more complex 19th-century story of this parish church. The patronage of the Worsley family is clearly key to the post-medieval development of All Saints' church, including the 1860 restoration campaign. This patronage in the church, first recorded in 1694, is visible throughout the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries, and the 1860 rebuilding may be viewed as the grandest example of the Worsley's claiming All Saints as their private memorial. This case study has demonstrated the importance Victorian restorers placed on connecting the rebuilt parish church to its earlier medieval development. The retention of the Saxo-Norman tower linked the new church to that visible heritage, while the new structure swept away any traces of post-medieval alteration. This highlights the need for those parish churches that were heavily restored or rebuilt during the 19th century to be treated differently to newly designed and built Victorian structures. An assumed lack of continuity of church building on the same site precludes any consideration of the earlier church and its potential influence on the design and architectural detailing of the Victorian structure.

Chapter 5 – All Saints, Slingsby

5.1 Introduction

This second case study will explore the Victorian church of All Saints, Slingsby, which replaced an earlier church on the same site. This earlier church was totally demolished in 1867 and its Victorian replacement reopened on the 2nd of June 1869. This rebuilding campaign commenced approximately six years after the completion of the restoration at All Saints, Hovingham, which lies two miles to the west. This chapter will reveal a very different approach to that taken at Hovingham, and that the decision to raze the old church and construct a new building was not a straightforward one.

In 1954, English Heritage designated All Saints, Slingsby as a Grade II listed building (Appendix 2.4), based largely on its significance as an aesthetically pleasing Victorian church designed by a good, but not celebrated, regional firm of architects. The original list description acknowledged that the church contained earlier material, stating that it incorporated "features of 13th-century (sic) church on the same site", and noted a reused 13th-century north arcade (see Section 5.3.1), but notes no further relationship between the Victorian church and any earlier structures. All Saints has received no significant attention by scholars, although two of its previous incumbents have published on the history of the church and village (Walker 1845; & Brooke 1904 & 1916). The description of the church in the Victoria County History is cursory and notes: "Though the site is an old one, nothing remains of the structure of any previous building except, perhaps, some of the voussoirs and a corbel capital of the north aisle" (Page 1914, 560). Interestingly, Pevsner goes further than simply cataloguing reused elements, and states that the church is "in plan and many details like the medieval predecessor church" (Pevsner 1966, 346). It is not known what Pevsner's assessment was based on, but it represents a rare acknowledgment by a modern scholar that a Victorian rebuild church owes a debt to an earlier church on the same site.

This case study demonstrates how an archaeological methodology can elucidate the significance of a parish church which was entirely rebuilt during the 19th-century, and challenges the assumption that such structures may be considered as new designs, divorced from the context of the earlier churches they replaced. The chapter follows the same broad structure as the previous case study; with an introduction followed by a detailed description of the current structure based on a visual and measured archaeological survey carried out in 2011, which aimed to confirm whether any in situ fabric remained from the earlier church. The survey also aimed to establish the extent of reused material in the Victorian

structure, and this identified spolia is presented within the third section. A full description of the appearance and architectural phasing of the church as it appeared shortly before its demolition in 1867 is presented in the fourth section, while the final section analyses the rebuilding of the church, including the decision-making process that resulted in the complete rebuilding of the medieval church. This section will explore the principle factors in the restoration and rebuilding process, including the condition of the fabric, reuse of material, changing architectural fashion, patronage, and the key individuals involved. Furthermore, it will demonstrate the value in examining the lost medieval church, to explore its influence on the design, plan form, and architecture of Victorian rebuild churches.

5.1.1 Historical Background – Slingsby Village

Slingsby is located approximately six miles west of Malton on the B1257 (Grid Reference: SE 696842 749846). The largest of the 'Street Parish' villages, Slingsby lies two miles east of Hovingham, with the hamlet of Fryton lying halfway between (fig. 5.1). Standing ~145 feet above sea level (Page, 1914, 557), the village is situated to the north of the B1257, and spreads down the gentle slope towards Wath Beck and the Vale of Pickering.

It is not known when Slingsby was first settled, but the place name termination 'by' has led to an assumption that it dates from Danish settlement in the 9th century (e.g. Taylor 1924, Brooke 1904). However, it must be noted that this only provides an indication of when the village received its present name, which may not correlate with its original settlement. Brooke (1904, 33) records early names for Slingsby as "Eslingesbi, Selungesbi, Slengesbi, Slyngesbi", the etymology of which appears to be 'Sleng's Farm' (English Place Name Society, 1928, 49). Little is known about Slingsby prior to the Conquest and the first documentary evidence for the village appears in the Domesday Book of 1086. It records that prior to 1066 Slingsby was divided into two manorial sites, each held by a different thegn (Williams & Palliser 1992, Folio 305V). Comprising 14 carucates of land for the geld, and land for 7 ploughs (Williams & Palliser 1992, Folio 305V), Slingsby was one of the largest vills amongst the present parishes forming the modern benefice of 'The Street'. This is reflected in its pre-Conquest valuation of 70 shillings, significantly greater than those recorded for the other parishes in this study.[26]

---

[26] Barton-le-Street – 20s; Appleton-le-Street (presumably including Amotherby) – 20s; Hovingham – not individually recorded. See: Williams and Palliser 1992.

Following the Conquest, Slingsby was one of numerous estates held by Robert, Count of Mortain, half brother of William the Conqueror (Page, 1914, 558). A separate Domesday folio records Slingsby as a berewick of Hovingham manor (Williams & Palliser 1992, Folio 327v), suggesting that Hugh Fitz Baldric (who held the manor at Hovingham) may have also held a part of the vill at Slingsby (Brooke, 1904, 51). The 13th-century 'Kirkby's Inquest' records Slingsby as containing 15 carucates (Kirkby, 1867, 113), rather than the 14 noted in Domesday, so it is hypothesised that Hugh Fitz Baldric held one carucate at Slingsby as a berewick of Hovingham manor (Brooke, 1904, 51).

By the 12th century, records indicate the manor at Slingsby was tenanted out, with one of the tenants being Roger de Pont l'Evêque, Archbishop of York in 1167-8 (Page, 1914, 558). By 1184, Slingsby was held by William Hay and Robert Chambord, and by 1215 it had passed to the Wyvill family (Page 1914, 558). In 1343 two thirds of the manor was sold to the Hastings family, and the remaining Wyvill holding was later abandoned (quitclaimed), leaving control of the manor with the Hastings family (Page, 1914, 559). Slingsby continued to change hands throughout the later Medieval and Post-Medieval periods, both through marriage and sale (see Brooke 1904 for full details), before being sold to the 4th Earl of Carlisle in 1751 (Brooke 1904, 115). The manor of Slingsby was then merged into the neighbouring Castle Howard Estate, where it remains today (Page, 1914, 560).

Slingsby village centres on a small, triangular green (The Green), on which is a Victorian schoolhouse, and the Wesleyan chapel. This chapel was constructed in 1837 in a Perpendicular Gothic style (fig. 5.2). To the west of The Green, Slingsby Castle, a large, unfinished and ruined early 17th-century house, sits on the High Street. As at Hovingham, Slingsby village expanded significantly to the north (along Railway Street), immediately following the arrival of the railway station in 1853 (fig. 5.3).

5.1.2 Historical Account – All Saints' Church

It is not known when the first church was founded in Slingsby. Domesday records a priest at Slingsby in 1086 (Williams & Palliser 1992, Folio 305V), but does not mention any church. The recording of churches was not specifically within the remit of the Domesday account, so their mention often appears reliant on questions over ownership or financial rights (Williams & Palliser 1992, 22). Slingsby is one of only nine Yorkshire vills in Domesday that are noted to have a priest, but of which there is no mention of a church (Skaife, 1896, 295). In the case of Slingsby there has been no consensus as to whether the record of a priest, but the omission of any church, indicates that a church was present in

115

the village by 1086 (e.g. see Brooke, 1904, 169; Walker, 1845, 10). If one accepts Lennard's (1959, 304) reasoning that a priest normally implies a church and vice versa, Domesday effectively records that a church stood in Slingsby by at least the late 11th-century.

The earliest confirmed documentary evidence for a church appears in two charters of 1157. In that year William Hay and Robert Chambord both granted the church at Slingsby to Whitby Abbey, with William Hay's gift being confirmed by Masci de Curci in the same year (Brown, 1897, 42). Robert Chambord's charter of 1157 grants the church to Whitby Abbey, "reserving however the tenure of Sampson the Priest, so long as he lives, or continues in a secular habit" (as cited in Charlton, 1779, 124). King Henry II confirmed the gift of the church to Whitby Abbey in 1168 (Charlton, 1779, 168), and Roger, Archbishop of York confirmed it before 1184 (Page, 1914, 560). By 1292, and apparently through to 1540,[27] Whitby Abbey was only receiving a pension from the rectory at Slingsby (Page, 1914, 560), which in 1363 was worth 13 shillings and 4 pence (Charlton, 1779, 250). Following the Dissolution, the advowson was conveyed to the manor at Slingsby, and from 1618 the Lord of the Manor has held the patronage of the church (Page, 1914, 560-1). Since 1751 the patronage has remained with the descendants of the Howard family (Earls of Carlisle) of Castle Howard.

5.2 Description of the Current Church

The present church of All Saints, Slingsby (fig. 5.4) was constructed in 1867-69 to a design by Robert J. Johnson, of Austin and Johnson Architects, Newcastle. The patron for the rebuilding was Admiral Edward Granville Howard (later Baron Lanerton), brother of the 8th Earl of Carlisle, whose principal seat was the nearby Castle Howard Estate. Admiral Howard's wife, the Hon. Mrs Diana Howard, laid the foundation stone on 24 September 1867 (*York Herald* 28/09/1867, 9), and the church reopened amidst much celebration and ceremony on Wednesday 02 June 1869 (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3). The present church comprises: nave with north and south aisles, chancel with north and south chancel aisles/chapels, a vestry, south porch and west tower (fig. 5.5). The construction of the Victorian church, which cost ~£5000, was paid for by subscription with the vast majority (£4575) covered by the patron, Admiral Howard (F5/123). Contemporary sources provide the names of many of the key contractors involved in the 19th-century construction of the church. For example, the clerk of works was Mr Ware, of Castle Howard; the contractor was Mr John Brown, the mason Mr Bailey, and the plumber and glazier a Mr Hodgson, all of York (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3). The same newspaper article also records "that

---

[27] Whitby Abbey was suppressed in 1540 as part of the Dissolution of the Monasteries

the capitals, finials, and figures are very beautifully sculptured, and are from the chisel of Mr Jno. [John] Raddis, of Birmingham." (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3). Roberts (1990, 4) states that the carved timber ends of the choir stalls are by a "Mr. Bodice, of Birmingham", but this may be an erroneous reading of 'Raddis'. The original account for the building of the church survives and reveals that John Brown was paid the full contract amount of £3,721. 11d. 5p, whilst John Raddis earned £82 9d in three instalments for his carvings (F5/123).

The church demonstrates a number of different architectural styles, with the late 15th-century Perpendicular Gothic style predominating. The church is constructed of ashlar masonry of yellow calcareous sandstone (RVBMRG, 2007, 3). This stone is described in a contemporary newspaper (*Malton Messenger* 28/09/1867, 3) as "Appleton stone", and was presumably quarried close to Appleton-le-Street, a village 2.5 miles to the east (fig. 5.6). Externally, the decorative architectural features, such as the windows, parapets and doorways, are constructed in "Whitby sandstone" (*Malton Messenger* 28/09/1867, 3), probably quarried in the Aislaby area (British Geological Survey 2010, 4). The church is roofed throughout with lead, except for the tower, which is felted and tiled.

5.2.1 Setting of the Current Church

All Saints' church is situated on the western periphery of the village, at the northern end of the High Street (fig. 5.7). The church lies to the north of The Green, and adjacent to the ruins of Slingsby Castle, which sits immediately to the southwest. The churchyard is bounded to the south and east by Church Lane (formerly Back Lane), to the west by The Lawns (originally Church Lane), and to the north by the grounds of the former Rectory. The Rectory, now a private house, has a date stone of 1740, although Walker (1845, 12) suggests this relates to a refronting of an earlier structure, using stones pillaged from the castle. Until the late 19th century a Tithe barn was located on Church Lane (formerly Back Lane) at the north-east corner of the churchyard (CD. Add.1871/1). Low limestone walls surround the churchyard and trimmed yew trees line the south pathway leading from the gate to the south porch. There are a number of large trees located in the churchyard, particularly in the southwest corner. The churchyard was extended in 1871, following the rebuilding of the church (fig. 5.8). The southern and eastern portions of the churchyard are filled with headstones and grave markers, mostly dating from the 19th and 20th centuries. The oldest graves can be found in close proximity to the south porch of the church (Roberts, 1990, 9) and the only individually listed object in the churchyard is a large tomb chest dated 1730 (listed Grade II – see Appendix 2.5). This tomb chest is constructed of

limestone and is located immediately to the southeast of the porch. To the southwest of the porch is a large Irish cross memorial, commemorating Admiral E.G.G. Howard, the patron of the Victorian church rebuilding.

5.2.2 Nave

The nave comprises three bays with a clerestory beneath a low-pitched roof, stylistically typical of those constructed during the 15th century. Each of the three bays in the clerestory elevations contains a square-headed window of two cinquefoil lights (fig. 5.9). Filled with clear glass, their interesting glazing pattern was designed by the 20th-century architect, George Pace (M. Mackinder. pers. comm. 2011). Externally a low, moulded parapet of Whitby sandstone crowns the nave walls. Internally, the nave is connected to the tower and chancel by large arches, each of which is described in their corresponding section below. The key architectural features of the nave are the two arcades connecting it to the north and south aisles. Each arcade comprises three arches sitting on two cylindrical piers with moulded capitals and plain circular abaci (fig. 5.10). These piers have water-holding moulded bases on chamfered square plinths. The arches are all two-centred and have two plain-chamfered orders, with chamfered hoodmoulds terminating on head-stops. The piers and many of the voussoirs forming the east and central arches of the north arcade appear to be constructed from a pale limestone, possibly Hildenley limestone, and show graffiti and wear. The south arcade springs from a half-column respond at the west; whilst the north arcade springs from a small, foliated corbel respond. This corbel respond is stylistically 13th-century and has a moulded abacus tapering down to a short, collared cylindrical section above three stiff-leaf carvings. The difference in springing results in the two arcades being slightly out of alignment, with the south arcade piers sitting eastwards relative to the north arcade (see fig. 5.5). The arches of the east and west bays of the north arcade are approximately 3.5m wide. The central bay of the north aisle and the three south arcade bays each span ~3.2m wide. Both arcades terminate at the east end of the nave on matching foliated responds.

The nave is largely filled by two rows of open-backed oak benches with trefoiled ends, all on slightly raised timber flooring. The rest of the floor, including the central avenue between the benches, comprises red and black Staffordshire tiles (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4) laid in a diaper pattern with narrow, black tile borders. In the northeast corner of the nave is an elaborate timber pulpit, which features pierced Perpendicular Gothic style tracery. Hanging in the centre of the nave is a very large Venetian-style brass corona lamp (see fig. 5.10). An elaborate font is located on two octagonal steps immediately

in front of the tower arch (fig. 5.11). The font is octagonal, with paired perpendicular panels on each face above eight Devonshire marble columns with foliated capitals. The Victorian font features a mix of Perpendicular Gothic and Early English Gothic motifs in its decoration.

The nave of All Saints' church, Slingsby is constructed in two distinct architectural styles. Based on the cylindrical piers, arch mouldings and floriated respond, the nave arcades are stylistically Transitional Early English, dating to c.1200 (Pevsner, 1966, 346). The clerestory, with its square-headed windows, low-pitched roof, and moulded parapet, is in the Perpendicular Gothic style of the late 15th century.

5.2.3 South Aisle

Externally the south aisle consists of three bays, with the south porch attached to the first, westernmost, bay (fig. 5.12). The central and eastern bays each contain a window of two lights with cinquefoil heads and perpendicular-style tracery. The windows are square-headed and have labels integrated into a continuous stringcourse. Immediately beneath the windows is a weathering offset, with the wall then running down to sit upon a chamfered plinth of Whitby sandstone. A low, moulded parapet crowns the south aisle walls, and the aisle is architecturally delineated from the south chancel aisle (to the east) by a stepped buttress. The west wall is coterminous with the nave, and the parapet and plinth provide its only architectural detailing. Within the porch is the main doorway into the church, where a timber door sits within a two-centred arch of two orders with deep roll mouldings, which springs from stiff-leaf capitals above nook shafts (fig. 5.13).

Internally, the south aisle (fig. 5.14) is separated from the nave by an arcade, as described in Section 5.2.2 (Nave), above. The south aisle is not architecturally delineated from the south chancel aisle, which lies immediately to the east. The central and eastern bays are filled with bench seating, continuous from the nave. The western bay contains a modern timber vestibule enclosing the south entrance. The two windows contain clear glass within the same glazing design as found in the clerestory. Mounted on the south wall near the doorway is a small black Bequest Board dated 1712 (fig. 5.15). Immediately below it is a small, framed brass plaque dating to the early 16th century (fig. 5.16). This brass was found in the rectory in the early 20th century by Rev Brooke, who had it framed and hung in its current location (Brooke, 1916, 5). With the exception of the nave arcade, the south aisle is uniformly constructed in the late 15th-century style of the Perpendicular Gothic, as demonstrated by the square-headed windows with perpendicular-style tracery. The only

stylistic anomaly is the south doorway, which, with its stiff-leaf capitals, is in an early Decorated Gothic style of the early 13th century.

5.2.4 Porch

Projecting from the westernmost bay of the south aisle is a porch, providing the main public entrance to the church (see fig. 5.12). The porch entranceway comprises a two-centred arch of two orders, with deep roll-mouldings sitting on moulded capitals and nook shafts. The hoodmould terminates on large carved angel label-stops bearing shields with the letters A (west) and S (east) for All Saints. The porch has very wide stepped diagonal buttresses at the southeast and southwest angles. A low, embattled parapet in Whitby sandstone crowns the south elevation, whilst the east and west elevations have the low, moulded parapet continuing from the south aisle. In the centre of the south elevation, breaking through the embattled parapet is a large image niche sitting on a winged angel corbel. Crocketted finials and a complex Celtic cross surmount this niche, which contains a Christ figure under an ogee arch (fig. 5.17). The east and west elevations of the porch each contain a single-light window within an ogee arch, filled with cathedral glass and iron rails. Beneath the windows is a weathering offset that runs down to the plinth. Internally large stone slabs form benches to either side of the porch thoroughfare. The porch employs a mixture of medieval architectural styles. With boldly stepped diagonal buttresses, a crenellated parapet and moulded capitals, much of the porch stylistically dates to 15th century. However, the trefoil-headed and ogee-arched windows are in the Decorated Gothic style of the late 13th and early 14th century.

5.2.5 North Aisle

The north aisle (fig. 5.18) corresponds closely to the south aisle in terms of architectural detailing. It consists of three bays with each bay containing a window of two lights with cinquefoil heads and perpendicular-style tracery. The windows are square-headed and have labels integrated into a continuous stringcourse. They are filled with green-tinted cathedral glass quarries, which are original to the Victorian rebuilding (*Malton Messenger* 28/09/1867, 3). Immediately below the windows is a weathering offset, beneath which the wall runs down to sit upon a plain chamfered plinth. A low, moulded parapet crowns the north aisle, and a stepped buttress architecturally delineates it from the north chancel aisle to the east. Unlike the south aisle, the west elevation of the north aisle features a stringcourse and weathering offset, both of which continue from the north elevation before terminating against the tower (fig. 5.19). Internally, the north aisle is separated from the nave by an arcade, described in Section 5.2.2 (Nave), above. To the east it is not

architecturally delineated from the north chancel aisle. The north aisle is largely filled with bench seating, continuous from the nave. With its square-headed windows and perpendicular-style tracery, the north aisle is uniformly constructed in the Perpendicular Gothic style of the 15th century.

5.2.6 Chancel

Externally, the chancel is of three bays, which are slightly narrower than those of the nave. The chancel sits on a high, moulded plinth of Whitby sandstone, and like the nave, the chancel roof is low-pitched, in the style common to the 15th century. Externally, the same low, moulded parapet that crowns the body of the church also surmounts the walls of the chancel. On the east elevation the parapet is breached at the apex of the gable by a small, canopied image niche (fig. 5.20). The image niche, which contains a weathered statue of King David, is surmounted by a cross, and sits on a foliated corbel above a carved head (fig. 5.21). A large five-light window with perpendicular-style tracery dominates the east elevation. The arch of the east window is surrounded internally and externally by hoodmoulds with head-stops. The cinquefoil-headed lights sit above blind decorated panels each containing a shield. The external shields contain the four Evangelists and an Agnus Dei; internally they depict the Instruments of the Passion. The east window contains very fine, if slightly faded, stained glass by Clayton and Bell (fig. 5.22). Dedicated to the 6th Earl of Carlisle[28] and paid for by the Castle Howard Estate, the main lights include "representations of the Virgin and Child, the four greater prophets[29], and Kings David, Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3). The smaller lights above contain twelve figures of saints" (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3). To the east of the south chancel aisle, the south elevation contains a two light window with perpendicular tracery (fig. 5.23). The cinquefoil headed lights rest above blind decorative panels and the window has a hoodmould terminating on head-stops. The stained glass in this window is dedicated to Rev William Walker and his wife (*Leeds Mercury* 25/09/1867, 3). A moulded stringcourse runs immediately beneath the windows of both the south and east elevation. Pairs of stepped angle buttresses are located at both the north-east and south-east corners.

Inside the church, the chancel is connected to the nave by a tall two-centred arch decorated in the Early English style (see fig. 5.10). The chancel arch is of two moulded orders, with a label terminating on head-stops. The arch sits on paired nook shafts of red and white veined, dark grey Devonshire marble (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3), which

---

[28] George Howard, 6th Earl of Carlisle, died at Castle Howard in October 1848.

[29] Being Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel

are topped by highly carved stiff leaf capitals with moulded abaci. The interior space of the chancel (fig. 5.24) is divided into a choir and the sanctuary. In the choir, the oak stalls have carved figure-ends and back panels carved with arcades of cusped arches with flowers in the spandrels. The choir is separated from the north and south chancel aisles by arcades of two arches, each with arches of two orders with deep chamfered mouldings. These arches sit on Early English-style stiff leaf capitals on compound shafts, with labels terminating on head-stops.[30] The floor of the choir is raised one step above the nave and aisles and is covered with red quarry tiles. There is a second step halfway across the choir, running north to south, and the floor of this upper section is decorated with patterned encaustic tiles.

The floor of the sanctuary is raised a further two steps above the choir, and is further delineated by timber and wrought iron altar rails. The sanctuary is divided by yet another step, with both floors covered with decorated encaustic tiles. The floor surrounding the altar has the highest level of patterned decoration, completing the hierarchy of floor decoration. The altar is an early 17th-century oak communion table (Page, 1914, 560), which sits directly below the east window (fig. 5.25). A moulded stringcourse runs immediately beneath the east window, below which a red-veined white alabaster reredos covers the wall. In the centre of the wall, hidden behind the altar is the undecorated foundation stone (fig. 5.26). This large oblong block of local Appleton Oolitic limestone was laid by the Hon. Mrs Diana Howard on 24 September 1867 (*Leeds Mercury* 25/09/1867, 3). On the north wall hangs a brass plaque commemorating Rev Walker, who provided an invaluable description of the church in 1845. In the south elevation the window splay continues down to form a sedile, to the left of which is a piscina contained within a cinquefoil-headed archway beneath a triangular canopy with poppy-head finial (fig. 5.27). The chancel contains the church's greatest mix of architectural styles. The arches, with their Devonshire marble shafts and stiff leaf capitals, are all in the Early English style of the early 13th century, while the ogee arch of the piscina is reminiscent of the late 13th-century Decorated Gothic style. Finally, the low-pitched roof and perpendicular tracery of the east window are in the Perpendicular Gothic style of the late 15th century.

5.2.7 South Chancel Aisle

Externally, the chancel is flanked to both the north and south by short aisles or chapels, extending from the nave aisles for just over half the chancel's length. Sometimes called the

---

[30] The label only features on the chancel side of the arcades.

Wyville Chapel or Lady Chapel, the two-bay south chancel aisle is externally a continuation of the south aisle, although architecturally delineated from it by a stepped buttress (see fig. 5.12). There is a matching stepped buttress at the east end of the elevation. Otherwise the external architectural detailing, including the parapet, plinth, stringcourse and weathering, all continue from the south aisle across the south chancel aisle. Each bay of the south elevation contains a square-headed window of two lights with perpendicular-style tracery and label integrated into the continuous stringcourse. The east elevation contains a small, vesica-shaped window, which is quite high and slightly offset to the north of centre.

Internally, the south chancel aisle (fig. 5.28) continues directly from the south aisle without any delineation. It is separated from the chancel by an arcade, as described in Section 5.2.6 (Chancel), above, with two steps in the eastern archway connecting the spaces. The two windows in the south elevation contain stained glass panels, depicting Justice and Charity (fig. 5.29), and are dedicated to the memory of Mr and Mrs John Close (Brooke, 1904, 187). Below these, a wide low arch is recessed into the base of the south wall, in which lies a heavily worn medieval knight effigy (fig. 5.30). The knight wears chainmail armour, has a sword hanging from a "broad transverse belt" (Page, 1904, 560) and holds a heart clasped within hands raised in prayer (Murray, 1867, 230). Dodsworth (1904, 174) wrote a detailed description of this knight after his visit in July 1619, in which he also records a Talbot at the knight's feet and notes a "shield on his arme with 3 [chevron] and a cheif depicted, the colours hard to see". By 1823 the monument was described as being in "a very dilapidated state, both the legs being broken off, and the talbot at his feet removed" (Eastmead 1823, 238), and by the mid 19th century Rev Walker (1845, 9) noted the colours were no longer visible on the shield. In the east wall the vesica-shaped window splays out into a wide, low arch, and contains a small stained glass panel (fig. 5.31) commemorating Bridget Spenceley (Brooke, 1904, 187). Set low into the southern corner of the east wall is a piscina with a plain chamfered two-centred arch.

A number of other funerary monuments have been set in the floor of the Wyville Chapel (see fig. 5.30). Immediately to the north of the knight effigy is a foliated cross slab, described in detail by Brooke (1904, 183-4) as a "flat tombstone seven feet long by two feet three inches broad at the top, tapering to one foot nine inches broad at the bottom. It bears a foliated cross in relief, the head treated in the conventional manner which prevailed throughout most of the 13th century, whilst the stem is treated naturally, narrowing upward from the base, and having on each side four branches. It stands on a Calvary of three steps". Immediately beside the cross slab is a rectangular stone slab with five small,

incised crosses, presumably the medieval altar slab. Next is a grave slab to a Miss Anne Walker, daughter of the Rev Walker, who died in 1839. Red and black quarry tiles in a diaper pattern with black tile borders cover the rest of the chapel floor. Architecturally, excluding the chancel arcades, the south chancel aisle is constructed in the Perpendicular Gothic style of the 15th-century.

5.2.8 North Chancel Aisle

The north chancel aisle lies between the north aisle and vestry, and currently houses the church's organ. The external architectural detailing, including the parapet, plinth, stringcourse and weathering offset, all continue across the north elevation from the north aisle. The north elevation contains a single square-headed window of three lights with perpendicular tracery (fig. 5.32). Filled with green-tinted cathedral glass quarries, this window has a label integrated into the continuous stringcourse. The stringcourse terminates to the east of the window without a label stop. Immediately beneath the window is a weathering offset, below which the wall sits on the same plinth as the north aisle. To the east the weathering offset steps down to indicate the start of the vestry. Internally, the north chancel aisle is not architecturally delineated from the north aisle, and is connected to the chancel by an arcade (as described in Section 5.2.6 (above)). A doorway in the east wall provides internal access to the vestry (fig. 5.33). The timber door sits in a heavily chamfered, trefoil-headed ogee arch, beneath an ogee canopy with poppy-head finial and head-stops. The north chancel aisle is a mix of architectural styles, with the single window in the Perpendicular Gothic style, and the vestry door, with its ogee canopy, in the Decorated Gothic style of the late 13th century.

5.2.9 Vestry

The vestry occupies the northeast corner of the church and is bounded to the west by the north chancel aisle and to the south by the chancel. It is accessed internally by a door from the north chancel aisle, and externally by a door in the north wall. There is a two-light window in the east elevation with trefoil-headed lights and a carved stone shield in the apex of the tracery (fig. 5.34). The window has a simple hoodmould without label-stops, and is filled with clear leaded glass. Beyond the plinth and parapet, the east wall has no further architectural detailing. There is a stepped diagonal buttress at the northeast corner, into which is built a chimney from the subterranean boiler room. The north wall of the vestry contains a narrow door within a two-centred arch surrounded by a hoodmould with elegant rolled label-stops. The door arch springs directly from the wall and the roll mouldings continue down the doorjambs. The weathering offset to the east of the doorway

is the same height as on the north aisle and north chancel aisle, but is lower to the west of the door. Internally, a fireplace is built into the northeast corner of the room with a four-centred arch and floral patterned spandrels (fig. 5.35).

5.2.10 Tower

The west tower is of three stages delineated by plain stringcourses, with a large, stepped diagonal buttress at each angle (fig. 5.36). Externally, the tower is crowned by a panelled battlement with blind quatrefoil tracery and a crocketted pinnacle at each corner. It has a low pyramidal roof covered with tiles, with a weathervane at its apex. A stringcourse at the base of the parapet features a grotesque in the form of a bird at each angle. This stringcourse also contains two plainly decorated drainage points on each elevation, with those on the north elevation being gargoyles. The upper stage of each elevation contains a square-headed belfry window, comprising two cusped lights beneath labels with label-stops. The north-western corner contains the projection of an octagonal stair tower which is illuminated by a number of narrow loopholes. A blue-faced, eight-day clock occupies the centre of the middle stage of the south elevation. A small door opens from the centre of the middle stage of the east elevation, providing access onto the nave roof. A large window of three lights with Perpendicular-style tracery dominates the lower stage of the west elevation. Containing slightly faded stained glass by Clayton and Bell, this window (fig. 5.37) is dedicated to the memory of Charles Hardwick (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3). Born in Slingsby, Mr Hardwick was Archdeacon of Ely, but died in tragic circumstances in 1854, aged 38 (Brooke, 1916, 3). The Trustees of the 6th Earl of Carlisle sponsored the window, with the glass in the lower panels representing the figures of the Venerable Bede, St. Augustine, and St. Jerome (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3). Above this window, in the centre of the middle stage of the west elevation, is a small trefoil-headed window which serves to provide light to the central chamber. There are a number of large stones near the base of the north and west elevations, several with incised decoration indicating that they are reused medieval grave slabs (fig. 5.38).

Internally, the tower is connected to the nave by a tall two-centred arch of two orders with hollow chamfers, which springs directly from the walls. A traceried timber screen, dedicated to Rev Brooke, fills the lower portion of this tower arch (see fig. 5.11). The central chamber of the tower contains the clock mechanism, dated 1838 (fig. 5.39), and the walls are heavily graffitied by generations of bell ringers. The upper chamber contains a large timber bell frame with three bells, all dated 1803. The tower is constructed uniformly

in the Perpendicular Gothic style, as demonstrated by the stepped diagonal buttresses, panelled battlement, square-headed windows and perpendicular tracery.

5.2.11 Features/Fabric Altered, Added or Removed 1869-Present

Having described the church of All Saints Slingsby as it appears today, the following will briefly detail the known alterations to the church since it reopened in June 1869. By identifying these changes to the fabric since it reopened, the form of the 1869 church can be better understood and explored. These alterations have been identified through a combination of archaeological investigation of the fabric, and documentary evidence, principally Faculties. The Borthwick Institute for Archives holds fourteen faculty applications pertaining to the church since 1869. However, not all of these were approved, nor all of the works carried out. For example, in the 1960's it was proposed to move the stained glass from the Wyville/Lady Chapel to the windows at the west end of the north aisle, but this never occurred. Faculties covering modern like-for-like conservation repairs will not be discussed.

The majority of the Faculties for the church relate to ephemeral changes to fixtures and fittings, such as the addition of war memorial tablets,[31] or the installation of the organ.[32] One of the first recorded changes to the church was the addition of the large brass corona chandelier currently hanging in the nave. Purchased by Rev Arthur Brooke in 1884 (Roberts 1990, 4) this corona formerly hung in the nave of St John's church, Howsham, North Yorkshire (PR. SLIN.18). It appears to have been owned by Sir Tatton Sykes of Sledmere Estate, and it is not known how or why it was hanging in Howsham church. Three matching brass coronae currently hang in St Mary's Church, Sledmere, which was designed by Temple Moore and completed in 1898 (fig. 5.40). Through comparison with the examples at Sledmere, the Slingsby corona is missing the majority of its candle arms; perhaps these are still in storage, waiting to be found. In the bell chamber are stored several oak and wrought iron choir desks (fig. 5.41), which match the choir stalls. There is an area of flooring with plain quarry tiling, which may correspond with the original location of these choir desks (partially visible in bottom left corner of fig.5.42). It is presumed these are the "choir kneelers and a short pew from the choir stalls", which were removed in 1966 (fac.1966/1/25). The oak choir stalls themselves appear to have been altered at some point in the past 144 years. There is a clear join down the middle of the

---

[31] See *Borthwick Institute for Archives* for full details.

[32] The organ was installed in 1871, replacing the harmonium that has been retained from the earlier church (*Malton Gazette* 15/04/1871, 4)

choir stalls that corresponds with the step in the chancel floor (see fig. 5.42). To the east of this join the carved arcade of the back panels is slightly different, suggesting the choir stalls were significantly lengthened at some stage. Another addition worth noting is the 1929 installation of the oak screen (see fig. 5.11) in the tower (fac.1929/1/4).

Based on the surviving faculty records and analysis of the structure, it can be seen that the fabric of the present church has changed very little since it was reopened in 1869. Indeed, a 2012-3 restoration of the tower saw the reinstatement of original features such as the ferramenta in the belfry openings. Therefore, All Saints church as it stands today closes matches the Victorian church as it appeared upon completion. This allows for the current church to be compared with the known evidence for the earlier church, in order to establish the relationship between the two structures.

5.2.12 Analysis of Current Church

The archaeological recording undertaken at the church during the summer of 2011 included the preparation of a measured plan and elevation drawings, alongside the visual inspection and recording of the fabric of the building. The measured plan (fig. 5.43) demonstrates that the walls of the church are of generally of uniform width and alignment, with the walls of the nave and aisles measuring ~700mm, the clerestory walls ~800mm thick, and the tower walls measuring ~1100mm thick. There was slightly greater variation in the chancel walls, with the north and south walls being ~750mm thick, while the west wall is ~700mm and the east wall ~850mm. The only significant anomaly in wall thickness was the west wall of the north aisle, which measures only ~600mm in thickness. Despite these varying dimensions, which are readily explained by the various structural requirements of each wall, there are no discernable deviations in thickness within individual walls and no variations in wall alignment. This level of uniformity in wall alignment and thickness indicates that the present church is the result of a single phase of construction, with no earlier wall fabric remaining in situ. Visual analysis revealed only uniform coursing of the ashlar, with no evidence of multiple construction phases or building breaks.

In most aspects the recorded church matches the 'proposed' plan and elevation drawings attached to the 1867 faculty Application (fac.1867/10) (figs. 5.44 & 5.45), with the principal difference being in the architectural styling of the chancel (which will be discussed below). All Saints, Slingsby, features a variety of architectural styles, but is predominantly in the Perpendicular Gothic style of the late 15th century. The principle deviations from this style may be found in the nave, with its transitional Early English style arcades, and in

the chancel and porch, both of which demonstrate a mixture of Gothic motifs stylistically dating to the 13th to 15th centuries. Despite these stylistic variations, archaeological analysis confirms that the present church is of a single phase and no structural elements of the medieval church survive in situ. Having described and analysed the present church and its material changes since rebuilding, the following section will examine the reuse of memorials and architectural spolia within the Victorian church.

5.3 Reused Material in the Present Church

Detailed archaeological investigation of All Saints' church enabled the extent of reused material incorporated within the current fabric to be determined. At first glance Slingsby appears to contain very little fabric reused from the previous building, especially when compared to many of the other 'Street Parish' churches. The 1954 list description directly mentions only two reused features[33] (see Appendix 2.4), but detailed visual analysis and stone-by-stone recording has identified a significant quantity of earlier material within the Victorian structure. This has been further supplemented or confirmed by archival and documentary research. The limited primary and secondary sources available provide differing accounts as to the extent of the reused material, but often include brief descriptions of items taken from the previous church. The following section will describe all of the reused material identified in the current church, how it has been identified, and its location (if known) in the previous structure. Figure 5.46 shows the identified reused material mapped onto a plan of the current church.

5.3.1 Nave

Much of the material forming the north arcade of the present nave is reused. The foliated corbel respond at the west end of north arcade is carved from a pale (possibly Hildenley) limestone and shows both wear and later alteration (fig. 5.47). This respond matches one described by Glynne in 1863 at the eastern end of the north aisle arcade (Butler, 2007, 383). Brooke (1916, 3) confirms its reuse and states that the large square slot cut into the respond was for a wooden rail with metal hooks where gentlemen could hang their top hats. It is curious to note that this foliated respond was moved to the west end of the arcade and replicated at the east end. It is presumed this may have been done for aesthetic reasons, given the large slot cut into the reused piece.

The two cylindrical arcade piers forming the north aisle arcade (fig. 5.48) are also reused, as documented by several sources (such as: *Malton Messenger* 28/09/1867, 3; Morris 1904,

---

[33] Being the north arcade piers and the knight effigy.

352; Brooke 1916, 3). Their pale stone, possibly Hildenley limestone, and lack of tooling (the stones have generally worn smooth) also identify their reuse, as does the presence of incised marks or graffiti (fig. 5.49) on the eastern pier. This graffiti includes at least three incised crosses, two daisy wheels, and several geometric markings. Daisy wheels are not uncommon church graffiti, and it is often said they were a charm against evil influences (Pacey, 2007, 81). The two clearest incised crosses have bored holes at the extremities, perhaps indicating where lost metal crosses were anchored. Finally, a significant proportion of the voussoirs in the eastern and central bays of the north aisle arcade are also reused. These voussoirs are of the same lighter coloured stone as the piers, and several of them carry incised graffiti or marks. These include a compass drawn incised circle on one voussoir, and a partial circle on another (fig. 5.50). In total 117 of the 184 voussoir stones within the eastern two bays of the north arcade appear to be reused. The original location of these voussoirs is not precisely known, however it might be assumed they came from the earlier north aisle arcade (the south arcade arches were described as shorter and plainer than the north[34]). Given the varying widths of the arcade arches, it is possible that these voussoirs have been reused in approximately their original locations. Surprisingly, the reuse of arcade voussoirs is only mentioned by one documentary source (Page, 1914, 560). Morris also noted "four of the corbels to the hood-moulding in the nave might very well pass for old" (1904, 352). However, as the carved hoodmould head-stops are clearly Victorian work, it is posited that Morris may have been referring to the arch voussoirs of the north arcade.

5.3.2 South Aisle

The brass plaque to Sir John Fons hanging on the south aisle wall has been reset from a medieval funerary monument (see fig. 5.16). Although little of the text can now be read, it corresponds to a brass described by Dodsworth on his 1619 visit and for which he provided the following transcription:

Honor	Pray for the soul of Sir John Fons, Person of	Virtus
et	this Church, and Chaplayne to the Erle of	et
Amor	Northumberland the iiij. Anno 1508.	Justicia

(Dodsworth, 1904, 174).

As discussed in Section 5.2.3, this brass was found in the rectory in the early 20th century, but there is also a description of the brass in the *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* (1909, 315),

[34] Butler 2007, 383. See Section 5.4.3 for discussion.

stating that it had previously been set into the chancel floor and was already almost unreadable. Hanging next to the brass plaque is the bequest board dated 1712 (see fig. 5.15). This black board, which sits within a yellow ochre frame and contains yellow ochre text, records a bequest by the Rev Robert Ward of five pounds a year towards the teaching of ten poor children in Slingsby.

5.3.3 Porch

The stone benches flanking the east and west walls inside the porch appear to be constructed largely from reused material (fig. 5.51). Although the south ends are modern replacements, the benches are formed from very large, heavily weathered stones. Their location - low down and beside heavy foot traffic coming in from outside - might put these stones at greater risk of erosion, but their extensive degradation relative to surrounding stones supports the hypothesis that they are reused fabric. Might these benches be formed from medieval grave slabs? Their large size may explain their reuse; as such stones would be comparatively expensive to quarry in the 19th century.

5.3.4 North Aisle

A single surviving 17th-century pew is currently sited against the west wall of the north aisle (fig. 5.52). It matches the nave benches which Glynne described in 1863 as having "knobs on the ends, of about Charles I period" (Butler, 2007, 384). This appears to be the sole surviving piece of furnishing from the pre-restoration church. Currently unattached to the fabric of the building is a small marble tablet memorial to Mary Henning, who died in 1801 (fig. 5.53). This memorial is currently leaning against the wall of the north aisle, near the organ. It was described in 1823 (Eastmead 1823, 238) as being located in the north chancel aisle/chapel, so it remains close to its position in the previous church.

5.3.5 Chancel

Very little of the timberwork from the previous church appears to have reused in the current structure. The specification for the carpenters and joiners included: "To take down the whole of the woodwork of the present church, such timbers as may be approved of by the Architects and as are sound and good may be used for joists and the remainder to become the property of the contractor and to be by him removed off this site. This however does not refer to objects of Antiquarian or other interest which may be discovered and which must be carefully preserved and given up to the proprietor" (PR. SLIN.15). No reused timber joists have been identified in the ceiling; however it is possible that some

earlier timbers have been re-cut and employed. A contemporary account notes that the choir stalls were made "from the oak of the old structure" (*Malton Messenger* 5/06/1869, 3). It is assumed that reused timber was not used to extend the stalls at a later date. The choir stalls have carved decorative bench ends, which show wear and stylistically appear older than other carvings in the church (fig. 5.54); however, it must be noted these carved figures are very well integrated into the Victorian choir stalls, and are likely anachronistic 19th-century work. The current altar is a table that stylistically dates to the early 17th-century (Page, 1914, 560). Brooke (1916, 4) records that this table was found at the west end of the church, and suggests that it was the communion table in use in the previous church (see fig. 5.25).

5.3.6 South Chancel Aisle

The south chancel aisle, or 'Wyville Chapel', contains a concentration of reused material and acts as a mini treasury of antiquities. The most described reused element in the church is the reset 'Wyville' knight effigy (see fig. 5.30), described in Section 5.2.7 (Chancel). Stylistically dated to c.1250 (List Description – see Appendix 2.4), Dodsworth's (1904, 174) description of the knight from 1619 records that it was then located in the choir of the medieval church. Immediately beside the knight effigy is a reset foliated grave cover, known as a cross slab, described in Section 5.2.7 (above). Although not mentioned in any early accounts, it is stylistically datable to the 13th century by its incised bracelet cross (Brooke 1904, 183). During the rebuilding the stone coffin believed to be of Sir John Fons was re-interred beneath this, otherwise unassociated, grave cover (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3). Reset in the floor beside the foliated cross slab, is a flat, rectangular stone with 5 incised crosses visible on its surface (fig. 5.55). These crosses confirm this stone was a medieval altar slab, or mensa, with Brooke (1904, 184) suggesting it formed the top of the side altar in the south chancel aisle chapel. It is not clear if Brooke's assertion is purely based on the stone's present location. Completing the treasury in the floor of the south chancel aisle, is the reset grave cover memorialising Miss Anne Walker, daughter of Rev Walker, who died in 1839 (see fig. 5.30).

5.3.7 Tower

The two large gargoyles located under the parapet in the north elevation of the tower predate the present structure (fig. 5.56). In the form of grotesque human faces, these heavily worn stones appear to be medieval carvings, and possibly match those shown on the south elevation of the tower in a c.1840 etching of the previous church by Miss Henrietta Elizabeth Walker (fig. 5.57). There are also a number of large stones in the west

and north elevations of the tower, immediately above the plinth. These include a number of fragments of reused grave slabs, with several showing parts of incised crosses (figs. 5.58 and 5.38). These reused fragments are all set into the lowers courses of the west and north elevations of the tower. Many of the stones in these lowers courses are significantly larger than the rest of the church's masonry. The seven incised fragments of crosses all stylistically date from the early 14th century (Page, 1914, 560). Roberts (1990, 7) has suggested that these cross slab fragments were reused in the earlier tower and have subsequently been put back in their original positions during the Victorian rebuilding. There is no documentary evidence to support this, and no mention is made of them in descriptions of the earlier church; however it is a very plausible theory, as the reuse of cross slabs as building material was a common practice during the later medieval period (see McClain 2005, 141). If they had not already been reused, it seems likely the Victorian rebuilders would have set them with the other funerary monuments in the south chancel aisle, or created another treasury, such as can be found in the porch at Amotherby (see Chapter 8).

The clock mechanism in the tower ringing chamber is dated 1838 (see fig. 5.39) and corresponds to one described in the *Leeds Mercury* in October 1838, which reports the eight-day clock was installed by James Harrison, of Hull (*Leeds Mercury* 27/10/1838, 4), at a cost of £100 (Whellan, 1859, 885). It is presumed that the clock face has also been reused, although closer analysis would be required to confirm this. The three bells in the tower are all dated 1803 and a *Malton Messenger* article (28/09/1867, 3) confirms their reuse. The bell frame appears to have been largely renewed, but may contain some earlier oak timbers.

5.3.8 Other

It is generally held that the image-niche statues of Christ and King David pre-date the current church (see figs. 5.17 & 5.21). Both statues are heavily weathered, but it is unclear if this reflects their age or their exposed locations and stone type. The belief that these statues are medieval has recently been challenged, with suggestions they may be post-medieval, or even 19th-century carvings (Proctor, pers. comm., 2011). Brooke states that the current aisle windows contain "perpendicular tracery restored from the original fragments" (Brooke, 1916, 3). It is presumed this in reference to the design of the tracery rather than to the reuse of any physical fabric and visual analysis confirms that the aisle windows are entirely Victorian work of uniformly carved Whitby sandstone. Likewise, Brooke (1916, 4) notes the niche in the east wall of the south chancel aisle "is evidently a restoration of the old piscina". This niche contains no drain and has crisp Victorian tooling and is likewise

clearly entirely 19th-century work. Brooke must be referring to its 'restoration' in terms of replicating what was there, rather than of reuse of earlier material.

The final and most easily overlooked reused fabric in the church is the ashlar masonry itself. The *Malton Messenger* (28/09/1867, 3) stated in 1867 that the church was to be built of Appleton Stone, but that "the old stone will be made available so far as possible". Visual analysis of the church reveals that two distinct geologies were employed randomly in the body of the church – might one of these represent a reuse of earlier masonry, or do they simply represent differing stone beds from the same quarry? If any of the earlier masonry was utilised, then all of the reused stones were re-faced, as all of the masonry displays consistent tooling matching other 19th-century construction in the area (fig. 5.59). The random employment of the two geologies reveals no coursing or grouping, as can be seen in the analysis of a typical wall (fig. 5.60). More firmly, the interior of the upper stages of the tower (fig. 5.61) appears to contain significant reused masonry, demonstrating courser ashlar, with varying geologies and tooling. Similarly, the tower courses of the west tower, which also contain the reused cross slab fragments, are partly composed of significantly larger stones with differing tooling (see fig. 5.38).

This detailed archaeological analysis of All Saints, Slingsby, has identified a significant quantity of reused earlier fabric within the Victorian fabric of the church. This reused fabric includes major architectural elements, such as much of the north arcade, as well as funerary monuments, sculptural elements and fixtures and fittings. Identifying this reused material not only aids in better understanding the significance of the present church, but also provides valuable insights into the earlier structure on this site.

5.4 Description of the Pre-Restoration Church

5.4.1 Sources

Having explored the present church, this next section will describe and analyse the earlier church of All Saints, Slingsby, prior to its demolition in May 1867. There are a small number of contemporary descriptions of the pre-1867 All Saints' church, Slingsby. Of the two with any detail, Rev W. M. Walker's brief account of the church in 1845 provides valuable information. Entitled *Some Account of the Parish of Slingsby*, it contains the only known image of the pre-restoration church: a sketch drawn by his eldest daughter, Henrietta Elizabeth Walker (Walker, 1845, 8). This pseudo-perspective drawing (see fig. 5.57) depicts the church viewed from the south-east, and shows the east end, south aisle, nave clerestory (south elevation) and tower (south and east elevations). No visual depictions of the north or

west aspects of the earlier church are known to exist. Ms Walker's etching provides valuable clues as to the external appearance of the church in the mid-19th century. Whilst its accuracy is unverified, the features depicted generally correlate with the surviving written descriptions of the church. The second, more detailed, contemporary description comes from the indefatigable 19th-century church explorer, Sir Stephen Glynne. Glynne's descriptions of Yorkshire's churches were published in full in 2007, including his description arising from a visit to Slingsby on 19th November 1863 (Butler, 2007, 383-4).

Another former vicar at Slingsby, Rev Arthur St. Clair Brooke, provides detailed secondary evidence for the church in publications of 1904 and 1916. Furthermore, Brooke transcribes excerpts from the architect's 1867 report on the condition of the old church. These snippets indicate that Johnson's survey report would have been an invaluable source for understanding the old All Saints; however it sadly seems to have been lost from the public record and the few sections transcribed by Brooke are now the only remaining source for this report. In researching his publications, Brooke states that he consulted village residents whose collective memory could be traced back as far as 1820 (1904, 147). Finally, unlike the previous chapter, there are a great number of contemporary newspaper articles relating to All Saints, Slingsby, principally focused on the rebuilding, but which impart valuable details about the earlier structure. Fascinatingly, one article in the *Malton Messenger* (28/09/1867, 3) records that a hermetically sealed bottle was deposited beneath the church's foundation stone, which contains a record of the demolition and the incidents leading up to it, along with a photograph of the earlier church. This time capsule currently remains beneath the foundation stone, and hopefully still contains what is now the only known photograph of All Saints prior to its 1867 demolition. Sadly, that image, if it survives, remains out of reach for the purposes of this thesis.

5.4.2 The Context of the Earlier Church

The principal evidence for the churchyard of All Saints' church, Slingsby prior to 1867 comes from Miss Walker's c.1840 etching (see fig. 5.57). This shows two paths through the churchyard, one heading southwards from the porch towards the High Street, with another path coming off this and heading east across the front of the south aisle. Low, stone churchyard walls can be seen in the background of the etching. A number of gravestones are also depicted, seemingly scattered at random throughout the churchyard. Walker (1845, 9) notes the presence of the "many remains of Norman gravestones", presumably meaning within the churchyard, although there is no other documentary evidence for these and their dating as "Norman" must be taken with caution. If they existed, it is surprising

that none of these early gravestones have been retained within the present church. Perhaps Walker was referring to the sections of 13th-century incised cross-slabs currently embedded in the church tower?

In 1871, shortly after the rebuilding of the church, Admiral Howard purchased land to increase the size of the churchyard (CD. Add. 1871/1). A map produced at the time (see fig. 5.8) shows the earlier extent of the churchyard prior to being enlarged to its present size. As can be seen, the churchyard boundaries on the north and west remained the same, with the extension being made primarily to the east, with an additional sliver of land to the south. The letters of Admiral Howard's factor, Mr Satterthwaite, notes that this extension would require the moving the road (then Back Lane, now Church Lane) and the demolition of five of the eight church cottages along it (F5/2/7). The owner of the freehold to these cottages, a Mr Metcalf, initially held out for an above value payment, and a separate graveyard was considered in the adjacent field, beside the castle moat (F5/2/7). Note also the location of the now demolished Tithe Barn, which is shown towards the top of this map.

The pre-1867 church of All Saints, Slingsby appears to have been a complex, multi-phase structure. In the 1840s it was noted that the outer walls of the church had "at different times, been rebuilt, in various styles of architecture" (Walker 1845, 9). Sources for the earlier church agree that the building consisted of: nave with north and south aisles, chancel with north and south aisles or chapels, and a west tower, (see: Butler, 2007, 383-4; Walker, 1845, 9; and *Malton Messenger* 28/09/1867, 3). Interestingly, the *Rural Dean's Returns* of 1867 (RD.RET.1, 515) clearly state that the church also had a vestry, although no mention is made of it in any other contemporary descriptions.

The *Malton Messenger* (28/09/1867, 3) gave the agreed measurements for the new church building, which can be compared with the results of the measured archaeological survey of the present church:

	Planned dimensions (ft.) 1867	Metric Conversion (m.) 1867	Measured Survey (m.) 2011
Nave	39 x 19	11.89 x 5.79	12.23 x 5.79
South Aisle	39 x 7	11.89 x 2.13	12.23 x 2.22
North Aisle	39 x 10.5	11.89 x 3.20	12.23 x 3.20
Chancel	31 x 18	9.45 x 5.49	9.45 x 5.49
Chancel South Aisle	19 x 8	5.79 x 2.44	5.85 x 2.45
Chancel North Aisle	19 x 11.5	5.79 x 3.51	6.60 x 3.38
Vestry	11.5 x 10	3.51 x 3.05	3.48 x 3.48

Crucially, this article also stated that: "The new church is the same length as the old one, but it is wider towards the north." Glynne (Butler, 2007, 383) had described the north aisle of the previous church as narrow, and another contemporary newspaper article (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4) confirms that it is the north aisle which was to be widened in the Victorian church. Crucially therefore, the *Malton Messenger* article provides a full set of dimensions for the plan of the demolished church, with the sole exception of the width of the earlier north aisle. Having established the plan of the pre-restoration church along with measured dimensions for much of the building, the following section will provide a detailed description of the church and its known features. These descriptions result from the synthesis of all available information on All Saints' church prior to its complete demolition in May 1867.

5.4.3 Nave

The nave, which Glynne described as being "rather short" (Butler, 2007, 383), had a clerestory with square-headed windows of two lights and simple perpendicular tracery. The c.1840 etching shows two of these windows on the south elevation, corresponding to the eastern and central bays. These were presumably mirrored to the north, although no evidence has been found to confirm the detail of the north clerestory windows. Curiously, the etching does not depict a third clerestory window corresponding to the western bay of the nave. Its omission may reflect the curious porch arrangement within the western bay of the south aisle. Sadly, as there are no detailed descriptions of the clerestory windows, the

lack or loss of this window cannot be further examined. In 1845 Walker described the church as having been substantially re-roofed and "recently covered with Welsh slate" (Walker, 1845, 9). He independently stated that the chancel had been rebuilt in 1835 (Walker, 1845, 9), and it is possible the nave re-roofing was carried out at the same time. The *Rural Dean's Return* (RD. RET.1, 515) reveals that the nave was ceiled internally by 1865.

In 1845 the nave is recorded as containing seating for 400 worshippers (Walker, 1845, 9), suggesting that it was pewed or benched throughout. In 1863 Glynne noted the nave seating consisted of "several plain old open benches with knobs on the ends, of about Charles I period" (Butler, 2007, 384), a description which matches the single pew now at the west end of the north aisle of the present church (see fig. 5.52). Another contemporary description states that the church "was filled with hideous pews of the 17th century" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4). This corroborates Glynne's dating of the pews, and provides a valuable insight into the importance of changing taste and fashion, as will be explored later. Johnson (as cited in Brooke, 1904, 178) reported the presence of a gallery at the west end of the nave, although only one other contemporary source confirms its existence.[35] The failure of other sources to include the west gallery likely reflects their fall from favour by the mid-19th century, again providing insight into changing architectural fashion. Brooke (1904, 178) suggests this gallery acted as a minstrel's loft rather than additional seating, which is entirely plausible, although no evidence is known to confirm that this was the case. Also largely missing from the contemporary accounts of the earlier church is any mention of the font, although Brooke (1916, 3) states that there was a Norman font located in the nave, but that it was buried in the graveyard during the rebuilding. A newspaper article documenting the reopening of the church also mentions that the old Norman font had been replaced (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3), but its location within the earlier church remains uncertain.

Both the south and north aisles were separated from the nave by arcades of three arches. Glynne described the north arcade as "pointed, and good early English, upon tall circular column[s] with moulded capitals[s]" (Butler, 2007, 383). He also noted that the north arcade terminated at the east on a foliated respond (Butler, 2007, 383). The arcade as described by Glynne very closely matches the corresponding arcade in the present church (see fig. 5.10), confirming its reuse on the same site. Glynne also described the south arcade, saying: "On the south the arches are plainer and shorter, but also Early English"

---

[35] *Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4

(Butler, 2007, 383). No further descriptions of the south arcade exist, but it is presumed, and inferred from the descriptions, that it was otherwise similar to the north arcade. The nave was separated from the tower and chancel by arches, which are described within the corresponding sections below.

5.4.4 South Aisle

The south aisle consisted of three bays and the walls were externally surmounted by a parapet, which is depicted on Miss Walker's etching as having simple mouldings at both top and bottom (see fig. 5.57). The etching also shows a small stepped buttress immediately to the west of the eastern angle of the south aisle. In his report on the church, the architect, Robert Johnson, (as cited in Brooke, 1904, 175) stated that the aisle walls had been rebuilt during a 15th-century remodelling of the church, however it is unclear if Johnson was differentiating between re-fenestration and a complete rebuilding of the walls. Johnson's report also noted that the foundations had failed and that the aisle walls were leaning in a "very alarming manner" (as cited in Brooke, 1916, 2). This is confirmed by the Rural Dean's Return of 1865 for Slingsby, in which the south wall is specially noted as being "considerably out of perpendicular" (RD. RET.1, 515). It is therefore surprising that such limited buttressing appeared to have been employed prior to the 1867 rebuilding.

Very unusually in a parish church, the south porch at Slingsby was completely contained within the western bay of the south aisle, as opposed to projecting from it. Internally, Glynne (Butler, 2007, 383) recorded that this porch arrangement cut through the westernmost arch of the nave arcade. The c.1840 etching shows the porch was accessed by a wide arched opening, with a low, possibly picket, gate. Brooke (1916, 3) stated that this arch was 'Norman'; however it is likely Brooke was either referring to it having a round-headed arch or, less convincingly, that the south doorway within the porch dated from 11th or 12th century. The c.1840 depiction of the porch archway appears post-medieval, and it would be highly unusual for a Romanesque arch to not be mentioned by any contemporary description, or for it to have not been retained within the present structure. Nothing is known of the south doorway, but Glynne described the door into the nave as an "ancient door, with tracery in wood" (Butler, 2007, 383). As the church is documented as having been significantly remodelled in the late 15th century, this traceried door may well have dated from that period.

A cusped two-light, square-headed window with label and label stops is shown to the west of the porch entrance (see fig. 5.57). Having this window to the west of the porch entrance, means either the south aisle projected west of the nave, or the doorway did not align with

the centre of the nave bay. The etching seems to show the south aisle as being coterminous with the nave, suggesting the doorway must not have aligned with the internal bay. Glynne noted that "the porch has its *windows* unglazed" [36] (Butler, 2007, 383), implying a second window, presumably in the western wall of the south aisle. The other two bays of the south aisle each contained a large square-headed sash window. Describing these, a contemporary newspaper stated that the "tracery has been cut away from the windows and replaced by ordinary sashes" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4), confirming that the post-medieval sashes were inserted into existing traceried windows. According to Brooke (1916, 4), the present south aisle tracery is based on fragmentary remains of tracery removed from these windows, thus revealing what the original 15th-century south aisle window tracery had been. These windows, which Glynne described in 1863 as "mostly mutilated" (Butler, 2007, 384), had labels integrated into a stringcourse. This stringcourse ran westward from the south chancel aisle across the south aisle stopping abruptly to the east of the porch entrance. This interruption to the stringcourse suggests the porch entrance and arrangement were a later alteration to the existing aisle. Nothing is known of the interior of the south aisle, but given the high seating capacity of the church, it is presumed the space was largely used for seating.

5.4.5 North Aisle

The little surviving evidence for the form and decoration of the north aisle comes almost exclusively from Sir Stephen Glynne's description of November 1863, in which he notes that the north aisle was narrow (Butler, 2007, 383). Johnson (as cited in Brooke, 1916, 175) concluded that the walls of both aisles had been rebuilt as part of late 15th-century remodelling, suggesting the exterior design and detailing of the north aisle would have been similar to that of the south aisle. This is supported by Glynne's description of the north aisle windows as "square-headed windows of two lights, and Perpendicular" (Butler, 2007, 383), which correlates with the known windows in the south aisle. The north aisle consisted of three bays, and it is presumed that there was a window centred within each bay, mirroring the arrangement of the south aisle (but without the porch). Finally, Glynne noted that, unlike the south aisle, the north aisle had no parapet (Butler, 2007, 384). Sadly, no evidence has yet been found which gives an indication of the interior of the north aisle, which was presumably filled with the same oak bench seating as the nave.

---

[36] Author's italics

5.4.6 Chancel

19th-century accounts (e.g. Walker, 1845, 9; Whellan, 1859, 885) report that the chancel at All Saints, Slingsby was entirely rebuilt in 1835, although no faculty or documentary evidence for this campaign survives. Glynne noted in 1863 that the chancel had a new roof (Butler, 2007, 384), possibly referencing the 1835 rebuilding, and in 1867 Johnson described this rebuilt chancel as being "so destitute of architectural character as to render its re-construction imperative" (as cited in Brooke, 1916, 2).

Miss Walker's etching shows the south elevation of the chancel as blank, having no windows or architectural detailing. Dominating the east wall was a large window of three lights with intersecting tracery, which Glynne described as "a poor pointed one" (Butler, 2007, 384). The etching suggests this window was filled with diamond pane leaded glass, and that the arch or hoodmould terminated on head-stops. No information on the north exterior elevation of the chancel survives. Inside the church, the chancel was divided from the nave by a chancel arch "springing at once from the wall" (Butler, 2007, 384). Described as a "handsome pointed arch" (Walker, 1845, 9), Johnson attributed it to the 15th-century remodelling of the church (Brooke, 1904, 175). Single arches in the north and south walls provided access to the chancel aisles, which are described in the corresponding sections below.

Eastmead (1823, 238) mentions that the chancel was divided into choir and sanctuary by an altar rail, but no description of this survives. Eastmead also notes a grave slab in the chancel, stating that "On entering the chancel, there is a large flat stone, and on it a brass plate, with an inscription … of Sir John Stone" (1823, 238). Brooke tells us that this brass plate, which is correctly for the rector John Fons and is described in Section 5.3.2, "lay just beneath the chancel step" (Brooke, 1904, 194-5). These descriptions confirm that as well as the altar rail there was a step separating the chancel/sanctuary from the choir. Fons' will stated that he wished to be buried "at the entrance of the Quire" (Brooke, 1904, 193), which suggests that the tomb and its brass were located at the entrance to the Sanctuary in front of the altar rails.

During the demolition of the church, a skeleton was found beneath one of the grave slabs wearing an impressive gold ring featuring a death's head and cross-bones, with white enamel in the middle and blue enamel on the sides, but when exposed to the air, some of the white enamel crumbled away (Brooke, 1904, 183). This ring was not re-interred, instead being given to Admiral Howard for the museum at Castle Howard (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3), but has since disappeared. There appears to have been some confusion as

to where this ring-wearing skeleton was found. Two early articles in the *Malton Messenger* (21/09/1867, 3; and 28/09/1867, 3) place the skeleton and ring as found under the knight effigy, whilst a later article in the same newspaper (05/06/1869, 3) associates the finds with the stone coffin of Sir John Fons, which seems far more likely given its description.

The most described feature in Slingsby church is the effigy of a cross-legged knight, dating from the late 13th-century (Page, 1904, 560), and now in the Wyville Chapel (see Section 5.2.7 above). The exact location of this effigy within the medieval church is a matter of some debate. The antiquarian Richard Dodsworth visited Slingsby church in 1619 and noted: "Ther is in the quier a monument cross legged of one of the Wyvills" (Dodsworth, 1904, 174). Whellan (1859, 885) and Eastmead also suggests the effigy was situated in the choir, giving its location as "near the altar rails" (1823, 238); however other, often later, contemporary sources (Murray 1867, 230; *Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4; Brooke 1904, 180) suggest the effigy was located in the south chapel (its current position). This raises the possibility that the Wyvill effigy was moved in the early 19th-century, possibly during the 1835 rebuilding of the chancel. Eastmead (1823, 238) later describes another monument as "In the north aisle, and to the left of the monument of the knight", implying that the effigy was located on the north side the chancel, presumably against the north wall.

It can be inferred from Walker (1845, 10) that the foliated cross slab, currently in the Wyville Chapel and described in Section 5.2.7 above, was also located in the choir. This based on his description of it coming between the descriptions of the knight effigy and John Fons' brass, both of which were in the chancel.

5.4.7 South Chancel Aisle

The chancel was flanked on both the north and south by short aisles that extended from the nave aisles for approximately half the chancel's length. In his description of the church, Walker states "On the east end of each aisle there appears to have been formerly a chapel" (Walker, 1845, 9). The south chancel aisle or south chapel was externally a continuation of the south aisle, and the c.1840 etching (see fig. 5.57) shows the south elevation as having two square-headed windows of two lights, with labels integrated into a stringcourse. Near the east end of the wall was a stepped buttress. The east wall appears to be blank, however Glynne (Butler, 2007, 384), Black (1863, 234), and Murray (1867, 230) all record a blocked opening, visible only from the outside. Murray describes this as "a curious small window opening (vesica-shaped) over the E. end, above a piscina S. of the altar. It is now built up, but the form is seen without" (Murray, 1867, 230). Murray's description also confirms the presence of both an altar and a piscina in the east end of the south aisle chapel. The precise

location, however, must be taken with caution, as Murray (1867, 230) notes that the blocked window was only visible from outside, so its location relative to internal features could only have been estimated.

The south chancel aisle was separated from the chancel by a single arch, described by Glynne as "straight-sided and wide" and sitting on "plainly moulded imposts" (Butler, 2007, 384). He also notes that a pointed arch separated it from the south aisle (Butler, 2007, 384). Brooke (1916, 4) argues that the south chancel aisle was at some stage a chantry chapel of the Wyville family. This is presumably erroneously premised on the presence of the knight effigy, but as this was likely located in the choir prior to 1835, there is no known reason to associate this space with a Wyville chantry chapel.

5.4.8 North Chancel Aisle

Sadly little information exists for the north chancel aisle. Johnson concluded that the walls of both aisles of the church, and therefore presumably also of the chancel aisles, were rebuilt during the 15th-century remodelling (Brooke, 1916, 2). If this was the case, then it might be hypothesised that the north aisle chapel had the same two-light square-headed windows and stringcourse as the south chancel aisle. This theory might be supported by Glynne and Walker's failure to mention them, as both tended to note features at variance. Internally the north chancel aisle was separated from the chancel by an arch described as "broad sprawling" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4) and of "flat and depressed form", which rose from "imposts of Early English foliage" (Butler, 2007, 384). Given that this opening is different from that connecting the chancel and south chancel aisle, it is assumed that one or both of these arches predates the 1835 chancel rebuilding. Based on its various descriptions, it is hypothesised that this arch dated from the late 15th-century remodelling, where it possibly replaced an early 13th century arch, of which the responds survived.

Glynne described the arch that separated the south chancel aisle from the south aisle, but made no mention of a corresponding arch between the north chancel aisle and north aisle, suggesting the two spaces were not architecturally delineated. In his description of 1823, Eastmead (1823, 238) seems to make little distinction, as he noted a funerary monument "In the north aisle, and to the left of the monument of the knight." As the knight effigy was located in the choir, this must relate to the north chancel aisle.

5.4.9 Vestry

No contemporary descriptions of the old All Saints' church refer to a vestry at Slingsby. However, the *Rural Dean's Returns* for 1865 clearly states that there was a vestry at the church (RD.RET.1, 515). The Slingsby Glebe Terriers (SLIN.Ter.L: 1727, 1743, 1749, 1760 & 1764) also reference the vestry in listing the areas of the church for which the parishioners were responsible. It therefore seems likely that there was a vestry at Slingsby, and as it is not depicted on Miss Walker's etching, it must have been located on the north side of the building. On the 1856 1st edition Ordnance Survey map (fig. 5.62) a small plan of the church is visible on which a projecting south aisle can be seen, but there is no corresponding projection to the north. This supports the theory that the vestry was located to the north of the chancel, as it is in the present church.

5.4.10 Tower

The tower is the area of the earlier church for which we have the most surviving information. Miss Walker's etching (see fig. 5.57) includes details of two elevations of the tower (south and east). Sir Stephen Glynne also provided a detailed description, which matches closely with the tower depicted in the etching (Butler, 2007, 384). Crucially, the earlier tower was also included on Johnson's scaled architectural drawings which accompanied the faculty application for rebuilding (fac.1867/10). These include a plan, north and south elevations, and an internal east elevation showing the tower arch (fig. 5.63; for plan – see fig. 5.45).

The earliest reference to a tower at Slingsby dates from 1430 in which "one of the Wyvills who still lived at Slingsby directed that he should be buried in the middle of the parish church before the cross, and left 20 shillings to the fabric of the tower of the church if it were built within three years' time" (Page 1914, 560). The antiquarian Roger Dodsworth recorded a 1619 visit to All Saints' church, Slingsby, in which he notes, "on the steeple was engraven in stone a maunch" (Brooke, 1916, 256). A maunch or manche is a large, open sleeve, and represented the arms of the Hastings' family (Walker, 1845, 10). Rev Walker noted in 1845 that "no trace now remains" (Walker, 1845, 10) of this tower engraving. The carving of a maunch (likely on a stone shield) on the tower implies Hastings patronage in its construction, rather than that of the above mentioned Wyvill, thus suggesting a construction date later than the 1430s.

The west tower was constructed in the Perpendicular Gothic style, and consisted of three stages, each separated by a plain stringcourse. The tower was supported by a stepped

diagonal buttress at each angle, and was topped by a low parapet, concealing a shallow gabled roof. Walker's etching (1845, 8) also shows a raised section in the centre of the east parapet - it is not known if this was mirrored on the west elevation. The base of the parapet on the south elevation contained two gargoyles. Brooke (1916, 3) states that, although missing by the 1860s, evidence was found during demolition that pinnacles once surmounted the tower at each angle. The upper stage of each elevation contained a square-headed belfry window, comprising two cusped lights beneath labels with label-stops. The lower stage of the west elevation contained a large window, which Johnson's plan indicates was of three lights. Glynne (Butler, 2007, 384) confirms this, but sadly gives no further insight into the window's tracery. It is recorded in 1867 as being one of only two windows which were not "square-headed, two light perpendicular windows" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4). As well as being of three-lights, it may be hypothesised to have also differed in being contained within a pointed arch. As the tower appears to be entirely in the Perpendicular Gothic style of the 15th century, the window presumably also contained Perpendicular tracery. In 1619 Dodsworth described some armorial stained glass within this window, saying "Ther is in the west window per pale Ar. [silver] on g [gules? – red]. 3 escallopes with quarterly or [gold] and G [gules – red], in the first quarter a raven proper" (Dodsworth, 1904, 174).

The middle stage of the south elevation contained the eight-day clock found in the present church tower. Below and to the east of the clock face was a small lancet window or opening. The tower also contained three bells all cast in 1803 (Page, 1914, 560). The top stage of the tower was clearly braced, with iron ties visible on the east elevation in Miss Walker's etching (Walker, 1845, 8). Johnson's plan (fac.1867/10) shows a freestanding spiral staircase was located in the northwest corner of the tower. Sadly, little else is known of the interior of the medieval tower prior to its demolition. Glynne described the tower arch, which connected the nave and tower, as "plain pointed" (Butler, 2007, 384). Johnson's elevation drawing (fac.1867/10) presumably shows this arch, which measured 3.3m wide by 5.4m high, with three plain orders springing directly from the wall (see fig. 5.63).

5.4.11 Architectural Phasing

Through the synthesis and analysis of the available documentary and physical evidence, the previous section has described the known elements of All Saints' church, Slingsby, immediately prior to its demolition in 1867. Despite the comparatively slim evidence, this

reveals a complex, multi-phase church. Based on this information it is possible to conjecture an architectural development for the medieval church.

Saxon Church

As discussed in Section 5.1.2 (above), it seems likely a church was already established at Slingsby by the time of the Domesday account in 1086, although no physical evidence of it survives and its location within the village is unknown.

12th-Century Church

Sadly no archaeological records were kept during the demolition of the old church in 1867. The most tantalising clue of an archaeological find, and one which might date the earliest phase of the church razed in 1867, was reported in the *Malton Messenger*, which wrote: "It is curious that from below the foundation of the old church, coins of the Hanse Towns Federation (12th century) were dug up" (*Malton Messenger* 21/09/1867, 3). As these coins were discovered at the base of the church foundations, they should provide a *terminus post quem* for the construction of the earliest phase of the medieval building. Sadly the coins, which were given to Castle Howard Museum, are now lost and were seemingly never recorded or examined beyond being labelled as '12th century'. It is also unfortunate that there is no record of which foundation trench they were located in, but it is presumed they came from either the nave or chancel foundations. Despite the loss of these coins, they do provide a 12th-century date for construction on this site. The architect of the rebuilding, Robert Johnson, suggested that the earliest church on the site consisted of "a nave with north and south aisles, and a chancel – the former very probably under one roof; and there is no evidence of the existence of a tower at this time" (Johnson 1867, as cited in Brooke 1916, 2).

Based on Johnson's archaeological evidence Brooke (1904, 174-5) argues convincingly that the church originally consisted of nave and chancel, with the aisles being slightly later additions. During the demolition of the church a large number of burials were discovered under the walls of the south aisle, suggesting the area occupied by the south aisle was formerly part of the consecrated churchyard (Brooke, 1904, 174). From this it can be inferred that the south aisle was a later addition to a presumably, aisleless Norman church (Brooke, 1904, 175). Pevsner's (1966, 346) stylistic dating of the nave arcade to c.1200 would support this. Brooke (1904, 175) states that the north aisle was added to the church before the south aisle, presumably basing this assessment on Johnson's report, but providing no evidence to support it. Both arcades are stylistically Transitional Early

English, but their slightly different architectural detailing supports the argument for close, but different construction dates. Given the evidence suggests aisles were added to an existing structure around the start of the 13th-century, the original structure must date to the late 12th-century at the latest. It is possible that this structure may be the same church that is granted to Whitby Abbey in 1157 (see Section 5.1.2).

15th-Century Remodelling

Johnson states that the aisle walls were all rebuilt at the close of the 15th-century (Brooke, 1904, 175) as part of an extensive remodelling of the church, which also saw the addition of the west tower and the clerestory (Johnson, 1867, as cited in Brooke, 1904, 175). During the demolition of the church, Johnson found no evidence of a tower prior to the late 15th-century (Brooke 1916, 2). This is supported by the documentary evidence, which as discussed in Section 5.4.10 (above), includes a 1430 reference to the construction, rather than restoration or rebuilding, of a church tower at Slingsby. Johnson also suggests that the chancel was most likely re-cast or rebuilt at this time, however its later rebuilding made it impossible to confirm this (Brooke, 1904, 175). It seems likely that the patron for this late 15th-century remodelling of the church was William Hastings, 1st Baron Hastings. A senior courtier in Edward IV's court[37], William Hastings was granted license to crenellate the manor at Slingsby in 1474 (Page 1914, 558), and he built extensively at his other holdings, including at Ashby de la Zouche castle. Hastings was executed for treason in 1483 and his assets confiscated, before being restored to his son shortly afterwards (Brooke 1904, 80-1). The architectural styling of the medieval tower dates it to the late 15th-century and the carved heraldic maunch (see Section 5.4.10) identifies it with the Hastings family. Given the wealth and power of William, Lord Hastings, his major building works at Slingsby manor and elsewhere, and the families comparative fall from grace after 1483, William Hastings seems a very likely contender for patron of the 15th-century remodelling at All Saints, Slingsby.

Post-Medieval Alteration

There are a number of small alterations that can be traced to the post-medieval period, such as the insertion of the minstrel's gallery at the west of the nave. Minstrel's galleries are generally a post-medieval feature (see Addleshaw and Etchells, 1948, 98-100), although the date of the gallery at Slingsby is unknown. Miss Walker's etching of c.1840 shows a

---

[37] William Hastings served as Master of the Mint and Lord Chamberlain under King Edward IV.

continuous stringcourse across the south aisle and south chancel aisle, which stops abruptly just east of the porch entrance, suggesting the porch entrance was a post-medieval alteration. The insertion of sash windows into the south aisle windows was likely an 18th-century alteration, while the three church bells, which were cast in 1803, shows some very early 19th-century investment in the church, as does the clock installation in 1838. The rebuilding of the chancel in 1835 is the final major architectural development for which we have evidence at All Saints, Slingsby. Sadly no faculty for this rebuilding survives, but from the descriptions it is hypothesised that the chancel arch and possibly the connecting chapel arches, survived the 1835 rebuilding.

This section has demonstrated the wealth of information that can be uncovered through a detailed archaeological investigation, despite the significant rebuilding of the church in the mid-19th century. The architectural development of the medieval church at Slingsby appears to have started with the construction of a small two-cell church of aisleless nave and chancel. During the late 12th or early 13th-century, first a north aisle was added, followed shortly afterwards by a corresponding aisle to the south. In the late 15th century, the church was significantly remodelled in the Perpendicular Gothic style, with the aisle walls, and probably the chancel, being rebuilt, and the west tower and clerestory added. Apart from minor alterations to the fabric, such as the insertion of sash windows, the church remained relatively unchanged until the rebuilding of the chancel in 1835. With the exception of this chancel rebuilding, the medieval architectural development of the church remained clearly visible up to its demolition in 1867. Figure 5.64 presents a phased plan of All Saints, Slingsby immediately prior to its Victorian restoration.

5.5 Analysis of the 1867-9 Restoration of All Saints, Slingsby

This section will analyse the Victorian restoration campaign, exploring the process which led to the complete rebuilding of the church, the key figures in that decision making process, and the relationship, if any, between the present, Victorian, church, and All Saints as it existed immediately prior to its razing in 1867.

5.5.1 From 'Restoration' to Rebuilding

Interrogation of the documentary records has revealed that the rebuilding process at All Saints, Slingsby was an evolutionary one, similar to that seen in the previous chapter. Indeed, the decision to rebuild the medieval church was not a straightforward one - the process appears to have started with a desire for general repairs, but over the space of less than a year it resulted in the total demolition of the medieval church and the raising of a

replacement structure. Unfortunately, little of the original correspondence regarding this process has survived; however, it has been possible to piece together much of the sequence using other documentary evidence. As this information has been gleaned from a wide range of sources, from secondary literature and newspaper articles, it needs to be treated with some caution, as some of the information provided, especially from the newspapers, appears confused or slightly contradictory.

Earl of Carlisle – Initial Ideas

The tragic death of the Slingsby-born Archdeacon of Ely in 1859 appears to have been a catalyst for a proposed restoration of All Saints' church, Slingsby.[38] In 1860 two newspaper articles[39] reported that the Earl of Carlisle was intending to install stained glass into the east window of the chancel as a memorial to the late churchman, with one paper further noting plans for "the restoration, if possible, of Slingsby Church" (*North Wales Chronicle* 27/10/1860, 11). Might the 1860 rebuilding at All Saints, Hovingham, also have influenced this desire to restore the church at Slingsby? By 1867 neither the memorial window nor the church restoration had been commenced, and a newspaper article of 1869 noted that the church at Slingsby was "one of the projects of the late Earl of Carlisle,[40] but his death shortly after his retirement from the vice-royalty, prevented its execution" (*Leeds Mercury* 03/06/1869, 4). The perceived need for the restoration of the church is confirmed by *The Rural Dean's Return* for 1865, in which the vicar, Rev Carter, noted that while the church was in "tolerable repair", it "stands in need of restoration, or rebuilding" (RD. RET.1, 515).

Admiral Howard – Plans Afoot

The patron for the 1867-9 restoration and rebuilding of All Saints' church was to be the late Earl's younger brother, Admiral Edward Granville George Howard, later Baron Lanerton.[41] Admiral Howard and his wife Diana Howard nee Ponsonby lived at Castle Howard along with the invalid 8th Earl of Carlisle, William George Howard (Ridgway, 2004). Brooke tells us that Admiral Howard, "observing the dilapidated state of the

---

[38] Charles Hardwick, Archdeacon of Ely, had died tragically in the Pyrenees in 1859 (See: Pickles 2004 for details).

[39] *North Wales Chronicle* 27/10/1860, 11 and *Yorkshire Gazette* 10/11/1860, 4

[40] George William Frederick Howard, 7th earl of Carlisle, died at Castle Howard on the 5 December 1864 (see Machin 2008 for details).

[41] Edward Howard raised to Baron Lanerton in 1874 (*The London Gazette* No.24050 1874, 1)

building determined in 1867 to make it more suitable for Divine worship, and more worthy of the reverence due to Almighty God" (Brooke 1916, 1-2). Does this note of religious paternalism reflect Admiral Howard's intentions or Rev Brookes' own religious perspective? The *Leeds Mercury* is more restrained in their description, saying: "The church, having become so dilapidated that its safety was imperilled, Earl Carlisle's brother, the Hon. Admiral Howard, resolved upon its complete restoration" (*Leeds Mercury* 03/06/1869, 4). Either way, the Admiral and Mrs Howard, were to remain active patrons of the restoration and rebuilding at Slingsby.

Restoration and Chancel Rebuilding

With Admiral Howard apparently having decided that the church was to be restored, the architectural practice of Austin & Johnson of Newcastle were employed, and promptly carried out a condition survey of the building (*Malton Messenger* 28/09/1867, 3). Sadly, the resulting architect's report has been lost, although small sections of it survive transcribed by Brooke (1904 and 1916). In this report Johnson wrote: "At first we thought the building would require no more than general repair, with the exception of the chancel, which was so destitute of architectural character as to render its re-construction imperative" (Johnson, 1867, as cited in Brooke, 1916, 2). This confirms the initial intention was to undertake general repairs to the medieval church, but also reveals a desire to rebuild the 1835 chancel based purely on changing architectural fashion (see also: *Leeds Mercury* 25/09/1867; *Malton Messenger* 21/09/1867). Plans to completely rebuild the chancel were a major development from 1860, when it was noted that the Earl of Carlisle had "undertaken to restore the east window" (*North Wales Chronicle* 27/10/1860, 11).

Demolition with Tower Retention

Following Johnson's condition survey, it was decided that the poor condition of the medieval church would necessitate much more drastic work. An article in the *Malton Messenger* attests to this: "The restoration of the venerable structure was resolved upon, but on a survey nothing short of the re-building of the nave and chancel was found practical" (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3). This article makes no mention of the rebuilding of the aisles, which is surprising since their poor condition had been noted (RD. RET.1, 515; and Brooke, 1916, 2) and their retention would surely have seriously hampered any rebuilding works. It is therefore assumed that the rebuilding of the aisles was also intended. So from the initial 1860 plans to restore the existing church, the process had evolved into the complete rebuilding of the body of the church, retaining only the medieval west tower (as had been done at Hovingham several years earlier). The faculty application for the

rebuilding, dated 5th March 1867, applied to "take down the *whole* of the present Church"[42] (fac.1867/10); however, the accompanying plan and elevation drawings for the replacement structure all show the 15th-century tower retained. The advertisement for a building contractor, published the same month, described the works as the "RESTORATION and partial REBUILDING" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 16/03/1867, 6) confirming that it was intended to retain and repair the medieval tower. One newspaper article states that not even the tower was to be entirely retained during this proposed restoration scheme, with the *Yorkshire Gazette* reporting: "The architects were therefore very reluctantly compelled to recommend that the church should be entirely taken down, except the lower part of the tower" which "externally appeared sufficiently stable to remain" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4).

With the restoration scheme established, All Saints' church closed on May Day 1867 (Brooke 1904, 179), which was also the traditional day of the village festival (Eastmead 1823, 235), and the demolition work commenced immediately (*Yorkshire Gazette* 18/05/1867, 9). From that day until the new church officially opened two years later, all Services were held in the adjacent tithe barn[43] (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3). An article describing the burial of a soldier provides an interesting glimpse into the churchyard during the demolition work and shortly before the foundation laying ceremony. The brief article in the *Malton Messenger* (14/09/1867, 3) notes that the gathering "who having placed themselves on the large mounds of debris and building materials which now lay scattered over the churchyard, presented a very striking appearance". This shows that the demolition work was well underway, and also suggests that much of the old church material was kept on site – presumably for reuse. An article the following week confirmed that the demolition had been completed (*Malton Messenger* 21/09/1867, 3).

---

[42] Author's italics.

[43] Location shown on fig. 5.8.

Full Rebuilding

During the 1867 demolition work, the further decision was taken to completely raze the medieval tower, resulting in the total demolition of the medieval church of All Saints, Slingsby. This decision was based on the tower's condition, as graphically described in the *Yorkshire Gazette*:

> "When the rest of the building and the upper part of the tower were taken away, the tower walls were found to be so shattered, and the mortar so perished, that it was unsafe to allow them to remain, and they therefore have been taken down."
>
> (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4).

So finally the course was set and the general repair of the medieval structure had, through a number of stages, become the complete rebuilding of the church. The original estimate for the 'restoration' of the church had been in the region of £2,500 (*Leeds Mercury*, 25/09/1867, 3); however the eventual complete rebuilding of the church would cost to the patrons was £4,575 (F5/123). A lavish Foundation Laying Ceremony was held on the site of the razed church on the 24th September 1867, with the foundation stone being officially laid by Mrs Howard. The ceremony appears to have one of great pomp and celebration, with flags, banners and streamers adorning the scaffolding poles and fixed to the highest branches of the surrounding tress (*Malton Messenger* 28/09/1867, 3). It was as part of this ceremony that a hermetically sealed time capsule was placed beneath the foundation stone, which if it survives now contains the only known photograph of the medieval church. During the course of the building of the present church, Admiral and Mrs Howard are known to have visited the site at least once, as Mrs Howard mentions visiting in a letter dated 28/08/1868 (J20/6). Finally, with the work complete and the scaffolding removed, a grand re-opening ceremony was held at the church on the 2nd June 1869 (*Leeds Mercury* 03/06/1869, 4), over two years after the church has closed.

5.5.2 Analysis of the Rebuilding Decision Process

The evolution of the restoration decision process which led to the total rebuilding of All Saints' church, Slingsby, provides fascinating hints as to the different factors that informed the desire and necessity to restore a medieval church during the mid-19th century. The principle factors known to have influenced the decision making process at Slingsby, between 1860-1869 include the condition of the fabric, changing architectural taste, and the appropriateness of the building for conducting divine worship, but they also reflect a keen awareness of the antiquity and character of the medieval church.

Condition

As demonstrated above, by 1860 the condition of the medieval church was clearly a significant factor in the rebuilding decision process. In 1823 the church was described as "a neat edifice" (Allen, 1823, 467), possibly suggesting that its condition was not considered noticeably poor, although this appears to be a common phrase in 19th-century church descriptions. The 1835 rebuilding of the chancel was very likely undertaken as a result of its poor condition, with a later description suggesting it had replaced "the *old and ruinous* chancel"[44] (*Yorkshire Gazette* 10/11/1860, 4). This clearly suggests that the 1835 rebuilding was a direct response to the poor condition of the earlier, presumably 15th-century, chancel, although Archbishop Drummond's Visitation Returns of 1764 makes no mention of any condition problems (Annesley and Hoskins, 1997, 41-2). An 1838 newspaper noted All Saints as having been "evidently subject to many vicissitudes" (*The Leeds Mercury* 27/10/1838, 4), providing the first contemporary indication that the rest of the church might also be in need of repair. This is reiterated in 1845 by Rev Walker, who noted the church had "suffered much from time, and other causes" (1845, 9). The c.1840 etching accompanying Walker's description (see fig. 5.57) shows tie-bars strengthening the upper stage of the tower, which had also lost its pinnacles.

By the 1860s we see the condition of the medieval church being clearly connected to a desire for its restoration or rebuilding. The *Rural Dean's Return* of 1865 (RD. RET.1, 515) gives a clear indication that the state of the church was no longer considered acceptable: "This church is not, upon the whole in a satisfactory state, and stands in need of restoration, or rebuilding, the South Wall being considerably out of the perpendicular". In 1867 the *Malton Messenger* went so far as to describe the church as "a very dilapidated structure, and its demolition was long needed" (28/09/1867, 3). However, it was Johnson's *Architect's Report* of 1867 that appears to have cemented the church's condition with its need for restoration and eventual rebuilding. This report stated "that the whole building was in a very insecure condition" and that it "has been so pieced and patched that it was in a dangerous state" (Johnson 1867, as cited in Brooke, 1904, 175-6). Finally, as part of the sermon at the foundation laying ceremony, the rector, Rev Carter, graphically described the church thus: "Our old church had fallen very much into decay, in fact, was dangerous, and unsuitable for divine worship. Its crumbling walls and decayed timbers seemed to suggest to us the question of the prophet Haggai." [45] (*Malton Messenger* 28/09/1867, 3). It is interesting to note that Rev Carter also links the poor condition of the church with it being

---

[44] Author's italics

[45] Haggai challenged the Israelites as to why they had not rebuilt the Temple of Jerusalem.

"unsuitable for divine worship" (*Malton Messenger* 28/09/1867, 3), which will be explored more fully in the concluding sections of this research. So, the poor condition of the fabric was both a driving factor in the initial decision to restore the structure, and also offered as the principle reason for the evolution from restoration to the full rebuilding of the church.

Changing Architectural Fashion

Whilst the condition of the church was the primary trigger for the subsequent restoration and rebuilding at Slingsby, a second important motivation appears to have been a change in architectural fashion. This is most clearly demonstrated by the Victorian approach to the 1835 chancel at Slingsby. As outlined above, the desire to rebuild the 1835 chancel was a major goal of the restoration process almost from its inception. Having been constructed less than thirty years previously, condition was unlikely to provide the impetus for this rebuilding, and all contemporary sources suggest its replacement was deemed necessary purely on grounds of architectural taste.

Just how great the shift in architectural fashion had been in less than a generation is demonstrated by an 1860 newspaper article, which in reference to the chancel rebuilding, stated that the church had been "grievously mutilated" by a "mongrel erection, destitute of character and design" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 10/11/1860, 4). The article goes on to suggest that the east window, with its "most barbarous attempt at tracery" was a "frightful distortion which now disgraces the church" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 10/11/1860, 4). Although far less acerbic, in 1863 Glynne similarly described the east window as a "poor pointed one" (Butler, 2007, 384), and Johnson's report of 1867 stated that the chancel was "so destitute of architectural character as to render its re-construction imperative" (Johnson, 1867, as cited in Brooke, 1916, 2). The contemporary documentary sources uniformly agree that by the 1860s the architectural styling of the 1835 chancel was no longer considered acceptable for a parish church.

Whilst these damning descriptions give a clear insight into how much architectural taste had changed since Queen Victoria had come to the throne, they also suggest a desire to remove other post-medieval alterations from the church. In 1845 Rev Walker (1845, 9) stated that the church had "suffered much from time, and *other causes*",[46] possibly referring to post-medieval alteration and accretions. One contemporary newspaper article stated: "It was at first intended to restore the nave, aisles and tower to their 15th century condition" (*Malton Messenger* 28/09/1867, 3). The phrasing "restore… to their 15th century condition"

---

[46] Author's italics

suggests the planned repairs included the removal of all later alterations, such as the sash windows in the south aisle. This attitude to post-medieval alteration at All Saints, Slingsby is captured in the following sentence from a contemporary newspaper: "The church was filled with hideous pews of the 17th century, and since then a gallery was inserted, and various alterations were made, that very much injured the appearance of the building" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4). Indeed, this is one of the few contemporary descriptions of the church to mention the presence of the west gallery at all, and its omission from other sources may be viewed as a reflection of their fall from fashion.

Reproduction and Retention of Style

During the late 1860s, the Middle Pointed, or Decorated Gothic, was the most fashionable architectural style being employed on ecclesiastical buildings. The majority of churches built, restored, or rebuilt during this decade, were done so in the Decorated Gothic style, as at All Saints' church, Hovingham in 1860 (see Chapter 4). At a time when medieval elements in unfashionable architectural styles, particularly the Perpendicular Gothic of the 15th-century, were being replaced with Victorian Decorated Gothic, it is surprising that the rebuilt All Saints, Slingsby is designed predominantly in the Perpendicular Gothic style.

As already discussed (see Section 5.4.2), the plan dimensions of the Victorian church broadly match those of the church it superseded. A comparison of the two plans (fig. 5.65) shows the principle variations to be the Victorian widening of the north aisle and the addition of the south porch.[47] These differences are confirmed by a contemporary newspaper report, which stated:

> It was therefore decided[48] to adhere exactly to the original ground plan, save that to procure a few additional sittings the north aisle should be a little widened; to build up again on a solid foundation the old piers and arches of the nave, and to rebuild the aisle walls and tower just as they were before, with the addition of a south porch.
>
> (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4)

This reveals that the Victorian rebuilders made a conscious decision to replicate the plan and dimensions of the demolished church, with only slight variations made for practical

---

[47] The dimensions of the pre-1867 vestry are conjectured based on the known chancel and aisle dimensions.

[48] Referring to the eventual decision to completely demolish the earlier church.

purposes. Crucially, the same article also imparts that a decision was also made to intentionally replicate the architectural detailing of the earlier church: "It was felt that in rebuilding the church, every care should be taken to preserve so far as possible its identity, and that its appearance ought to be as far as possible that of the old church, as it was before it fell in dilapidation." (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4). A similar sentiment was shared in another newspaper, which reported "The architect has followed as closely as possible the architecture of the original building" (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3). A comparison of the south elevation of the Victorian church with a reconstruction of the same elevation pre-1867 (fig. 5.66) highlights how closely Johnson's design mirrors that of the medieval church. The decision to replicate the 'identity' and appearance of the previous church accounts for the unexpected architectural styling of the 1867-9 building. This denotes an early example of a highly conservative and archaeologically informed rebuilding of a parish church. Even the low-pitched 15th-century style roofs were replicated "in accordance with the old indications" (*York Herald* 28/09/1867, 4). This is particularly significant as it was very common at the time to remove low-pitched 15th-century roofs, replacing them with the steeper-pitched roofs in the late 13th-century style. G.G. Scott (1850) had advocated such archaeologically informed restorations, but they were rarely undertaken, particularly on parish churches, and especially prior to the formation of the SPAB in 1877.

It must be noted that this archaeological approach was not strictly adhered to. The chancel and south porch are two areas of the Victorian church that clearly do not replicate the design of the earlier church; indeed they appear to demonstrate Robert Johnson's free hand in architectural design, with seemingly little or no reference made to the earlier structure. The explanation for this likely lies in the porch and chancel being the two major elements of the church for which there was no clear medieval model upon which to base a design.[49] With no precedent for the porch, Johnson designed a south porch "in accordance with the general style of the exterior of the church" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4). Despite Johnson hypothesising a 15th-century date for the chancel[50] (Brooke, 1904, 175), its Victorian design underwent a number of iterations. The *Malton Messenger* (28/09/1867, 3), perhaps erroneously, reported the chancel was to be rebuilt in the Norman style. Given the lack of known evidence for a Norman chancel, such a proposal would seem at odds with the generally conservative approach to the rebuilding at Slingsby. Another

---

[49] The chancel having been largely rebuilt in 1835, and there being no external south porch.

[50] Presumably being a 15th-century rebuilding of an earlier chancel, which was in-turn rebuilt in 1835.

contemporary newspaper reported that it was: "proposed in the first instance to rebuild the chancel in the early pointed style of the pier arches" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4). The chancel presented on Johnson's faculty drawings (fac.1867/10) is designed in the Geometric Decorated Gothic style of the late 13th-century, with a steeply pitched roofline and geometric east window tracery (fig. 5.67) - a fashionable design entirely unrelated to Johnson's own assessment of the architectural development of the medieval chancel. The final design, as seen in the present building represents "an adaption of the perpendicular style of the aisles and clerestory" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4).

Beyond the chancel and porch, the Victorian west tower is the element most altered from its medieval predecessor, despite being the only earlier element initially intended for retention. At first glance the Victorian tower appears remarkably similar to its 15th-century predecessor, but there are several minor design changes, largely reflecting practical or changed liturgical considerations. One of the main deviations in the design of the Victorian tower is the addition of the stair tower at the north-west corner, replacing the free-standing internal spiral staircase (see fig. 5.45). The Victorian tower also omits the small window from the middle stage of the south elevation, presumably because it no longer had any liturgical function. Interestingly, an aesthetic alteration to the design was also noted in a contemporary description: "as the tower was somewhat low and stunted, it is proposed to make it a few feet higher" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4).

Despite these alterations, the tower also represents the most archaeologically informed reconstruction in the Victorian church. The pinnacles at each corner of the current tower do not appear in descriptions or the depiction of the tower prior to 1867; however it is reported that these were added to the Victorian tower design "according to indications that existed of such adjuncts to the old tower." (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4). The reuse of cross slab fragments in the lower stage of the tower, likely reflecting their earlier reuse in the 15th-century tower, similarly demonstrates that the Victorian rebuilding was archaeological in its reconstruction and that "The lower part of the tower [was] re-built as it formerly existed" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4).

Despite the Victorian alterations, such an archaeological reconstruction[51] signifies that the Victorian church may be viewed largely as a reconstruction of the medieval design, rather than simply a reproduction of the church as it appeared in 1867. This shows a detailed understanding of the development of the building and its medieval architectural features.

---

[51] Further demonstrated in the Perpendicular tracery of the south aisle windows that were restored from surviving fragments (as noted in Section 5.4.4)

Why might this approach have been undertaken? There was obviously an appreciation of the architectural and historical interest of the medieval church, which one contemporary newspaper article described as "of much interest to the architectural ecclesiologist" (*Malton Messenger* 05/06/1869, 3). Several other accounts (see *Leeds Mercury* 03/06/1869, 4; Brooke 1916, 3) also highlight this awareness of the architectural development of the medieval church and, more importantly, note its planned replication. This is most evident in the *Leeds Mercury* (03/06/ 1869, 4), which stated: "The reproduction of the mixed architecture and the retention of the ancient monuments have been carefully studied". As discussed in Section 5.2.2 (Nave), the nave arcades of the Victorian church are not symmetrical, due to the half column springing at the western end of the south aisle. This suggests that their current form mirrors that of the earlier church. Importantly, this suggests that the Victorian church replicates the unique architectural development of the old church, not just its predominant architectural styles.

5.5.3 Analysis of Reused Material

Having discussed the intentional reproduction of the medieval church's plan and architectural development, this section will consider the reuse of earlier fabric within the Victorian church. The 1867 faculty application for the rebuilding of All Saint's Church, Slingsby (fac.1867/10), contains a line allowing the applicants "to make use of or sell the old materials as may be deemed expedient". At first glance there appears to be little reused material in the Victorian church, which is perhaps surprising given the stated desire to retain the character of the medieval church.

It is interesting to note that most descriptions of the present church make reference to the reuse of material. For virtually all descriptions of the Victorian church - contemporary and modern - to mention the reuse of material, suggests it was, and is, considered significant; however, these sources provide very differing levels of detail on the extent of reuse. Whilst most sources offer one or two examples of the reused fabric in the church, with the exception of the knight effigy these reused elements appear chosen at random. For example, the Victorian County History suggests "nothing remains of the structure of any previous building except, perhaps, some of the voussoirs and a corbel capital of the north arcade, which appear to be 13th-century work re-used" (Page 1914, 560). Morris (1904, 352), who mentions very little other reused material, is the only other source to reference reused voussoirs. Brooke (1916, 3-6) is the only documentary source to attempt anything like a comprehensive list of reused material, and even this does not represent the full extent of spolia present. As has been demonstrated above, the earlier church at Slingsby was not

richly endowed with medieval sculptural elements. Equally it contained little early (Anglo-Saxon and Romanesque) work to exhibit the antiquity of Christian worship in the village. The following section will thematically explore the context of the reused material identified in Section 5.3 as reused within the Victorian church of All Saints, Slingsby.

<u>Reuse of Architectural Elements</u>

It has already been revealed that the architectural details of each phase of the medieval church were replicated in the Victorian church. Externally all of these replicated details, such as the windows and parapets, have been executed in Whitby sandstone and are clearly 19th-century work. Brooke noted in 1904 that "The greatest care was taken to preserve, as far as possible, the architectural features of the older building, and whatever old relics the church contained" (Brooke 1904, 179). Despite this assertion, parts of the north aisle arcade and the porch benches represent the only reused architectural elements within the present church. Whilst there is significant reuse of material in the north aisle arcade, it is a mixture of medieval (piers, corbel and voussoir) and Victorian work (capitals, bases, corbel and voussoir). Johnson's plan for the rebuilding (fac.1867/10) depicts the north arcade piers in the same black ink as the west tower, suggesting they were always intended to be retained within their original position (see fig. 5.45).

As well as being a significant factor in the extent of rebuilding, the condition of the church also provides a possible explanation for this lack of reused architectural elements in the Victorian church. For example, Johnson's *Report* states that "the bases and some of the capitals of the pillars [were] being crushed and split by the superincumbent weight, and the pillars [are] very much out of the perpendicular" (Johnson 1867, as cited in Brooke 1904, 175-6). The architectural elements described as being in a poor state by Johnson, corresponds with the Victorian elements of the reconstructed north arcade. Given the clear desire to retain the form and character of the earlier church, that so little material was reused offers a striking insight into just how poor the condition of the medieval church must have been by 1867.

<u>Reuse of Sculptural and Funerary Elements</u>

Whilst very few medieval architectural features were reused, many of the pre-restoration funerary monuments have been reinstated in the Victorian church. Indeed, all such monuments described in pre-1867 sources (e.g. Allen, 1823; Eastmead 1823; Walker, 1845; Whellan, 1859) are still to be found in the church today. These reused monuments are

grouped into two distinct areas of the church, with grave slab fragments reused in the tower exterior, and complete monuments reused within the building.

It is not known if the grave slab fragments in the tower have been reset in their previous locations, but that they are dispersed around all three elevations make this seem likely (as opposed to being set together as a treasury of decorated stonework). The original locations of the reused monuments within the church are known (as discussed in Section 3 above), with most of them being located in the medieval choir. A contemporary source (*Malton Messenger* 28/09/1867, 3) records that it was initially intended to reinstate these monuments in their original locations within the rebuilt church. An article from the previous week (*Malton Messenger* 21/09/1867, 3) also stated that: "The tomb, skeleton, and effigy have been preserved, and will be restored to the chancel of a beautiful transition Norman church." This decision was obviously changed at some stage during the course of the rebuilding, and many of these funerary monuments were relocated to the south chancel aisle. Indeed, with three complete medieval grave slabs and an altar stone, this space now forms a mini-treasury of reused funerary monuments in the church. Such treasuries of antiquities, particularly of grave slabs, are a very common feature of Victorian restorations. Whilst effigies appear to have been commonly reused within the church, as will be seen at Appleton-le-Street and Amotherby, it is more common for other grave slab treasuries to be formed in the Victorian porch (as a St Helen, Amotherby, All Saints North Street, York, and many others). The marble tablet commemorating Mary Henning in the north chancel aisle, and which is not currently affixed to the church, is the only reused funerary monument to have been returned to approximately its original location.

It appears that the incorporation of architectural spolia in the Victorian rebuilding of Slingsby reflects a desire to retain medieval features of the earlier church. The pre-1867 church had undergone some alteration during the post-medieval period; however, unlike at Hovingham (see Chapter 4) much of the medieval church fabric survived through to the demolition of the church in 1867. Despite this, the church contained little in terms of rich medieval architectural detailing, and much of what was there must have been in such poor condition as to render its reuse in the Victorian church either impossible, or at least not structurally or aesthetically desirable. Therefore the extremely poor condition of surviving medieval elements appears to have largely dictated the amount of reused material found in the church today. Finally, it is interesting to note the lack of reused material in the chancel. This may represent the religious significance of this space, or more convincingly (assuming an attempt to reuse material within its earlier context), it reflects the lack of medieval fabric to survive the 1835 rebuilding of that space.

5.5.4 The Decision Makers

Sadly, little documentary evidence exists to illuminate the decision process that resulted in the eventual rebuilding at All Saints, Slingsby. However, by examining these key stakeholders, some conclusions may be drawn about both the decision-making process and the driving forces that led to the rebuilding.

<u>Incumbent</u>

The Rev William Carter (fig. 5.68) had been rector at All Saints, Slingsby for twelve years when the church was razed and the rebuilding begun. After completing a BA (Mathematics third class) at Queen's College, Cambridge, William Carter was ordained in December 1831, and served as Perpetual Curate at St Michael's, Malton from 1843-55 and Rector of All Saints Burythorpe from 1848-55 (Anon. 1865, 111). Following the death of the Rev Walker, Carter was installed as Rector of All Saints, Slingsby in December 1855 (*Jackson's Oxford Journal* 29/12/1855, 5). Rev Carter was to serve as rector at Slingsby for 26 years, until his death at the Slingsby rectory on 2 June 1882, aged 78 (*Bury & Norwich Post* 13/06/1882, 7).

Rev Carter is known to have lectured locally for both the Church Missionary Society[52] (*York Herald* 14/08/1847, 5) and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (*York Herald* 31/10/1857, 5), suggesting he had a strong missionary and evangelical focus. As detailed above, the possible restoration at All Saints, Slingsby appears to have been first mooted in 1860, some five years after Carter's installation at the church. Neither of his two previous parish churches was restored during his incumbency,[53] so Rev Carter's experience of churches under his care was entirely of unrestored buildings. Newspaper articles record Rev Carter's attendance at several foundation ceremonies and re-openings of restored or rebuilt parish churches in the area (e.g. Whitwell (*York Herald* 25/08/1860, 10)), so he was clearly aware of the other church restorations occurring locally.[54] We know from Mrs Diana Howard's letters that Rev Carter visited Castle Howard and was socially

---

[52] With Rev Charles Hodgson – see Chapter 6.

[53] Burythorpe was entirely rebuilt in 1857-8 (List Description – see Appendix 2.6), and Malton was heavily restored in two campaigns of 1858 and 1883 (Page 1914, 534).

[54] Newspaper records for the 1860s show that the foundation-laying ceremonies and, in particular, the re-opening ceremonies for restored parish churches drew many of the local clergy and gentry from Ryedale, and even further afield. Many of the clergy appear to have attended numerous such events each year.

acquainted with the Howards (C.H.A J20/6). Crucially, we also know from his entry in the *Rural Dean's Return* of 1865 (RD. RET.1, 515), that he wanted the church to be restored or rebuilt. This is supported by a contemporary newspaper, which reported: "The want of a new church at Slingsby has long been thought requisite by the rector and his parishioners, consequent upon the decayed and crumbling state of the old structure, which was a very ancient one and not deemed quite safe for public worship." (*Malton Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4). From this limited evidence, it seems apparent that Rev Carter was an active supporter of the restoration and rebuilding at Slingsby; and may have actively pursued its restoration with the patron.

The Patron

There are two patrons who need to be considered as stakeholders in the rebuilding; the first being George W. F. Howard, 7th Earl of Carlisle (1802-1864). Although it did not eventuate within the Earl's lifetime, proposals for the restoration of the church can be associated with him from as early as 1860. The 7th Earl had provided land and funding towards the construction of a new church at Welburn (1858-60), and was involved in several other church building projects around the Castle Howard Estate (see Gent, 2010), so it is highly plausible that a restoration at Slingsby was earnestly planned before the Earl's health deteriorated.

As discussed above, the eventual patron for the rebuilding was Admiral Edward Granville George Howard (fourth son of G.W.F. Howard) and his wife, Mrs Diana Howard. Following the death of the 7th Earl, the Howard family continued to be associated with a number of building programmes during the 1860s-70s, including the construction of The Carlisle Memorial in 1867 (*Leeds Mercury* 14/08/1867, 3), and the remodelling of the chapel and alterations to the West Wing at Castle Howard (from 1870). Due to the invalidity of the 8th Earl (Rector of Londesborough), it appears Admiral & Mrs Howard were often the public face of the Castle Howard Estate, and individually patronised a number of projects.

Sadly, Admiral Howard's private papers have been lost, but a number of the Hon. Diana Howard's letters survive (J20/6), as does the account for the rebuilding (F5/123). These reveal that Admiral Howard and Mrs Howard visited the building site at least once, and that they both appear to have been actively engaged in the restoration and rebuilding of the church at Slingsby. Following the rebuilding, they remained involved with the patronage of the church, including the purchase of land for extending the churchyard in 1871 (CD. Add.1871/1), and attending important services, such as the installation of the organ in 1871 (*Malton Gazette* 15/04/1871, 4).

The *Leeds Mercury* (03/06/1869, 4) stated that "the Hon. Admiral Howard, resolved upon its complete restoration", strongly suggesting that it was Admiral Howard who instigated the restoration project that lead to the church's rebuilding. At the foundation laying ceremony, the Rev Carter thanked "Admiral and Mrs Howard for their unsolicited munificence, in undertaking to rebuild the church" (*Malton Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4). Although the cost of the rebuilding was defrayed by subscription, Admiral Howard essentially covered the entire cost. It seems very likely that he and Mrs Howard were directly responsible for the decision to restore, and then to rebuild the church (a decision which more than doubled the initial cost of the works).

The Architect

The next stakeholder to be considered is the architect for the Victorian church, Robert James Johnson. The architectural firm employed to carry out a condition survey of the medieval church in 1867, and to subsequently design the replacement church, was Austin and Johnson, of Newcastle. Thomas Austin had been in poor health and died that year (D.S.A. 2008), leaving R. J. Johnson (fig. 5.69) as the principle architect involved at All Saints, Slingsby. In order to consider Johnson's potential influence on the rebuilding at Slingsby, it may be helpful to briefly outline his career as an architect, and where his involvement at Slingsby sits within this.

Johnson was articled to John Middleton of Darlington in the late 1840s before becoming an assistant in the London office of Sir George Gilbert Scott, where he worked from 1849 until 1858 (Brodie et al. 2001, 504). In 1861 Johnson became an Associate of the RIBA, after being proposed by Sir G. G. Scott, Sir M. D. Wyatt and W. Burges (Felstead 1973, 163), all prominent Victorian architects. He was elected a Fellow of the Institute in 1865 and was elected President of the Northern Architectural Association in the same year (Felstead 1973, 163). It was also the year Johnson went into partnership with Thomas Austin as 'Austin and Johnson' in Newcastle, purchasing the practice of the late architect, John Dobson (1787-1865). In 1868, during the rebuilding of All Saints', Slingsby, Johnson was appointed Honorary Secretary of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland, a group outspoken in its advocacy of non-destructive restoration (Faulkner 1995, 5). Immediately following the rebuilding at Slingsby (1870-5) he refitted the Chapel at Castle Howard and made internal alterations to the West Wing at Castle Howard, again for Admiral Howard. During the 1970s, Johnson undertook a number of church restorations in the North East of England, including at the church of St Mary, Stannington, where he employed a very similar approach to that at Slingsby, even

down to the reuse of the medieval north arcade (List Description – Appendix 2.7). Finally, in 1886 Johnson was elected as a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries (F.S.A.), attesting to his antiquarian interests.

It can be clearly seen from his various appointments that R.J. Johnson was well regarded as both an architect and antiquarian. During his early career working in the office of George Gilbert Scott, Johnson would have known and worked with the leading church architects of the time, including G.G. Scott himself and George Bodley. Perhaps more importantly, he was connected to many of the upcoming architects who were to become the leading lights of late Victorian architecture, such as: E. R. Robson, J. J. Stevenson, C. Hodgson-Fowler, T. G. Jackson, T. Garner, G. G. Scott Junior and J. O. Scott (Faulkner 1995, 3). Despite working away from London for most of his career, Johnson remained well connected, and seemingly very well regarded. Indeed, Johnson is said to have been a particular favourite of G. G. Scott, and that his work was admired by G. E. Street (Faulkner 1995, 8). It has been suggested that Johnson's chancel design at Slingsby may have influenced the work of G. Bodley (Giles Proctor pers. comm. 2011). His obituary in *The Builder* (07/05/1892, 353) concludes "Mr. Johnson was of the very few men standing quite in the front rank of the profession, who continued to practise in the country instead of being absorbed in the great vortex of London."

This all serves to demonstrate that despite his comparative isolation from London, Johnson would have been very well aware of the wider restoration debates across Victorian England. Indeed, Johnson was working in G. G. Scott's London office in the year (1850) that Scott published *A Plea for the Faithful Restoration of our Ancient Churches*. Johnson himself waded into the restoration debate in his work *Specimens of Early French Architect* (1864), which amounted to a "plea for a more conservative and antiquarian approach to the restoration of historic buildings" (Faulkner 1995, 4). Although Johnson's own church restorations could sometimes result in the loss of much medieval work, especially early works such as at Slingsby and Stannington, he was clearly ardently against the principle of destructive restoration. In 1861, he stated that "I cannot forbear remarking how destructive and bad most modern restoration has been; we in our pride, set up for ourselves a notion of what a building should be, and at once ruthlessly sweep away the work of six centuries of men" (Johnson 1861, as cited in Faulkner 1995, 4). Many church restorers had focused on returning churches to an 'ideal', and usually earlier, form; in contrast, Johnson's approach to restoration was conditioned by his love of history and medieval antiquity (Faulkner 1995, 5) and sought to retain the essential character and history of the building.

This restoration philosophy is writ large across the rebuilding of All Saints, Slingsby, and Johnson's influence cannot be doubted. Johnson's antiquarian and archaeological interests are evident in the in situ reuse of structural elements, such as the north arcade, in the reconstruction of the south aisle tracery, and in the replacement of the lost tower pinnacles. That a similar restoration took place (even including the reuse of the north aisle arcade) at St Mary's, Stannington, Northumberland in 1871, confirms Johnson's influence on the design approach at Slingsby. Johnson was clearly a strong influence on the decisions made during the planned restoration and subsequent rebuilding at Slingsby. His report of the condition of the medieval church directly led to its demolition, although Brooke (1916, 2) records that Johnson only reluctantly made this recommendation. Sadly, it is not known why Austin and Johnson were chosen as the architectural firm for this project. It is possible that G. Gilbert Scott may have personally recommended Johnson to the patron, Admiral Howard, or alternatively, the Admiral's nephew, George Howard, later 9th Earl of Carlisle, may well have known and recommended Johnson (Proctor pers. comm. 2011). Johnson clearly maintained a good working relationship with Admiral Howard and upon finishing the rebuilding at Slingsby, Johnson was commissioned to undertake the expensive refitting of the chapel at Castle Howard from 1870-5.

The Parishioners

The final, and often neglected, stakeholders to be considered are the Parishioners, those local people who regularly visited and worshiped in the church. Despite the newspaper report that the rebuilding was long desired by both rector and parishioners (*Malton Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4), it is remembered within Slingsby village that not all of the parishioners were happy about the rebuilding of their church. Peter Smithson (pers. comm. 2011) recalls his elderly relatives stating that they much preferred the medieval church and were unhappy about the rebuilding. This indicates that the parishioners were not the driving force for rebuilding, or at least not as a consensus. There are no newspaper comments or documentary evidence to support this, but this is perhaps unsurprising, given that Slingsby was a rural village and the wealthy patron for the rebuilding was part of the Castle Howard Estate, and thus was their landlord and social benefactor.

5.5.5 Slingsby Case Study Conclusion

The employment of an archaeological methodology to record and analyse All Saints' church, Slingsby, has elucidated the previously unconsidered story of the Victorian rebuilding of this parish church. Not only has this methodology uncovered the medieval development and post-medieval alteration of the church prior to its 19th-century

rebuilding, it has revealed the complex path taken from restoration to eventual total rebuilding. As at Hovingham, this demonstrates that the 19th-century campaign was not simply a case of sweeping away the old church and replacing it with a new, unrelated Victorian church. The Victorian restorers at All Saints, Slingsby, were keenly aware of the antiquity of the church, and the restoration campaign clearly sought to preserve the medieval character of the building, including the reinstatement of lost medieval elements and the removal of post-medieval alterations to the church.

The desire to rebuild the 1835 chancel at Slingsby highlights a major shift in architectural fashion, reflecting the developing Gothic Revival from the early to the mid-19th century. Although little is known about the 1835 chancel, the etching of c.1840 (see fig. 5.57) depicts a simple Gothic-style structure with intersecting tracery in the east window. Interestingly, this window looks remarkably similar to that found in the east window at nearby Stonegrave Minster prior to its 1860 rebuilding (fig. 5.70). Were these perhaps of a similar date? The desire to rebuild this "mongrel erection" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 10/11/1860, 4) aligns with the wish to re-medievalise the parish church, as seen by the removal of post-medieval alterations, and the reinstatement of lost medieval elements, such as the south aisle window tracery and tower pinnacles.

With some small deviation, it can be seen that the Victorian church at Slingsby closely follows the plan and dimensions of its medieval predecessor. All importantly, it has also been shown that the Victorian church of All Saints, Slingsby, recreates both the architectural styling and the architectural development of the medieval church. Despite the complete loss of the medieval structure, the 19th-century works at Slingsby were in essence a large-scale restoration and reconstruction, driven by necessity of its poor condition, rather than an intentional full rebuilding. Reflecting a strong antiquarian awareness, where possible, medieval architectural and funerary elements were reused within the Victorian church, usually within their (believed) original context. It is hypothesised the antiquarian leanings of the architect, R. J. Johnson are the key to the archaeological-informed conservative rebuilding of All Saints' church, Slingsby.

This case study again challenges any assumed disjunction between Victorian parish churches and earlier church fabric on the same site, instead revealing a manifest continuity of plan, design and fabric through from the medieval church to its Victorian incarnation, with only the intervening, post-medieval, history being expunged from the story. This thesis has reveals the complex mix of factors which resulted in the negotiated fabric of Victorian rebuilding. At a time when the standard narratives of the Gothic Revival suggest

Slingsby should have been reconstructed in the Geometric Gothic style, we find a building largely in the Perpendicular Gothic. This divergence from form is elucidated by an archaeological approach to the study of the church. It reveals two previously unknown significances of All Saints' church, Slingsby. The first significance being that the Victorian restorers had a high level of awareness of, and appreciation of, the complex architectural development of the medieval church, and actively sought to replicate that development and retain the character of the earlier church. Secondly, and deriving from the first, is the archaeological approach that was applied to the rebuilding. Akin to the "Conservative" restoration process espoused by the Ecclesiologist, G. G. Scott, and many others, it was highly unusual for the archaeological imperative to trump architectural fashion in practice. This led to the building of a largely Perpendicular Gothic style building well before such a style came into fashion amongst late Victorian ecclesiastical architects. It is this, along with its archaeological approach, which led English Heritage to re-designate All Saints' church, Slingsby from Grade II to Grade II* (Appendix 2.8) in 2012.

This case study again highlights the need for those parish churches that were rebuilt during the 19th century to be treated differently from newly designed and built Victorian churches. An assumed lack of continuity of church building at Slingsby had led to the church's significance being judged solely on the Victorian church as a new design by a 19th-century architect. The methodology employed by the study has revealed that far from being a new Victorian church, All Saints, Slingsby, may be viewed more as a re-packaged iteration of the medieval parish church, reflecting a considered continuance of the visual identity of the parish church.

Chapter 6: St Michael, Barton-le-Street

6.1 Introduction

The church of St Michael, Barton-le-Street, was constructed in 1870-1 following the demolition of an earlier church on the same site, and will form the focus of this third case study. Planning for this restoration and rebuilding campaign commenced early in 1869, coinciding with the final stages of the rebuilding at All Saints' church in the adjacent village of Slingsby. Known locally as St Michael and All Angels, the patron for the Victorian rebuilding was the Hon. Hugo Meynell-Ingram, with the new church being designed by the Leeds-based architects, Perkin and Son. The present structure incorporates over two hundred and fifty pieces of reused Romanesque sculpture - stylistically dating to c.1160 – which were all taken from the earlier structure. Barton-le-Street was comparatively well known in the late 18th and early 19th centuries for its 'curious' sculpture, which was commonly held to have come from a monastic church.[55] Despite its wealth of exceptional 12th-century sculpture, today St Michael is not a well-known or celebrated church. The church was listed in 1954 at Grade II (see Appendix 2.9), reflecting its status as a small 19th-century parish church by a minor architect. During a later listing review, the English Heritage assessor argued that the surviving Romanesque sculpture warranted a higher designation for the church, but this was rejected on account of the Victorian rebuilding (Grenville pers. comm. 2012). The 1954 list description focused primarily on the reused 12th-century sculpture, highlighting Victorian work for differentiation, along with a basic architectural description of the Victorian church. Following a re-assessment of the church based on research carried out by the author for an MA Archaeology of Buildings dissertation (Smith 2009), English Heritage announced in November 2013 that the church was to be redesignated at Grade I (Appendix 2.10).

Once described as being "famous for its rich collection of Norman sculptures" (Thompson 1909, 122), Barton-le-Street, has received some scholarly attention, particularly around the turn of the 20th century. The late Victorian incumbent at Barton-le-Street, Dr Charles Cox, was also the editor of *The Reliquary and Illustrated Archaeologist* periodical in which he

---

[55] E.g. Baines 1823, 412; Lewis 1848, 164; *York Herald* 16/04/1870, 10. The most common theorem held that the sculpture was reused from St Mary's Abbey, York.

published an article on the church in 1900 (Cox 1900, 213-219). The antiquarian Dr Romilly Allen (1889, 153-8), and a later incumbent, Rev H.E. Ketchley (1907, 1-13) both also produced papers on St Michael. Interestingly, Allen and Cox each explore the wider context of the church and its rebuilding, rather than just focusing on its reused Romanesque sculptural elements – in marked contrast to much of the modern scholarship on parish churches. In November 1907, Rev Ketchley delivered a lecture to the Yorkshire Archaeological Society on St Michael's reused corbel stones (Anon. 1908a, 4), presumably based on his published description. A number of modern scholars, including Zarnecki (1953, 36-7), Butler (1982, 85-6), and Wood (1994 59-90; 2012, 45-48) have made passing note of St Michael, all exclusively referencing its reused Romanesque sculpture. Despite his well-known dislike of Neo-Romanesque architecture (Mowl 2000, 7), Pevsner described St Michael as "a sumptuous small Norman church, rebuilt without any restraint" (1966, 73).

Unparalleled archival sources for the pre-restoration church at Barton-le-Street allow for a much more detailed reconstruction and nuanced analysis than was possible at Hovingham and Slingsby. This case study will argue that the 19th-century church of St Michael represents a conservation-led restoration of the medieval church. Crucially, it will demonstrate that archaeological examination of the Victorian church can elucidate the context, and thus the significance, of its reused Romanesque sculpture. The 1870-1 rebuilding of St Michael's church also provides valuable insight into the Victorian reuse of sculptural material and the development of conservation theory at a parish church level.

6.1.1 Historical Background – Barton-le-Street village

The small village of Barton-le-Street lies between Slingsby and Appleton-le-Street, being approximately five miles to the west of Malton (fig. 6.1). Recorded in Domesday (Williams & Palliser 1992, Folio 305V) as Barton(e) or Bartun(e), the appellation 'la strada' or 'le street' first appears in the documentary record in 1614 (English Place-Name Society 1928, 47), reflecting the village's location along the former Roman road. Domesday records that the pre-Conquest manor of Barton-le-Street was held by Waltheof, Earl of Northumbria (Williams & Palliser 1992, Folio 305V), who was initially allowed to keep his estates after the Conquest, but was executed in 1076 following his involvement in two rebellions against William I (Dalton 1994, 12). William I then granted the manor to his half-brother, Robert, Count of Mortain (Page 1914, 472), with Barton-le-Street becoming one of two hundred and fifteen (215) Yorkshire manors held by the Count of Mortain (Williams & Palliser 1992, 31). By 1086 the manor at Barton-le-Street was held by Richard de Surdeval (Page 1914, 472), presumably as tenant. The Count of Mortain was stripped of his estates in 1088

for plotting against William Rufus, and it is likely that full possession of Barton-le-Street passed to Richard de Surdeval at that time (Page 1914, 472). It is known that Ralph Paynel held the estate by 1089, possibly as an inheritance through his marriage to Maud, daughter of Richard de Surdeval (Fleming 1991, 166). The manor then passed through the Paynel line, but was often challenged and forfeited throughout the 12th and early 13th centuries (see Clay 1939 for details). By 1205 King John had seized the estate from Fulk Paynel's descendants and granted it to Geoffrey Luttrell, a descendant by marriage of William Paynell (Page 1914, 472). Records indicate that the Paynel interest in the estate was not maintained (Clay 1939, 46) and in 1231 Barton-le-Street was granted to Richard de Grey, whose descendants held it for a number of generations (Page 1914, 473). Finally, by 1639 the manor at Barton-le-Street had passed to Sir Arthur Ingram (Lawton 1842, 514), whose descendants held it into the 20th century.

6.1.2 Historical Account – St Michael's Church

The earliest documentary evidence for a church at Barton-le-Street comes from the Domesday Book, which records a church in 1086 (Williams & Palliser 1992, Folio 305V). In 1089 Ralph Paynell gifted the church to Holy Trinity Priory, York, at its re-founding as a dependency of Marmoutier Abbey, France (Dalton 1994, 137). Archbishop Thomas II later confirmed the appropriation of Barton-le-Street church by Holy Trinity, subject to a competent vicarage being assigned. However, this appears never to have happened and Barton-le-Street remained an ancient rectory (Addleshaw 1956, 14). Consequently Holy Trinity Priory held the advowson, but never had the formal right to claim tithes from Barton-le-Street (Addleshaw 1956, 14), which perhaps explains why successive generations of the Paynel family confirmed the gift of the church to Holy Trinity throughout the 11th and 12th centuries (Page 1914, 475).

Holy Trinity Priory was often challenged at Barton-le-Street so the advowson of the church is sometimes difficult to track. It is known that Holy Trinity presented William d'Eu, Precentor of York Minster, from 1139 and that he remained rector at Barton-le-Street until his death c.1173-4 (Butler 1982, 93-4). The monks of Holy Trinity then took direct possession of the church, but records state that Fulk Paynel broke down the church doors and ejected the prior and monks of Holy Trinity, before installing his third son, Hascuil, by force (Clay 1939, 201).[56] Hascuil, who also held a Prebendary of York, remained in possession of the church until his death (some time between 1217-

---

[56] Holy Trinity claimed the following incident happened during the war between King Henry and the king of Scotland, presumably referring to the Revolt of 1173-4.

20), but was never admitted or presented by a bishop or archbishop (Clay 1939, 201). It appears that following Hascuil's death Holy Trinity Priory briefly regained possession of the church (Butler 1982, 93). The next rector was then successfully presented by Richard de Grey, after which it appears that the advowson passed with the lords of the manor and was thus held by the de Grey family until the reign of James I, after which it passed to the Lords Irvin (Lawton 1842, 514). In the mid-19th century the patronage of the St Michael's church was held by the Hon. Hugo Francis Meynell-Ingram, of Hoar Cross, Staffordshire, and Temple Newsam, Yorkshire.

The astonishing array of reused Romanesque sculpture at Barton-le-Street is not displayed as part of a Victorian stone treasury or museum (as will be seen at St Helen's, Amotherby (Chapter 8)), but is rather reincorporated within the fabric of the present church, and is complimented by fine Victorian stone carving. Whilst some of this Romanesque sculpture has received academic attention, it been always been treated without any consideration of its original context, or analysis of its current context. As will be demonstrated in this chapter, an archaeological methodology for investigating this church greatly enhances our understanding of the present structure, and reveals the true significance of the reused Romanesque sculpture. This archaeological methodology also provides insights into Victorian restoration decisions, as well as elucidating the design, and arrangement of the lost medieval church and its post-medieval arrangement.

Having explored the wider historical context of Barton-le-Street and St Michael's church, the following sections will describe and analyse the current structure based on a visual and measured archaeological survey carried out between 2009 and 2011. Reused material will be identified and then combined with documentary research to reconstruct the church as it appeared immediately prior to its total demolition in 1870. Information from the demolition of the earlier structure will also be used for this reconstruction, as well as for exploring potential earlier phases of the structure. This digital reconstruction informs a detailed description of the lost, earlier church, allowing for the relationship between the two structures – old and new – to be explored. Finally this chapter examines the factors relating to the rebuilding of the church and also the reuse of material in the new structure.

6.2 Description of the Current Church

The present church of St Michael, Barton-le-Street (fig. 6.2), was constructed in 1870-1 following the complete demolition of the earlier church on the same site. Designed by the Leeds architects Perkin & Son, a contemporary periodical (Anon.1870, 180) reveals the names of many of the contractors involved in its construction: the builder was Mr John

Thornton of Slingsby; the clerk of works was Mr Isaac Newton; the carpentry was executed by Mr John Tomlinson, of Leeds; [57] and the sculpture was undertaken by Messrs Maw and Ingle, also of Leeds. Uniformly decorated in the Romanesque style, the present church comprises an aisleless nave with north porch, and a chancel with south vestry (fig. 6.3). The church is constructed from coursed ashlar of locally quarried limestone, with calcareous sandstone (probably Birdsall sandstone) used for the external decorative elements such as the window surrounds and plinth. The nave and chancel roofs, both steeply pitched, are covered with regular, grey slates. It is not the purpose of this study to document and describe the wealth of reused Romanesque sculpture dating to c.1160 sculpture in detail (see Smith 2009 & 2012).

6.2.1 Setting for the Current Church

St Michael's is situated between Barton-le-Street's two village greens, on the northern edge of the village, close to the present B1257 (fig. 6.4). On sloping ground, the large churchyard is accessed by gateways from the western green (principal entrance) and from the larger green to the north. Gravel pathways lead from these gates to the church, which rests on a levelled platform in the hill's gentle slope. The churchyard is enclosed by a low stone wall, and there are a number of gravestones, principally dating from the 19th-century, set throughout. Immediately to the west of the present porch is a large, rough stone, featuring a rectangular socket in its top (fig. 6.5). This stone is generally held to be a pre-Conquest cross base (see Appendix 2.8); however W.G. Collingwood (1907, 268), stated that this cross base "does not seem to be pre-Norman"; a statement immediately challenged in a review published in *The Reliquary and Illustrated Archaeologist* (Anon. 1908b, 69).[58]

6.2.2 Nave

The aisleless nave is of four bays (fig. 6.6), with the bay rhythm externally delineated by single-light windows and flat buttresses. The nave is uniformly decorated in the Neo-Romanesque style throughout. Externally the nave measures 18.6m by 7.9m with the walls resting upon a low, moulded sandstone plinth that follows around the buttresses. The Romanesque-style flat buttresses between each bay feature corner-shafting, and have simple, offset sandstone capstones. A highly decorative corbel table runs across the top of the north and south elevations, with a moulded stringcourse separating it from the plain,

---

[57] The *York Herald* (24/06/1871, 9) states that the timber carving was all carried out by William Matthews, of Leeds.

[58] Presumably this review was by the then Rector of Barton-le-Street, Rev Charles Cox.

low parapet above. The corbel table, which is interrupted by the buttresses, comprises individually carved corbels, depicting animals and human faces, beneath an upper course of plain arches (fig. 6.7). The four bays of the southern elevation each contain a central window, featuring a single, large, round-arched light, with a small chamfer (fig. 6.8). These lights sit within a recessed arch window surround containing nook shafts with scalloped cushion capitals, supporting a single order of roll moulding and wide hollow chamfer. Running immediately below the windows is a moulded stringcourse, which is interrupted by the buttresses. A roll-billet stringcourse runs across each bay at the height of the window-arch springing, and follows around the top of the window arches. As with the lower stringcourse, this is interrupted by the buttresses between each bay. The nave north elevation is architecturally identical to the south elevation, with the exception of the porch, which projects from the second bay (from the west).

At both the north-west and south-west angles of the nave are flat clasping buttresses with corner-shafting, in the Romanesque style. These clasping buttresses are both extensively weathered and most of the corner-shafts have been lost at the upper level. The gabled west elevation (fig. 6.9) contains two single-light windows matching those of the north and south elevations, and features the same moulded plinth and stringcourses. Within the gable is a large, chamfered roundel window surrounded by roll and hollow chamfer mouldings, and an outer order of roll billet moulding. At the apex of the gable is a tall bellcote constructed largely in calcareous sandstone, which rests on a corbel table of five large corbels beneath chamfered arches. These large corbels are heavily weathered and appear to be carved from limestone, suggesting they are reused 12th-century work (fig. 6.10). The bellcote contains two bells, each hung within narrow round-arches within a roll moulded round arch with imposts, nook-shafts and cushion capitals. The two bells were recast and hung in 1888 at the expense of Mrs Emily Meynell Ingram, wife of the late patron (Bulmer 1890, 645). A column with large scalloped cushion capitals separates the two bell arches. All of the bellcote capitals are heavily weathered, but those of the nook shafts appear to be in Hildenley limestone and finely carved, again suggesting they may be reused 12th century work (fig. 6.11). The gabled bellcote has a carved cross at its apex. Externally the eastern gable elevation is almost entirely occluded by the chancel, but the gable is coped and features a Celtic cross at its apex.

Internally, the nave features a central passageway between two rows of wooden bench pews (fig. 6.12). The floor is covered with geometric tiles, including some encaustic tiles, while the pews rest on slightly raised timber flooring. The windows all sit within reveals styled similarly to their exterior decoration, with the window splay sitting within round-

arched surrounds with nook shafts. The nook shaft capitals are all simple cushion capitals, but their detailing alternates between each window (fig. 6.13). The majority of the nave windows contain pale green quarries of cathedral glass in a diaper pattern within a thin red border. On the south side the windows in the second bay (from the west) and the easternmost bay contain stained glass. The memorial window glass in the second bay commemorates Elizabeth Borden, and the matching stained glass window in the eastern bay commemorates Francis and Elizabeth Carr, the parents of Elizabeth Borden. A plaque within the window reveal records that Elizabeth died in 1855, and Francis in 1873, and while no Faculties survive for these two stained glass windows, they stylistically date to mid-1870s (McWilliams pers. comm. 2104). Mounted in the centre of the south wall is a brass memorial tablet commemorating Rev Charles Hodgson, rector of Barton-le-Street, who died in December 1869 just prior to the construction of the new Victorian church (fig. 6.14). Another brass memorial, dating to 1873, is located immediately to the east of the north door, which commemorates another former rector, Rev Thomas Lund, who died in October 1836 (fig. 6.15).[59] A roll billet moulded stringcourse runs along the walls at the height of the window springing and traces around the top of the window arches. The lower part of the nave walls is covered by oak wainscoting with blind Gothic-style tracery (fig. 6.16), which was installed in 1904 to a design by Edward Henry Smales (PR.BS.20).The panelling rises up to a wide stone stringcourse, featuring a stylised acanthus frieze. Crowning the wall plate at the top of each the north and south nave walls is a set of 16 reused Romanesque carved corbels, all spaced roughly ~880mm apart (fig. 6.17). Cox (1900, 216) records that these corbels are all reused from the exterior nave walls of the earlier church.

The majority of the nave is occupied by two rows of simple oak bench pews on raised timber floors. The oak used for the interior of the church was reportedly all harvested from the Temple Newsam estate (*York Herald* 24/06/1871, 9), a large Yorkshire estate belonging to the patron. Geometric Minton tiles decorated the floor of the central avenue, with large heating grills spaced throughout. Immediately to the west of the doorway is a large font of Caen stone (*York Herald* 24/06/1871, 9), featuring a rectangular bowl resting on red alabaster columns with cushion capitals (fig. 6.18). The whole of the font is very richly carved with Romanesque-style decoration, including acanthus leaves and bead moulding.[60] A timber screen separates the western-most bay, which is currently used as a store. Within

---

[59] Erected in 1873 by their grandson and nephew, George Lund, this memorial brass also commemorates Rev Lund's second wife, Elizabeth, who died June 1815.

[60] This rich carving was executed by Charles Mawer, of Leeds (*York Herald* 24/06/1871, 9).

this bay, resting against the north wall is a timber reredos (fig. 6.19) dating to 1920 (fac. 1920A/42), which was removed from the sanctuary prior to 1967, when Gordon Barnes photographed the church (fig. 6.20). Internally, the detailing of the western elevation largely matches that of the north and south walls with the roll billet moulded stringcourse surrounding the window arches, and the acanthus frieze stringcourse below. The principal difference is that the roll billet moulding around the two main windows terminates on carved head corbels, and the remaining stringcourse is formed of reused acanthus frieze. In the north-east corner of the nave is a large timber pulpit, richly carved in a Romanesque style (fig. 6.21), which Pevsner describes as needing "some stomaching" (Pevsner 1966, 73). The eastern elevation is dominated by a large chancel arch, which will be described in Section 6.2.4 (below). The acanthus frieze stringcourse from the north and south elevations continues across the eastern elevation, although employing reused 12th-century pieces, rather than Victorian carving. With the exception of the later Gothic-styled panelling, the nave and its fixtures and fittings are uniformly decorated in the Romanesque-style, and mixes reused 12th-century sculptural work with Victorian elements.

6.2.3 Porch

The large, gabled porch projects from the second bay (from the west) of the north elevation of the nave, and provides the principle entrance to the church. Externally the porch measures approximately 3.5m square. The eastern and western elevations each feature a central roundel window surrounded by a roll billet moulding. The porch is accessed through a large Romanesque doorway in the gabled north elevation. This heavily restored 12th-century doorway is of two decorated orders, with an unusual decorated hoodmould or flat order, spiral beaded nook shafts and figuratively carved doorjambs (fig. 6.22). A moulded coping runs around the gable, which is broken at the apex by a large canopied image niche containing a statue of St Michael slaying the dragon.

Internally the porch is dominated by reused Romanesque sculpture. At the top of the east and west walls is a unique 12th-century corbel table, featuring carved corbel stones beneath an arcade with decorated spandrels. Further carved heads are located within the soffit of each arch of this astonishingly richly decorated corbel table (fig. 6.23). Matching their exterior decoration, the internal splays of the occuli windows are surrounded by a roll billet moulding. Mounted on the east wall below the window is a large, marble funerary monument commemorating Anne Lund, who died in 1815 (fig. 6.24). The south wall of the porch, which corresponds to the exterior north wall of the nave, features a large doorway, providing access to the body of the church. This large reused Romanesque

doorway is largely similar to the porch doorway, but is slightly smaller; the arch having two figuratively carved orders without any hoodmould (fig. 6.25). This heavily restored doorway also features nook shafts and figuratively carved doorjambs. Eighteen reused medieval carved stones are set into the wall above this doorway, including part of a series of Labours of the Months, and two stones forming an Adoration of the Magi, both dating to the mid-12th century (fig 6.26). With its treasury of reused 12th-century carved stonework, the architectural decoration of the porch is overwhelmingly and uniformly Romanesque in style.

6.2.4 Chancel

The chancel is slightly narrower than the nave, and its two bays are externally delineated by a flat buttress with corner-shafting. Externally the chancel measures ~7.15m east to west by ~6.7m north to south. The walls of chancel are the same height as the nave walls, but the roofline has a slightly lower pitch. The external decoration of the chancel follows that of the nave, with each bay containing a single-light Romanesque-style window, and the plinth, stringcourses, corbel table and parapet all mirror those of the nave (fig. 6.27). The north-east and south-east angles feature the same flat clasping buttresses with corner-shafting found at the west end of the nave. The three round-headed lights forming the east window dominate the eastern elevation, and a single roundel window sits in the gable (fig. 6.28). These windows contain the same detailing as the other windows in the church, including the roll billet mouldings and nook shafts. The western bay of the south elevation contains the projecting south vestry. One of the corbels above the vestry carries the carved date 1870, commemorating the rebuilding of the church (fig. 6.29).

Internally, the floor of the chancel is raised a step above that of the nave, to which it is connected by an impressive, highly decorated chancel arch (see fig. 6.12). The round-headed chancel arch is of two orders – mirrored on the east and west faces – with an outer order featuring beakheads on the outward face and an incised double-chevron moulding on the soffit, while the inner order contains a large barley-sugar twist angle roll. The arch is surrounded by a roll billet moulded hoodmould that terminates on the abaci. Page (1914, 475) suggests that some of the beakheads in the outer order might be reused, but this is not apparent today and all appear to be Victorian carvings. The chancel arch springs from reused 12th-century carved capitals and triple responds (fig. 6.30). [61] Romanesque-style decoration dominates in the chancel, and is generally richer than that found in the nave, revealing a hierarchy in the carved decorative scheme. For example, the chancel window

---

[61] The eastern-most capital on each side is a Victorian replacement.

reveals are similar to those in the nave, but the nook shafts are painted black to resemble Purbeck marble, and feature more richly decorated scallop cushion capitals with wedges and beaded collars (fig. 6.31). The arch of the window reveals also feature a shallow zigzag carving immediately below the hoodmould. The two north windows and single south window are filled with geometric stained glass by "Mr Burnett of Leith" (*York Herald* 24/06/1871, 9),[62] and are contemporary with the rebuilding. Beneath the windows on the north and south walls is a reused 12th-century stringcourse decorated in a lozenge pattern (see fig. 6.31). On the same level, a Victorian rose moulded stringcourse runs across the east wall, terminating below the east window, the gap indicating the previous location of the reredos (fig. 6.32). Above this and immediately below the east window is another stringcourse, featuring the same lozenge pattern as found on the stringcourses on the north and south walls; however this stringcourse noticeably narrower. The three lights of the east window contain stained glass, which depict Christ the King (centre), St Michael slaying the dragon (right), and the Angel Gabriel (left), are by Heaton, Butler, & Bayne, of London (*York Herald* 24/06/1871, 9). Between the north elevation windows is a Romanesque-style marble memorial tablet to the patron of the Victorian rebuilding, Hugo Meynell-Ingram, who died shortly before the reopening of the church (fig. 6.33). Opposite it on the south wall of the chancel is a brass plaque commemorating his wife, Emily Meynell-Ingram, who died in 1904 (fig. 6.34). The south-eastern window reveal extends down to form a sedile. To the immediate east of this is a pillar piscina formed from a reused 12th-century pillar with interlace acanthus, and a Victorian base and capital (see fig. 6.32). The sanctuary is delineated from the chancel by two steps and a timber altar rail in the form of a Romanesque-style arcade. The altar (fig. 6.35), which sits immediately beneath the east window, is stone and features the same carved decorative scheme as the font (see Section 6.2.2 above). The western bay of the south elevation of the chancel contains a large arch, connecting the chancel and vestry, which is described in Section 6.2.5 below. A reused corbel table, matching that of the porch, adorns the top of the chancel's north and south walls. This corbel table contains some of the richest and most diverse 12th-century carvings to be found in the church (fig. 6.36). The Victorian chancel at St Michael, Barton-le-Street, is decorated uniformly in the Romanesque-style, and, like the nave, combines original 12th-century sculptural elements with 19th-century work in a similar character.

---

[62] Presumably referring to William Barnett, originally of York, who founded 'Barnett and Sons' at 101 Constitution St, Leith, Edinburgh in 1867 (Hyland 2010)

6.2.5 Vestry

The small, single cell vestry projects from the western bay of the south chancel elevation. The external decorative scheme of the vestry is consistent with the rest of the church, with the same stringcourses, plinth etc. The eastern elevation of the vestry is blind, and a Romanesque-style doorway, detailed to match the windows, fills the western elevation (fig. 6.37). Its roll billet moulded hoodmould terminates on stylised corbels. The gabled south elevation features a single-light window, which differs from the nave and chancel windows only in being taller, dropping below the line of the stringcourse (fig. 6.38).

The vestry is connected to the chancel by a large archway that occupies the entire wall between the two spaces (fig. 6.39). The round arch is of two orders, with the outer order featuring a lateral chevron decoration, while the smaller inner order contains a plain angle roll. The outer order sits on nook shafts with carved cushion capitals, consistent with the church's other 12th-century carving. The eastern capital is covered with an interlaced acanthus pattern, while the western capital features beaded scalloped decoration. Flanking the archway, but heavily obscured by the organ cover are two reused Romanesque triple-headed corbels. The corbel on the east features three male faces, one of whom is drinking from a horn, and another whose puckered lips suggest whistling (fig. 6.40). The corbel on the western wall is almost totally obscured but is said to feature a mitred bishop, an Agnus Dei, and a bull. The organ was transferred to Barton-le-Street in 1874 (Ch.Ret. 1875) from the private chapel at Temple Newsam, the principal Yorkshire residence of the Meynell Ingram family, patrons of the rebuilding. The painted timber organ case (see fig. 6.39) dates to the early 20th century and was designed by Temple Moore in a Gothic style (Pevsner 1966, 73). Below the organ case and separating the vestry from the chancel is an open timber parclose screen. With the exception of the organ case, the vestry is decorated throughout entirely in the Romanesque style of the mid-12th century.

6.2.6 Features/fabric altered, added or removed 1871-Present

Having described the church of St Michael, Barton-le-Street as it appears today, this section will briefly outline known alterations since the church reopened in 1871. These are based on a combination of documentary evidence, principally Faculties and Parish Records, and physical evidence within the structure. The Borthwick Institute for Archives only holds four faculty applications pertaining to the church since its rebuilding, and as with the previous case studies most of these alterations relate to ephemeral changes to fixtures and fittings. These include the addition of a War Memorial (fac. 1917/28), and the addition of the timber panelling in the nave (PR.BS.20). This document also contains plans

for the addition of panelling to the chancel (more highly decorated than that of the nave), although this was apparently never installed. Unlike the earlier case studies, St Michael's appears to have retained most of its original glass, particularly in the chancel. No documentary evidence survives for the late 19th-century installation of the two stained glass windows in the nave, which presumably replaced clear glazing. As discussed in Section 6.2.2 (Nave) the timber reredos currently stored at the west end of the church was installed in the chancel in 1920, and it is not known when it was removed to storage. This timber reredos replaced an earlier stone reredos, which dated from c.1880 (fac.1920A/42). Elaborately carved from Caen stone (Bulmer 1890, 646), this original reredos is visible in two early photographs (fig. 6.41). Although no documentary evidence survives, one of the most significant alterations to the church was the early-20th-century installation of the organ and organ case in the vestry.

6.2.7 Analysis of Current Church

With the exception of minor addition to fixtures and fittings, such as the war memorial, organ, and nave panelling, the church today remains architecturally unchanged since its 1871 rebuilding. The present church is constructed entirely in a uniform Neo-Romanesque style, as exemplified by the use of round-headed arches, nook-shafts, flat buttresses, and profusion of stylistically Romanesque mouldings, including beakhead, chevron, and billet moulding. The only Gothic style features, being the organ case and nave panelling, are later additions. The exterior decorative elements of the present church, including the plinth and windows, are all of non-local calcareous sandstone (probably Birdsall Calcareous Grit), while the ashlar employed for the body of the church is Hildenley limestone. All of the stonework displays uniform tooling marks throughout, presented as regular striated chisel marks (fig. 6.42). Cox (1900, 216) records that the ashlar masonry of the earlier church was heavily reused in the rebuilding, but that every stone was re-dressed. Where tooling is visible on reliably 12th-century elements, it shows similar striated or boasted chisel markings (fig. 6.43), which are only readily differentiated by their comparative lack of crispness relative to 19th-century elements. The north and south walls of both nave and chancel are approximately 830mm wide, while the east and west gable walls are ~1100mm wide. The church fabric contains no identifiable building breaks, or changes in wall alignment or thickness. The archaeological survey of the current structure (fig. 6.44) confirms that the present church represents (with the exception of reused sculptural elements) a single phase of construction, and that no structural elements of the church survived the rebuilding of 1870-1.

6.2.8 Reused Material in the Present Church

Despite the lack of in situ architectural elements to have survived the rebuilding and restoration at Barton-le-Street, St Michael's contains more reused material than any other church in this study. Having described and analysed the present church and its material changes since rebuilding, the following section will examine the reused material identified within the present church fabric.

<u>Funerary Monuments</u>

The present church of St Michael contains surprisingly few reused funerary monuments; indeed the only funerary monument within the church to be reused within the church is the marble tablet to Anne Lund, mounted on the east wall (interior) of the porch (see fig. 6.24). Other funerary monuments are known to have been in the earlier church - as will be demonstrated in the following section - but these were not returned to the rebuilt church. No documentary explanation is known for the lack of earlier funerary monuments in the present church, but it is hypothesised that it reflects the lack of a local family associated with its patronage. Unlike Hovingham and Slingsby, the patrons of St Michael's did not live locally and the church presumably did not contain memorials to the patron's ancestors.

<u>Sculptural Elements</u>

While St Michael's contains very few reused funerary monuments, over 250 individual pieces of reused Romanesque sculpture have been identified within the fabric of the present church. These have been identified through analysis of style, tooling, and condition of the fabric, along with documentary evidence, and include numerous individual nave corbels, the elaborate chancel corbel table, and the two figuratively carved Romanesque doorways. The responds of the chancel arch, but not the chancel arch, are also reused, as are the treasury of carved stones set above the north doorway. All of the bellcote capitals are heavily weathered, but those of the nook shafts appear to be in Hildenley limestone and finely carved, again suggesting they may be reused 12th century capitals. Several pieces of the nave stringcourse are reused earlier material, and Cox (1900, 218) confirms the lozenge stringcourse in the chancel is also reused from the earlier church (for a detailed analysis of the reused sculptural elements see Smith 2009 & 2012.) Figure 6.45 is a plan of the current church showing the identified reused material.

6.3 Reconstruction of Pre-Restoration Church

6.3.1 Sources

There is more evidence available for the church of St Michael, Barton-le-Street, prior to 1870, than any other church in this research project. A number of written descriptions of the earlier church survive, including those by Sir Stephen Glynne (Butler 2007, 82-3), a number of trade directories and gazetteers (e.g. Baines 1823, 412; Lewis 1848, 164; Whellan 1859, 851), and several contemporary newspaper articles (e.g. *York Herald* 24/06/1871, 9; *Malton Gazette* 24/06/1871, 4). However, setting Barton-le-Street apart from the earlier case studies is the survival of a series of architectural drawings and early photographs of the pre-restoration church, which provide unparalleled information about its form, layout and architectural detailing. There are two known photographs[63] of the exterior of the church, both dating to c.1869, and a full series of "before" plan, elevation, and section drawings were prepared in May 1869 by the architects, Perkin & Son, of Leeds (fac. 1869/10). Articles written in the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Allen 1889, 153-9; Cox 1900, 213-9; Ketchley 1907, 1-130) add much detail, and Allen's description of the church, appears based on photos held by the church but now lost. When combined with the extensive reused material, and surviving documentary sources, these represent an unrivalled collection of sources for the pre-restoration church.

6.3.2 The Context of the Earlier Church

Despite the wealth of information available for the church prior to 1870, very little is known about the wider setting of the church prior to its rebuilding. The church sits in the centre of the village, between its two greens, and the churchyard is otherwise surrounded on all sides by housing (fig. 6.46). The c.1869 photographs of the church reveal little of the wider churchyard, but do show a cluster of relatively late gravestones around the south door (fig. 6.47), and a very few gravestones on the north side of the church (fig. 6.48). A small section of the graveyard immediately adjacent to the chancel south wall was fenced off with iron railings, presumably marking a family grave plot (see fig. 6.47). To the west of the church a low picket fence can be seen separating the churchyard from the small green.[64] Glynne specifically mentions a stone coffin and a sepulchral slab in the churchyard

---

[63] One photograph, showing the church from the north-east, was first published in *Reliquary and Illustrated Archaeologist* Vol. VI (1900), 214, and reproduced again in the *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* Vol. XX (1909), 264, at a lighter and clearer resolution.

[64] Visible to the extreme right of fig. 6.48

(Butler 2007, 83), neither of which is visible in the photographs, and they do not survive in the church or churchyard today.

The pre-1871 church of St Michael, Barton-le-Street, appears to have been a simple two-cell church of nave and chancel. Glynne provides a neat summation of the earlier structure, describing it as "a small church, with only nave and chancel, but lofty and dignified proportions, and most interesting from the unusually rich work of advanced Norman character, which prevails throughout" (Butler 2007, 82). The surviving photographs reveal that the nave and chancel were under separate roofs, both of which appear to have been covered with stone tiles, which the Rural Dean's Return of 1865 described as "a very heavy old roof" (RD.RET.1, 494). The same source records that the roofs were "ceiled" (RD.RET.1, 494), which is confirmed by Perkin's 1869 longitudinal cross section drawing of the church (fig. 6.49), which show both the nave and chancel ceiled over at the top of the walls, concealing the timber roof structure.

6.3.3 Nave

Available evidence concurs that the nave was aisleless and of four bays beneath a gabled roof, with opposing north and south doors in the second bay from the west. The south doorway as described by Glynne in 1863 matches the present north door, although Allen (1889, 154) and Glynne (Butler 2007, 83) both note that the doorway was not nook-shafted, unlike its Victorian replacement. Perkin's 1869 south elevation drawing (fig. 6.50) appears to show the bases of nook shafts to the south doorway, so it may have simply lost its shafts by the mid-19th century. Perkin's drawing also records a building scar around the south doorway, suggesting the earlier presence of a gabled south porch, although its date of construction and demolition are unknown. Disturbed coursing of the stonework above the porch area suggests that some rebuilding of the upper levels of the elevation have occurred (see fig. 6.47). By 1869 the south doorway had clearly fallen out of use, as demonstrated by the bench pews arranged in front of the door visible in the longitudinal section drawing (see fig. 6.49). Although the south door is most commonly the primary entrance to a parish church, it appears the north door was always principal at Barton-le-Street, presumably because the church was located at the southern edge of the village (Thompson 1913, 68). Historically known as the 'Coneysthorpe Door', beyond its medieval liturgical function, the south door was used by parishioners travelling from the nearby village of Coneysthorpe (Thompson 1913, 68). Presumably use of the south door would have decreased markedly following the construction of Coneysthorpe's chapel-of-ease in 1835. This suggests the

1869 arrangement of the pews on the south side of the nave may post-date the 1835 construction of the Coneysthorpe chapel-of-ease.

The window in the first (western-most) bay of the south elevation was a small, single cusped light beneath a hoodmould with small label-stops, stylistically dating the window to the mid-13th-century. The windows in the 3rd and 4th bays are matching, both being large single light lancet windows with hoodmoulds, which appear to have dogtooth or nail-head decoration, stylistically dating them to the early-13th century. Based on the surviving exterior photographs (see figs. 6.47 & 6.48) and Perkin's drawings (see figs. 6.49 – 6.53), all of the nave windows were filled with glass quarries in a diaper pattern, with no stained glass present. The nave has no visible plinth, and a rich Romanesque corbel table crowns the south elevation. Allen (1889, 153), working from photographs, recorded 41 corbels on each elevation of the nave, and states that those at the west end of both nave walls were later replacements. Perkin's elevation drawings show the nave corbel table as having an arcaded upper course (as in the present porch and chancel), but this arcading is not visible on the photographs. There is a pair of stepped angle buttresses at the south-west angle of the nave.

Three large stepped buttresses dominated the north elevation of the pre-1870 nave, one each between the four nave bays (see fig. 6.51). The two outer buttresses appear matched, while the central buttress only extended two-thirds of the elevation's height and Glynne notes that it featured angle-shafts (Butler 2007, 83). The window in the first (western) bay was a wide single lancet with a moulded hoodmould, stylistically dating to the early-13th century, although its odd proportions suggest it may have been a post-medieval imitation. The fourth (eastern) bay contained a tall, narrow, single light with a round-arched head, sited high up in the nave wall. The window of the 3rd bay was similar but slightly shorter and narrower, and both of these windows stylistically dated to the 12th-century. As with the south elevation, there is no evidence of a plinth, and a rich Romanesque corbel table crowns the elevation.

At the apex of the western gable was a large single bellcote (see figs. 6.47 & 6.52), described by Glynne in 1863 as "modern" (Butler 2007, 82), and which Allen (1889, 153) dated to 1836. The bellcote contained two bells, one of which was cracked by 1865 (RD.RET.1, 494). Perkin's plan of the old church (fig. 6.54) shows the west wall of the nave to have been slightly thicker than any other wall, raising the possibility it may have been rebuilt, perhaps to take the weight of this, or an earlier, bellcote. Such a rebuilding hypothesis is supported by Allen's noting of later corbels at the west end of the nave north and south walls (Allen 1889, 153) and Glynne's description of the west window as being of "doubtful Decorated

character" (Butler 2007, 82), suggesting it was a later copy. This west window was of two cusped lights with simple Decorated tracery beneath a hoodmould. Stepped angle buttresses were placed at both angles of the elevation.

The 1869 plan and section drawings by Perkin & Son provide a rarely detailed view of the nave interior at that time, revealing - as has already been seen at Hovingham - the spatial arrangement of the nave furnishings. The three section drawings uniquely embellish this by revealing the nave's fixtures and fittings in three dimensions, as well as the locations of memorials and wall tablets, and the window reveals and other architectural features. Perkin recorded the interior dimensions of the nave as 54' 6" x 20' 4" (16.61m east to west by 6.20m north to south), with pews arranged to either side of a central passageway, with box pews against the north wall and bench pews against the south wall. Upon entering the church through the north door, there was a step down into the nave. The cylindrical font on a, presumably later, square stem, was located immediately to the west of the north door, in much the same position as today. Cox (1900, 218) relates that following the rebuilding this Norman font was taken by the churchwarden and used as a feeding trough for pigs. Following the churchwarden's death it was sold at auction, and Cox later found it sunk into the meadow as a cattle water trough on a Slingsby farm (Cox 1900, 218). Some time after 1886 Cox rescued the font bowl and had it installed at the nearby Butterwick chapel,[65] where it remains today, set upon a modern base (fig. 6.55). The section drawing suggests it was originally on a narrower base, and was covered by a dome-shaped font cover, presumably timber, which is now lost. In the centre of the nave, near to the font, was a small rectangular stove, the flue for which can be seen on the photographs exiting through the ridge of the nave roof. The western bay of the nave contained slightly raked pews on three shallow steps. There appears to have been a curious arrangement in the north-west corner of the nave, beside the raked pews. The plan and section drawings indicate that there was one or more steps, seemingly heading down from a timber door (see figs. 6.53 & 6.54), but it is not clear what purpose this served or where such steps might have led - perhaps to a coal store?

Internally the windows in the western-most bay of the nave both sat within plain, splayed reveals. The remainder of the nave windows all sat within moulded splays with nook shafts and round-arched heads, suggesting a 12th-century date. Of the nave south wall, Glynne recorded that "at least one window has been tampered with and a new piece of string-

---

[65] Holy Epiphany Chapel, Butterwick, was constructed in 1858 as a Chapel-of-Ease to St Michael, Barton-le-Street (*The Builder*, Vol. 17, 23 April 1859, 286)

course put in" (Butler 2007, 83). This is presumably in reference to the trefoil-headed western-bay window, which, unlike the other windows, sat within a pointed-arch reveal. It is curious that Glynne mentions a new stringcourse, as Perkin's section drawing shows no stringcourse at all in the western bay (see fig. 6.49). A stringcourse frieze is shown on the remainder of the south interior elevation, which stepped down around the windows and followed the arch reveal above the south doorway. This stringcourse is described by Glynne as being "enriched with a kind of twining foliage ornament" (Butler 2007, 83), matching the fragments of acanthus frieze found reused in the church today. Perkin's section drawing also appears to record a simple stringcourse immediately above the pews; however this may possibly represent a peg rail for hanging gentlemen's hats, as seen at Slingsby (see Chapter 5). A panelled timber pulpit and reading desk were located in the south-east corner of the nave, beside the chancel arch. The Jacobean-style arcaded panelling is suggestive of an early 17th-century date for both the reading desk and pulpit.

There is no section drawing of the interior north wall of the church, so comparatively little is known about it, but Glynne (Butler 2007, 83) records the nave stringcourse frieze as following mirroring paths on both north and south walls of the nave. Perkin's depicts three large memorial tablets high on the east wall of the nave, above the chancel arch. Hidden behind whitewash, the two stones forming the Adoration of the Magi (now located over the north door) (fig. 6.56) were found during the demolition of the church; one stone either side of the chancel arch, near the springing (Ketchley 1907, 12). This wall was otherwise bare, apart from the chancel arch, which will be described in Section 6.3.4 (below). The interior west wall of the nave featured only the large west window, which sat within a deep splay. Beneath this, the raised pew section at the west end of the nave was backed with panelled wainscoting, which obscured the bottom of the window reveal.

6.3.4 Chancel

The pre-restoration chancel was of two bays, with the bays architecturally delineated by a flat buttress with corner shafts. The top of these buttresses featured a carved head at each angle (Allen 1889, 153-4), integrating them with the adjacent corbel table. The corbel table surmounted the north and south external chancel elevations, and matched that found in the present porch and chancel, although the upper section of the table is not clearly visible in the historic photographs. Based on early photographs Allen (1889, 153) recorded twelve corbel stones on each side of the chancel. The increased level of detailing and sculptural decoration seen on the chancel buttresses and corbel table demonstrate a clear hierarchy in the decorative schemes between the chancel and nave of the 12th-century church. The

western bay of the north elevation contained a narrow, round-arched window, which appears to have been aligned slightly east of the bay centre. Below and to the west of this, near the angle with the nave was a small priest's door, featuring a timber door within an undecorated, round-arched doorway. This doorway was clearly out of use by the late 19th-century, as a stove was placed immediately inside the door with the flue exiting through a hole cut into the timber door. The eastern bay of the north elevation contained a large, single-light lancet window with a hoodmould, possibly with dogtooth or nail-head decoration. The south chancel elevation was architecturally similar to the north, but with both bays containing a large, single-light lancet window with hoodmould, again with dogtooth or nail-head decoration or similar. As with the corresponding window on the north elevation, the western bay window appears set slightly off centre.

Glynne described St Michael in 1863 as having an east window comprising "three pointed windows" (Butler 2007, 83), when all other sources, including photographs, show a single lancet window at the east end. St Helen's church, Amotherby had three lancets at its east end (see Chapter 8), and it is possible that Glynne confused the two churches, which he visited on the same day. The east window was a central single-light lancet window beneath a hoodmould. Perkin's drawing of this elevation (see fig. 6.52) depicts the hoodmould as having dogtooth or nail-head moulding, stylistically dating it to the early-13th century. At both angles of the east wall was a flat clasping buttress with fine corner shafts. As with the nave, all of the chancel windows appear to have been quite high within the building, particularly the Romanesque windows in the north elevation.

The chancel was divided from the nave by the chancel arch and a single step up. It is apparent that the chancel arch had been completely rebuilt at some stage prior to Victorian rebuilding. In 1859 the chancel arch was described as "a very fine one" (Whellan 1859, 851), suggesting, perhaps erroneously, that it was surviving at this date, but by 1863 Glynne described it as having been "altered badly" (Butler 2007, 83), while *York Herald* stated that it "had been destroyed" (24/06/1871, 9). The chancel arch appears on Perkin's section drawings as a plain semi-circular arch with no architectural moulding (see fig. 6.53), and in profile it appears extremely narrow, especially when compared to its supporting capitals (see fig. 6.49). Based on its plain, round-arched depiction, the chancel arch was clearly rebuilt in the post-medieval period, although more refined dating is not possible. Although the chancel arch itself was lost, Glynne notes the "fine clustered shafts supporting it remain undisturbed" (Butler 2007, 83), matching those found in the church today.

The choir contained two choir stalls against the south wall and a single stall against the north wall, with a small rectangular stove positioned in the north-west corner, beside the chancel arch pier. The sanctuary was separated from the choir by a single step up and a set of altar rails, which Perkin's section drawings show with thick turned balusters. This altar rail, which was lost during the rebuilding, was inscribed "The Guifte of John Slingsby, 1610" (Cox & Harvey 1973, 18). The timber communion table had thick turned legs, suggesting an early 17th-century date consistent with other surviving examples within this study. Glynne notes that there was no piscina in the church by 1863 (Butler 2007, 83), and none is shown on Perkin's drawings. The re-used 12th-century pillar piscina in the present church was discovered under the church floor during the rebuilding (Ketchley 1907, 13). As piscinae fell out of liturgical use following the Reformation, it is likely that the piscina was removed in the post-medieval period, reflecting post-Reformation alteration in the chancel. Glynne (Butler 2007, 83) does record that there was an almery[66] both to the north and south of the altar. That on the south he describes as being "obtuse-arched" (Butler 2007, 83), but Perkin's drawing appear to show a rectangular opening rather than arched one (see fig. 6.49). It is unclear if Perkin or Glynne is more accurate in their description, but if the aumbries were obtuse-arched, they most likely dated from around the late-13th century, while a rectangular opening cannot be dated.

The east window was filled with clear glass quarries in a diaper pattern, while the lancet windows in the north and south elevations appear to have been filled with glass quarries in a rectangular leaded pattern. There was a large memorial tablet, or possibly a post-Reformation text wall painting (presumably a Decalogue), on the east wall, immediately to the south of the east window. The chancel's lancet windows sat within a semi-circular arched recess, with the arch resting on nook-shafts with cushion capitals. Internally the windows are described by Glynne (Butler 2007, 83) as having reveals with semi-circular arches and nook-shafts with cushion capitals, matching Perkin's plan and section drawings. Based on these, it appears that 13th-century lancet windows were inserted into the existing 12th-century window reveals. Therefore the original windows, of which one remained in the chancel north-west bay, would have been small and narrow, but internally were heavily splayed and sat within a semi-circular arched reveal with nook-shafts and cushion capitals. The exterior of these windows is typical for their date, but nook-shafted reveals demonstrates an unusually high level of decorative investment for a small parish church. Comparable windows survive in situ at St John the Baptist, Adel, West Yorkshire, but with plain internal reveals (fig. 6.57).

---

[66] Also called an aumbry - being a closed recess or storage cupboard.

A decorated stringcourse ran immediately below the level of the window reveals, presumably being the one reused within the present chancel (see Section 6.2.4). Perkin's longitudinal section drawing depicts a triple-headed corbel situated between the windows on the south wall of the chancel (see fig. 6.49). The corbel is shown above the stringcourse, with choir stalls below, whereas Glynne (Butler 2007, 83) locates it below the stringcourse. It is probable that Glynne is mistaken, as it would be unusual to locate such a corbel so low on a wall, and if it were below the stringcourse the choir stalls would be interrupted. Glynne (Butler 2007, 83) notes that this triple-headed corbel included the head of an ox and an Agnus Dei (corresponding to that on the west side of the present vestry arch), and that there was a matching corbel on the north wall, depicting three figures (corresponding to that on the east side of the present vestry arch). Perkin's section drawing shows two other corbels, one on the south chancel wall near the chancel arch, and one apparently in the south-east angle (see fig. 6.49).

6.3.5 Architectural Phasing

Collectively, this architectural research allows for a detailed reconstruction model of the lost earlier church (fig. 6.57). It reveals that prior to 1870, St Michael had undergone remarkably little alteration since its construction in the mid-12th century. The following section will offer a phased architectural development of the church as it appeared at the time of its demolition. Figure 6.58 presents a phased plan of St Michael's, Barton-le-Street immediately prior to its Victorian rebuilding.

Saxon Church

The only physical evidence for pre-Conquest worship at Barton-le-Street is the Anglo-Saxon cross base in the churchyard, although it is not known if this is original to the present church site, or even to the village. As already detailed, Domesday recorded a church in the village by 1086, but the construction date and location of this structure are not known.

12th-Century Church

The wealth of Romanesque sculpture, which must have made Barton-le-Street one of the most richly decorated Norman churches in England, is stylistically datable to c.1160 (Anon. n.d. (b)). The mid-12th-century dating of the surviving sculpture matches the Romanesque architectural features which survived in the church until 1870, including the flat chancel buttresses with angle-shafts, and the round-headed windows with nook-shaft

reveals. William d'Eu, Precentor of York Minster from 1139 (Butler 1982, 93-4), was rector at Barton-le-Street until his death in c.1174, and is thus a likely patron for the construction and rich embellishment of the medieval church of St Michael. At the time the advowson of the church was held by Holy Trinity Priory, York, who also held the churches at Healaugh and Adel, both of which have rich Romanesque sculpture of similar date (although neither has the wealth of decorative detail seen at Barton-le-Street). Given the high quality architectural detailing and abundance of elaborate sculpture, a very wealthy and well-connected patron was undoubtedly associated with the construction of the 12th-century church. The body of this church appears to have been little altered through to 1870, with the principle change being to the fenestration - indeed only three of the original windows had survived intact, although many of the original internal reveals remained.

Medieval Alteration

The lancet windows (including the East window and all of the windows of the south elevation) are Early English in style, and with their dogtooth or nail-head mouldings are stylistically datable to the early-13th century. The Decorated Gothic tracery of the west window stylistically dates it to the later 13th-century, although as discussed above, this was possibly a post-medieval copy.

The Labour of the Months stones presently reset above the north doorway were discovered during the razing of the old church, where they had been reused face-inwards in the north and south walls of the nave (Page 1914, 475). Given their anachronistic style, these stones were (and are) often mistakenly identified as being 11th-century work (e.g. *York Herald* 24/06/1871, 9), although they are likely contemporary with the other mid-12th-century sculpture in the church. The exact location of their reuse within the old nave walls in unknown (as is their original context). However, their reuse clearly suggests some level of alteration and rebuilding to the nave walls. Given the addition of the three large late-medieval buttresses on the nave north wall, this rebuilding may have been medieval rather than post-medieval.

Post-Medieval Alteration

The church seemingly underwent several post-medieval alterations, principally to its interior fixtures and fittings, but also to its fabric. An ecclesiastical court record of 1590 (V1590-1/CB1) noted that the chancel at Barton-le-Street was then in decay, a seemingly common problem at the time. The reconstruction of the church c.1870 (see fig. 6.57) reveals no visible evidence of late 16th-century chancel repairs, so it is possible

the reference to decay related principally to the roof structure. Internally, the communion table, altar rail, pulpit, and reading desk likely dated from the early-17th-century, reflecting changing post-Reformation liturgical arrangements. As discussed in Section 6.3.4 the 12th-century pillar piscina may have been removed from the chancel at a similar date. Other internal fixtures and fittings, such as the stoves and box pews, likely dated from the later 18th or early 19th-centuries. The church room was listed in 1842 as 200, a decrease of 100 from the 1818 return (Lawton 1842, 514). Might this reflect a major early 19th-century reordering of the nave, or perhaps even the removal of a gallery? The 1836 addition of a bellcote on the west gable may have been part of a wider rebuilding of the western end of the nave. The thicker nave west gable wall, and dubious West window, suggests a different building phase, and Allen (1889, 153) noted later, non-Romanesque corbels were employed at the western end of both sides of the nave. The loss of the internal stringcourse at the western end of the south elevation confirms significant rebuilding or alteration occurred there. Glynne mentions this in 1863, when he comments "there has been modern alteration within the south side of the nave" supporting that this work was late, presumably 19th-century, and possibly contemporary with the 1836 bellcote. Possibly the most significant post-medieval alteration to the fabric was the replacement of the 12th-century chancel arch with a plain, thin, round-headed arch, possibly as late as c.1860. There is no documentary evidence for this alteration, and it is uncertain why or exactly when the chancel arch was replaced.

6.4 Analysis of the 1870-1 restoration of St Michael's, Barton-le-Street

> "It must always be a matter of extreme regret to archaeologists that the
> old church of Barton-le-Street was pulled down, and it must not be
> forgotten that in cases such as this, the ecclesiastical authorities who
> granted the faculty, and the generous patron who supplied the money,
> are often more to blame than the architect."
>
> Allen 1889, 154

6.4.1 Analysis of the rebuilding process

Whilst there are unparalleled resources for the Church of St Michael prior to 1870, sadly, little documentation survives to elucidate the restoration process itself. The rebuilding at Barton-le-Street did not receive the same level of newspaper coverage as the preceding restoration at All Saints', Slingsby, and comparatively little is known about the decision

making process. However, a number of insights can still be gleaned from the information available.

In the Bishop's Visitation Record of 1868, the rector wrote: 'I have grounds for hoping that a new church is in contemplation' (V.1868/Ret.). This reveals that the rebuilding was already under consideration by 1868, and suggests that it was intended from the outset as a full rebuilding rather than a restoration. That a full rebuilding was envisaged sets Barton-le-Street apart from the preceding restoration campaigns at Hovingham and Slingsby, both of which were originally intended restorations before developing into more ambitious rebuilding campaigns. The faculty application (fac.1869/10) for the rebuilding of St Michael's church, Barton-le-Street, is dated 20 June 1869, just 18 days after the reopening of All Saints' church, Slingsby. Such proximity in dates, while possibly a simple coincidence, reminds us that such restorations did not occur in isolation, and that incumbents, patrons and parishioners were aware of restorations in neighbouring communities. It is not known exactly when the old church was demolished, but it was reported on 16 April 1870 that the demolition had taken place and construction of the new church had commenced (*York Herald* 16/04/1870, 10), so a date in early 1870 seems likely. The re-opening ceremony at St Michael had been scheduled for Whitsunday (Sunday 28/05/1871), but was postponed following the death of the patron, Hugo Meynell Ingram, on the preceding Friday (*York Herald* 03/06/1871, 11). The reopening ceremony instead took place on 18 June 1871 *(York Herald* 24/06/1871, 9) and was a comparatively low-key event.

Condition

The perceived condition of the church prior to 1870 appears to have been a major factor in the eventual demolition of the medieval church. In the 1865 Rural Dean's Return the Rector indicated that the church was in good repair, but later noted: "The north wall of this church is considerably out of perpendicular, though supported by buttresses and iron clamps, and the roof is far from being in a satisfactory state" (RD.RET.1, 494). The growing perception that the church was in a poor condition was echoed in an article of 1869, which described the church as "old and dilapidated" (Anon. 1869, 118). Most tellingly, the 1869 public notice relating to the rebuilding (fac. 1869/10) contains a handwritten notation on the back stating that it had been pinned to the Schoolroom door, which was then being used for services. This strongly suggests that some issue had forced the closure of the church in 1869. Following the rebuilding, a newspaper stated that the old church "had become so ruinous that its restoration was hopeless, and, in fact, it was unsafe

for the congregation to assemble within its walls" (*York Herald* 24/06/1871, 9). Surviving photographs of the church show a slightly warped roof with a number of replacement slates (see fig. 6.47 & fig. 6.48). Cox (1900, 216) disputes this, and argues that the church appeared to be in a good state of repair, although Cox's commentary is based solely on photographs (now lost) and he was clearly biased against the rebuilding process.

The deterioration of the external Romanesque sculpture also appears to have been a consideration in the rebuilding of the church. As already discussed, the vast majority of the reused sculpture in the Victorian church is reset within the church, protecting it from the elements. A newspaper article (*York Herald* 16/04/1870, 10) written during the rebuilding process notes that the sculptures were to be moved into the church for their preservation. A later author stated: "Some of the carvings had become so weather-worn that the Patron, wisely or unwisely, had them placed in their present position to form a cornice for the chancel roof" (Ketchley 1907, 3), again suggesting that the preservation of the Romanesque was an important element of the design of the Victorian building.

Architectural Fashion

The role of changing Victorian architectural fashion also needs to be considered as a factor in the rebuilding. A contemporary newspaper had described the earlier church as "of large size, but barn-like plainness" (*York Herald* 16/04/1870, 10), a pejorative description that would be echoed during the rebuilding of St Helen's church, Amotherby (see Chapter 8). A later vicar, who clearly regretted the rebuilding stated, "the only reason that I have ever heard stated for pulling down this most interesting fabric in 1870 was to produce in a new building a thorough imitation of the original Norman, which had been a good deal interfered within the 13th and 14th centuries by enlarged windows and clumsy buttresses" (Cox 1900, 216). This motivation is echoed by a later description that claims the church was rebuilt "with the laudable object of giving back the original uniformity of design" (Anon.1904, 5). While the Slingsby and Hovingham case studies both reveal a desire to remove post-medieval alterations, this is the first indication of Victorian restorers wishing to remove later medieval elements, and represents a very different approach to that taken at Slingsby.

Patron Memorial

The obituary notice for the patron, Hugo Francis Meynell Ingram, stated that the new church was intended as a memorial to the patron's father (*York Herald* 03/06/1871, 11), Hugo Charles Meynell Ingram, who had died in February 1869. As has already been seen

in the Hovingham case study, commemoration can be a factor in triggering restoration, and this appears to be the case at Barton-le-Street. Hugo Meynell Ingram himself died on 26 May 1871 shortly before the re-opening ceremony, which had been scheduled for Whitsunday (Sunday 28/05/1871), was postponed following news of this accident (*York Herald* 03/06/1871, 11). In consequence the rebuilt St Michael's church, Barton-le-Street, contains a small memorial to the patron himself, rather than to his father.

6.4.2 Recycled Romanesque sculpture

The recycling of the 12th-century sculpture is perhaps the most interesting aspect of the Victorian rebuilding of St Michael's church, Barton-le-Street. As noted at the start of the chapter, in the 19th century it was widely held that St Michael's was built using material from another structure (e.g. Baines 1823, 412; Lewis 1848, 164). Whellan (1859, 851) wrote that the church "was said to have been repaired with material" from the abbey, while a newspaper reported, "the church was evidently built from the ruins of some other, and antiquaries have never settled the point as to whether St Mary's Abbey at York, or the church of the Holy Trinity at York was used as the quarry. A third party hold that neither of these churches, but still an earlier Norman building furnished the material" (*York Herald* 16/04/1870, 10). That a Norman structure was posited indicates it was Romanesque elements of St Michael that were considered recycled. This misconception may have arisen through thinking the sculpture was too fine for a modest parish church, and therefore must have come from a high-status church, for example being robbed from an abbey after the Reformation. The Victorians clearly recognised the early origins of the St Michael, with the church described as "an ancient structure" (Whellan 1859, 851) and an "ancient Norman church" (Anon. 1870, 180). Might the belief that St Michael's Romanesque sculptural decoration was not indigenous to the village have affected contemporary perceptions of the church?

Irrespective of its believed origins, the Romanesque sculpture at Barton-le-Street was noted as being of "great antiquarian interest" (*York Herald* 16/04/1870, 10). Indeed its fame was such that a Durham and Northumberland Architectural and Archaeological Society tour included visiting the building site in 1870 in order "to view the interesting Roman sculptures of the old church, now being rebuilt into the new one" (*York Herald* 24/09/1870, 7). The Romanesque sculpture appears to have been the primary focus of the Victorian judgment of the old church's value, with the remaining fabric of the church being somewhat secondary. A reporter described the old church as barn-like but stated that it was "of great antiquarian interest in consequence of the great number of sculptured stones

walled into it" (*York Herald* 16/04/1870, 10). As demonstrated in the chapter the pre-1870 church was actually a fine 12th-century structure, however the Romanesque sculpture was of such exceptional quality that the church fabric presumably failed in comparison, especially as much of it had been altered and 'debased'. These Victorian judgements may have been heightened by the belief that the sculpture was reused from a higher status building.

The focus on the sculpture, both before and following the restoration, highlights that these were (and are) considered to be the significant element of the church, rather than the building as a whole, perhaps explaining why so little of the remainder of the church was retained and recycled, such as the fine chancel buttresses. Again reflecting their obvious value to the restorers, significant care was taken in resetting the Romanesque sculpture in the new church. It was noted at the time that given the extent of sculpture reused "the reader may imagine the care and attention required and bestowed to place them in proper order; yet this has been done with surprising exactness in the new church" (*York Herald* 24/06/1871, 9). Archaeological investigation (Smith 2012) of the reuse of the Romanesque sculpture has demonstrated that the Victorian restorers maintained the original decorative and spatial hierarchy of the earlier scheme, with the more-richly decorated chancel carvings reused within the Victorian chancel.

The new Victorian sculpture was designed in an Neo-Romanesque style, and blends with the 12th-century while possessing "an individuality of their own, so that there is no chance of the archaeologist at any future period being confused in endeavouring to distinguish the new work from the old" (Allen 1889, 154). With the hindsight of another century, Allen was perhaps ambitious in this assertion, although the Victorian sculpture is generally discernable from the earlier work. The 19th-century carvings are very fine and the new church was described at the times as "a remarkably fine example of the Norman style, and is of first-class workmanship" (*York Herald* 24/06/1871, 9). It is clear that careful consideration was given to the appearance of new carvings, with the same article reporting, "the new sculpture requisite to fill up gaps has been adapted, as far as possible, to the old style, the fine delicate work of the present age being avoided" (*York Herald* 24/06/1871, 9). It was reported at the time that the Victorian chancel arch was reconstructed from "a specimen of elaborately-worked arch that was found in the walls" (*York Herald* (24/06/1871, 9). Therefore it can be surmised that the design and decoration of the present chancel arch reflects that of the lost 12th-century original. Several other pieces of the original Romanesque scheme were also discovered during the demolition and were reincorporated into the new church, including the Labour of the Months carvings and the

interlaced stem of the pillar piscina, which was discovered under the floor of the old church. This demonstrates that the Victorian restoration of St Michael has actually enhanced modern understanding of this astonishing 12th-century decorative scheme.

Reuse of funerary monuments

The lack of reinstated funerary monuments in the Victorian church of Barton-le-Street seems at odds with the works at the other Street Parish churches, which all reinstated some or all of their funerary monuments. No documentary explanation is known for the lack of earlier funerary monuments in the church, but it is hypothesised that it reflects the lack of a local family associated with its patronage. Unlike Hovingham and Slingsby, the patrons of St Michael's did not live locally and the church presumably did not contain memorials to the patron's ancestors. Unlike Hovingham, Barton-le-Street did not represent a family chapel, demonstrating the ancestry of its patron.

6.4.3 Analysis of Plan Form and Architectural

As a full rebuilding was planned at Barton-le-Street from the outset, the present church matches very closely to that presented in the drawings accompanying the 1869 faculty application, again in contrast to the two previous case studies. Comparison of the present St Michael with the reconstructed 1869 church reveals that the Victorian rebuild closely followed the plan, dimensions and predominant architectural style of its predecessor. The current nave internally measures ~16.78m x 6.26m, effectively mirroring the previous church's recorded dimensions of 16.61 x 6.20m.[67] Likewise, the Victorian chancel internally measures 6.52m x 5.07m, matching the dimensions of the earlier chancel (6.43m x 5.03m). In 1863 Glynne described the church as being small but of "lofty and dignified proportions" (Butler 2007, 82). Based on Perkin's scaled section drawings (see fig. 6.53) the nave walls of the earlier church internally rose ~6.3m from the floor level to the wall plate, a height roughly equal to the nave width. In contrast the nave walls of the Victorian church internally rise 5.67m (floor to wall plate). Cox (1900, 216) confirms this variance, stating that the walls of the old church were approximately 3 feet higher than their replacements (although 2 feet would seem more accurate). The rebuilding contract apparently dictated that the proportions of the original church were to be replicated throughout, but the contractor (Mr Barton (presumably Thornton?) of Slingsby) apparently reduced the wall height to save costs (Cox 1900, 216). Despite the significant change in proportions, it was several years before this breach of contract was noticed (Cox 1900, 216), which is perhaps

---

[67] Calculated from the scaled plan drawing (fac.1869/10)

understandable given the Victorian church contains open roofs, while the old church had been ceiled over at the height of the wall plate. Despite this one major deviation, the Victorian church of St Michael otherwise conforms very closely to both the dimensions and proportions of the earlier church. The principal deviations to the plan may be viewed as largely pragmatic, including the addition of the porch (as already discussed there are indications of an earlier south porch) and vestry, and the removal of the redundant priest's door and south door.

As discussed in Chapter 1, in the mid 19th century, the Decorated Gothic style was deemed the spiritually and liturgically 'correct' style for new ecclesiastical architecture, and it was used extensively in Victorian restoration. Yet at Barton-le-Street, as we also saw at Slingsby, a different architectural style has been employed in the rebuilding, in this case the Neo-Romanesque. The pre-1870 church was Romanesque, so its Victorian replacement may again represent a replication of that earlier style, maintaining the visual identity of the parish church through its rebuilding. Comparison of the two buildings reveals that the external decoration in particular does not closely compare. It may be that the Neo-Romanesque design of the church was a response to it being a vehicle for displaying the 12th-century Romanesque sculpture. Either way, this case study again demonstrates the fabric of the pre-restoration church fundamentally shaping the size, shape and look of the Victorian church.

6.4.4 The Decision Makers

Incumbent

The Rev Charles Hodgson, rector of Barton-le-Street, died on 21 December 1869 (Fox 1872, xxxviii), shortly before work commenced on the demolition of the old church. His replacement, Rev Charles Ogilvy was installed at Barton-le-Street early in 1870 and oversaw the rebuilding of the church during his first year in the parish. It is not known what impact this change in incumbent might have had on the restoration process. Despite moving from Barton-le-Street to York for his health in the summer of 1868 and his death the following year (Fox 1872, xxxvii), it is the Rev Hodgson who must be considered as a stakeholder in the rebuilding of St Michael.

It may, however, be worth briefly outlining the background and potential contribution of the Rev Ogilvy. Charles William Norman Ogilvy was a younger son of Sir John Ogilvy (9th Baronet of Inverquharity and MP for Dundee). Born in 1839 and educated at Christ Church, Oxford (BA 1864, MA 1865), Ogilvy had served as curate at Chippenham (1865),

St Mary Magellan, Oxford (1867-9), and Brackley, Northamptonshire (1869-70) (Anon. 1878, 697). His instalment at Barton-le-Street in 1870 was his first incumbency as a priest; the same year he married the Hon. Emily Priscilla Maria Ponsonby, daughter of the 2nd Baron de Mauley (Burke 1882, 470). Ogilvy was obviously a priest of comparatively high station, and was even distantly related to the Earls of Carlisle of nearby Castle Howard.[68] This, combined with both his education and curacy at Oxford,[69] suggests Ogilvy would have been well connected with the changing liturgical trends and evolving restoration debate.

Returning to Rev Charles Hodgson, he was born in Liverpool on 23 July 1801 and was initially educated at Sandhurst Military College (Fox 1872, xxii), before attending Magdalene College, Cambridge, from 1820 (BA 1824; MA 1830) (Venn 1947, 398). In 1825 he was ordained to the curacy at St Johns Lee church, Acomb, Hexham and was ordained priest the same year (Fox 1872, xxiii). Through a friend he secured a wealthier curacy at Folkingham, Lincolnshire, where he stayed from 1825 – 1833 (Anon. 1865, 310). In 1833 he was installed in the rectory at Barton-le-Street under the patronage of Maria Seymour-Conway, Dowager-Marchioness of Hertford (Fox 1872, xxvi). Rev Hodgson served as rector at Barton-le-Street for 37 years until his death in 1869. From 1835 he also served as an Association Secretary of the Church Missionary Society, where he was actively involved.[70] Rev Hodgson's widow recalled that on arrival at Barton-le-Street parish, the rector found the spiritual welfare of the two outlying villages (Coneysthorpe and Butterwick) unsatisfactory, even stating that the village of Coneysthorpe has been "utterly uncared for in a spiritual sense" (Fox 1872, xxvi). Mrs Hodgson noted that her husband had evangelised heavily within the parish, building up congregations in all three villages, and suggesting this directly resulted in the construction of two new places of worship within the parish – being: Coneysthorpe Chapel of Ease in 1835 (fig. 6.59) and Holy Epiphany Chapel, Butterwick in 1858 (fig. 6.60). She proudly states: "Thus, when admitted to the living in January 1833, there was only the parish church for the three villages; when Mr Hodgson left it in August 1868, never to return, there were three places of worship" (Fox 1872, xxxvii). In 1854, Rev Hodgson edited a volume entitled *Family Prayers for One Month*

---

[68] Rev Ogilvy's mother was Lady Jane Elizabeth Howard, daughter of the 16th Earl of Suffolk and 9th Earl of Berkshire - another cadet branch of the Howard line.

[69] St Mary Magellan had been restored by G. G. Scott in 1841-2 and was the first Gothic Revival interior in Oxford.

[70] As signified by the publishing of a memorial volume dedicated to him (Fox 1872), which provides a fascinating biography of Rev Hodgson, including reminiscences by his widow.

(Hodgson 1854), in which the preface records that the prayers were being published "with a view to obtain assistance towards building a chapel in the hamlet of Butterwick, in the same parish [Barton-le-Street]" (Hodgson 1854, iii), confirming Rev Hodgson's hand in the fundraising and construction of the chapel.

Rev Hodgson's active involvement in the Church Missionary Society (Fox 1872, ix) and the Protestant Association (*Essex Standard* 01/05/1840, 2) clearly demonstrate his evangelical leanings. This low-church character may possibly have influenced the comparatively simple architectural designs and detailing of the two chapels constructed in the parish during his incumbency (see figs. 6.59 and 6.60). Might a similar influence be identified in the design and liturgical arrangement of the rebuilt Barton-le-Street? As already noted in 1868, Rev Hodgson wrote: "I have grounds for hoping that a new church is in contemplation" (V. 1868/Ret.), showing that the rector was in favour of a new church building at Barton-le-Street. This provides the only glimpse into Rev Hodgson's role in the decision-making process that lead to the rebuilding at Barton-le-Street. It is clear that the rector favoured the rebuilding, but having already contributed £150 towards the construction of Butterwick chapel in the same year (*York Herald* 22/01/1859, 7), his role may have been restricted to lobbying the church's wealthy patron.

Patron

The patron for the rebuilding of St Michael's church, Barton-le-Street, was the Hon. Hugo Francis Meynell Ingram, who bore the entire cost of the work (*York Herald* 16/04/1870, 10). Born in 1822, he was educated at Harrow and Christ Church, Oxford, and in 1863 he married Emma, daughter of Charles Wood, 1st Viscount Halifax. Hugo Meynell Ingram inherited the family estates in March 1869, following the death of his father Hugo Charles Meynell Ingram. This inheritance included the principle seat at Hoar Cross, Staffordshire, and amongst several Yorkshire holdings, the Temple Newsam Estate and the small manor of Barton-le-Street. Rev Hodgson had stated his hopes for a new church the previous year (1868), suggesting Hugo Charles Meynell Ingram may have been considering a restoration at Barton-le-Street. It is perhaps very significant that the faculty application to rebuild Barton-le-Street was submitted only three months after Hugo and Emily inherited the estate.

Emily Meynell Ingram's brother Charles had been heavily involved with the Oxford Movement (Hall 2004, 290), suggesting Emily would have been well versed in Victorian architectural and liturgical trends. Hall (2004, 290) notes that it was not until after her marriage to Hugo Meynell-Ingram that a major restoration was undertaken at Yoxall (St

Peter - restored 1865-68), a church local to the Hoar Cross estate. As such Emily Charlotte Meynell Ingram should also be considered as a patron of the rebuilding at Barton-le-Street. Despite the Meynell Ingram's apparent interesting in church restoration, it seems they were only remotely involved in the actual restoration at Barton-le-Street. In a letter of April 1870 to her father, Emily Meynell Ingram wrote that she had been informed by Mr Ogilvy (presumably Rev Ogilvy, the new rector) that "our little church at Barton – is a 'gem' to quote his words" (reproduced in Hall 2004, 291), suggesting she was not overly familiar with the church. More tellingly, the same letter records that it was the Meynell Ingram's agent, Mr Leather, who had appointed the architect, Perkin & Son. Despite this, Emily goes on to note that as a small and local firm she felt they were "more likely to give the requisite attention to a small country church than the big wigs - & [were] less expensive" (reproduced in Hall 2004, 291). This "laissez-faire attitude to patronage" (Hall 2004, 291) contrasts markedly from the construction of Holy Angels, Hoar Cross, which Emily Meynell Ingram commissioned the following year. Designed by the leading London architects, Bodley and Garner, Holy Angels was designed as a memorial to Hugo Meynell Ingram, and is considered one of the finest products of the Gothic Revival (fig. 6.61).

Architect

The architects for the rebuilding of Barton-le-Street, were Perkin and Son of Leeds. The son of a master mason of the same name, William Perkin had worked in partnership with Elisha Backhouse from c.1839 until 1865 (Felstead 1993, 707). Perkin's eldest son, William Joshua Belton Perkin, had been articled to the firm and following its dissolution in 1865, they formed Perkin & Son, with the younger son, Henry, joining the firm in 1871 to complete his articles (DSA n.d. (a)).

As architects for the rebuilding of the Romanesque parish church at Barton-le-Street, Perkin and Son were perhaps a surprising choice. Perkin & Backhouse's best-known surviving buildings are institutional rather than ecclesiastical, such as Armley Prison, Leeds (1846-7), Ripon Union Workhouse (1854), and the Leeds Union Workhouse. The latter is a sprawling Neo-Jacobethan building constructed 1858-61, but the complex includes the small St James Hospital Chapel (fig. 6.62). Built at the same time, this brick-built chapel was designed in a Neo-Italian Romanesque style described at the time as "Byzantine" (*Leeds Mercury* 10/04/1858, 1). Perkin & Backhouse were also responsible for the design of a number of Commissioner churches in Yorkshire during the mid-19th century. Surviving buildings by Perkin & Backhouse and Perkin & Son do not demonstrate any one dominant architectural style within their oeuvres of ecclesiastical design. Earlier commissions, such as

Christ Church, Lofthouse, and St John the Evangelist, Cullingworth (1851-53) were designed in the Early English Gothic style. Later commissions, including St Peter, Hunslet Moor (1866-68) were designed in the Geometric Gothic style. The hospital chapel at Leeds Union Workhouse and St Michael, Barton-le-Street appear to be Perkin's only Neo-Romanesque designs, although they are architecturally very different buildings. Given Perkin's lack of dominant architectural style for designing churches, the employment of the Neo-Romanesque throughout the Victorian church of St Michael, Barton-le-Street, may reflect a direct response to the architecture of the earlier church.

As well as designing new churches, Perkin was also involved in a small number of church restorations; the earliest recorded being All Saints', Bramham, Yorkshire, which was restored by Perkin & Backhouse in 1853-4 (Longbottom n.d.). After Barton-le-Street Perkin & Son were also responsible for an 1875 restoration campaign at All Saints' church, Kirk Deighton, North Yorkshire (Harrogate Borough Council 2008, 3).

The views and input of the parishioners of Barton-le-Street appear totally lost to modern scholarship as no opinions are recorded in local newspapers or parish magazines. In contrast to the two previous case studies, there is no one dominant personality who appears to have driven the eventual character of the rebuilding. Before his death the active and evangelical Rev Hodgson was clearly advocating, and possibly even lobbying for, a new church. The trigger for the restoration campaign appears to have been a change in patronage, and Emily Meynell Ingram may have been the real patron, rather than her husband. The patrons themselves were seemingly not actively involved in the restoration, even leaving the appointment of an architect to their agent. Perkin and Son were versatile architects but not ecclesiastical experts; however William Perkin's detailed architectural drawings indicate they invested significant time and resources on Barton-le-Street church (as Emily Meynell Ingram had suggested a small firm might). Perhaps the agent Mr Leather was the key driving force behind the restoration? Unfortunately on the available evidence it is not possible to further analyse how these personalities combined to create the Victorian church of St Michael with its combination of 12th-century and Victorian sculpture.

6.4.5 Barton-le-Street Case Study Conclusions

The 1870-1 rebuilding of St Michael's church, Barton-le-Street, has been lamented by subsequent antiquarians and scholars, judging it to have destroyed the medieval church. This attitude is typified by Allen, who wrote, "before its destruction, it must have been one of the most interesting Norman buildings on a small scale in Yorkshire" (Allen 1889, 153).

The wealth of visual and documentary sources for this church has enabled this 'lost' medieval church has been digitally reconstructed in remarkable detail, including its post-medieval fixtures and fittings. It has allowed for analysis of the fabric, revealing a remarkably complete 12th-century parish church with little alteration. Archaeological investigation has demonstrated that the context of recycled material can be recaptured, allowing a reassessment of its value. More importantly, this has enabled the decision-making process of church restorers to be examined, revealing the reuse of material to have been a considered process that reflects Victorian social values. The decision to move the Romanesque sculpture inside the new church may well have prevented its subsequent deterioration. Discoveries made during the demolition of the church allowed for the reconstruction and replication of previously lost elements of the 12th-century decoration, augmenting modern understanding of this important scheme. The erroneous belief that this remarkable sculpture was not indigenous to the church may have adversely affected the perceived value of the fabric of the church, perhaps explaining why so little of it was recycled, when so much care was obviously taken to reset the sculptural scheme into the Victorian church.

Chapter 7: All Saints, Appleton-le-Street

7.1 Introduction

This brief case study chapter will examine the Church of All Saints, Appleton-le-Street, which is the only church in this thesis whose fabric largely escaped Victorian intervention. Sitting on a hilltop overlooking the shrunken medieval village, this small church features an impressive Saxo-Norman west tower and complex medieval phasing. All Saints is the mother church of a very large parish, with St Helen's, Amotherby (Chapter 8), being a dependant chapel. Shortly after the appointment of the Rev Charles Pierrepont Peach to the parish in 1855, two of the north aisle windows were restored. This work represents the earliest Victorian restoration campaign recorded for the churches in this study. However, rather than being rebuilt or heavily restored, All Saints underwent only very minimal alteration.

All Saints, Appleton-le-Street is generally considered to be a 'medieval' church which escaped Victorian intervention, and as such its architectural history and phasing have been well documented (Taylor & Taylor 1965; Keeton 1973; Rahtz et al. 2001). The church carries a Grade I designation (see Appendix 2.11), and is particularly prized for its Saxo-Norman west tower. The list description provides a detailed architectural description and phasing of the church, although it makes almost no mention of post-medieval features or alterations. The porch, which is noted in the list description as dating from the 19th century, is the only architectural element of the church for which no description is given. Pevsner (1966, 64-65) provides a brief phased development of the church, paying particular attention to the tower, and also notes the surviving medieval sculpture, but again fails to document any later alterations. In the 1970s, the then incumbent, Rev Barry Keeton, self-published a detailed and comprehensive history of the church (along with St Helen's, Amotherby) based on exhaustive archival research (Keeton 1973). This provides the most detailed architectural history of the church, including the post-medieval history of All Saints, but it too remains strangely silent on the 19th-century story of either building.

All Saints, Appleton-le-Street has received significant scholarly attention, including numerous comprehensive architectural descriptions. These all demonstrate the same preoccupation with the medieval period, almost suggesting that the structure remained unchanged from the 16th century through to today. This was obviously not the case and

All Saints continued to undergo alteration throughout the post-medieval period, particularly during the 19th and 20th centuries. Therefore, this case study will not endeavour to provide yet another detailed architectural description and phased development of the medieval fabric. Instead, it will aim to fill the gap in current scholarship by exploring the known post-medieval changes to the church, with a focus on the alterations that took place in the mid-19th century. Due to the relationship between Appleton-le-Street and Amotherby, some of the analysis of their 19th-century treatments will be discussed in the subsequent chapter (Chapter 8). Together these chapters will introduce the role of a vicar as patron, and highlight the contrast between the Victorian treatment of two churches under the same vicar and patron.

7.1.1 Historical Background – Appleton-le-Street village

Lying approximately 3.5 miles north-west of Malton, Appleton-le-Street is the only village in the 'Street Parishes' benefice to sit directly on the B1257 (fig. 7.1). Today, Appleton-le-Street is the smallest village in this study, although it sits within the largest parish. As with the previous case studies, the earliest documentary evidence for Appleton-le-Street comes from the Domesday Book of 1086, where its name is listed as 'Apeltun' (Williams & Palliser 1992, 80). According to Domesday, Cnut held the manor at Appleton-le-Street before the Conquest, after which it was held by King William I (Page 1914, 465). By the early 13th century the manor had passed to the Paynel family, who also held neighbouring Barton-le-Street (see Chapter 6). Unlike Barton-le-Street, the manor at Appleton passed through the Norman branch of the family, but by 1426 it was said to be held in the fee of the lords of Malton (Page 1914, 465). The manor passed through numerous hands throughout the medieval period before being held by the Hebden family from 1632 until the late 18th century, after which it again changed hands several times (Page 1914, 466). In 1861, the population of Appleton-le-Street was 185 persons (Coke 1864, 7), significantly higher than today.

7.1.2 Historical Account – All Saints' Church

The documentary history of All Saints' church, Appleton-le-Street, has been comprehensively detailed by one of its 20th-century incumbents (Keeton 1973). Despite the present church being considered by many to be of pre-Conquest foundation, there is no mention of either a church or priest at Appleton-le-Street in Domesday. Indeed, the first documentary evidence for the church is a late 12th-century charter in which King Henry II confirmed the gift of the church to St Albans Abbey (Keeton 1973, 2). Keeton (1973, 2-3) hypothesises that All Saints was originally gifted to the Benedictine Abbey of St Mary

and St Oswin, Tynemouth, before 1090, but that the possession passed to St Albans Abbey following the rebellion against William Rufus. Two chantry chapels are known to have been founded at Appleton-le-Street in the 14th century (see Keeton 1973, 20-23 for details), with Thomas de Bolton founding the chantry of the Blessed Virgin in 1339 (Page 1914, 471), and William Lord Latimer endowing a chantry chapel before 1381(Page 1914, 466). The Abbey held the advowson at Appleton-le-Street, and therefore also at Amotherby, until the Dissolution, after which they passed to the Crown (Page 1914, 471). During the later 16th century and through to the mid-17th century the advowson passed with the manor, but in 1764 and again in 1817, a Mrs Grace Thompson presented (Page 1914, 471). Trinity College, Cambridge briefly held the advowson, presenting in 1822, but the Rev James Jarvis Cleaver held it by 1829. The Rev J.J. Cleaver changed his name under Royal licence to Peach in 1845,[71] and the Cleaver/Peach family held the advowson for the remainder of the 19th-century (Keeton 1973, 9). Three successive generations of the Peach family were to act as both patron and incumbent at All Saints' church, Appleton-le-Street, in a dynasty spanning much of the 19th century.

7.2 Current Church

The material fabric of the present church (fig. 7.2) remains substantially medieval, with only minor elements relating to Victorian restoration. The church (fig. 7.3) consists of a two-bay nave with north and south aisles, 2-bay chancel, and a west tower with porch. The church is described at length, along with a phased plan, by Page (1914, 469-470), while the tower, and to a lesser extent the nave, are described and analysed in detail by Taylor & Taylor (1965, 28-9). Rahtz, et al. (2001, 24-31) offer the first archaeological assessment of the fabric, which offers a slightly refined architectural phasing. For context, the following brief outline of the architectural development of the church is based on that provided by Rahtz et al (2001).

7.2.1 Architectural Phasing

Figure 7.4 presents a simplified phased plan of the present church, based on survey work carried out in 2014. The west tower of All Saints, Appleton-le-Street has often been cited as one of the finest pre-Conquest towers in the Yorkshire (e.g. Taylor 1924, 59; Wragg Elgee & Wragg Elgee 1933, 224). Identified as belonging to a regional type of towers centred on Lincolnshire (Stocker and Everson 2006, 7), there is a growing consensus that their construction dates to after the Conquest – see Stocker and Everson (2006, 46-57) for a review of the dating debate. It is generally held that the lower two stages of the tower at

---

[71] See Section 8.3.4 for explanation of this name change.

Appleton-le-Street date to the 11th century, with the belfry stage being added shortly later, most likely in the early 12th century (Taylor & Taylor 1965, 29). The unique decoration of the belfry openings was the subject of the first scholarly work on the church, appearing in *The Antiquary* (Anon. 1893, 2-3). In the late 12th century the Romanesque north door was added to the tower and the tower arch was widened. It is likely that the nave is contemporary with the tower, with the external nave quoins visible at the west end of the church. The present chancel dates to the 13th century, but in 1368 St Albans Abbey charged the newly appointed vicar with the repair and rebuilding of the chancel (Lawton 1842, 513). The chancel was again repaired and this time also shortened, with archival documents recording that this work was carried out in 1461 by Abbot John Whetehamstede at a cost of £25 (Keeton 1973, 16). In the 1970s, Rev Keeton discovered traces of wall paintings behind the timber panelling on the north wall of the chancel (fig. 7.5). This vine scroll was identified as Victorian, but potentially based on surviving 13th-century work, some of which is thought to survive at the west end of the north wall (PR. AS. 75). The two-bay north aisle has been stylistically dated to the late 13th century, based on a surviving lancet window and arcade, the latter featuring round piers supporting double-chamfered two-centred arches. The two-bay south aisle was added in the opening years of the 14th century, stylistically datable by its octagonal arcade pier and intersecting traceried east window. The church has been re-roofed on several occasions, with at least three different rooflines visible on the east face of the tower (fig. 7.6). Taylor (1924, 59) suggests that the present low-pitched roof is "five centuries old". The present roof covering matches that described by Sir Stephen Glynne in 1863 (Butler 2007, 67) and presumably predates any Victorian restoration. A photograph of the church from c.1893 shows the present roof structure, but reveals that the south aisle was previously covered with pantiles (fig. 7.7).

7.2.2 Post-Medieval Investment and Alteration

There were a number of identifiable post-medieval alterations to the church, although some are of uncertain date. For example, scars in the south aisle pier (fig. 7.8) and east respond reveal the one-time presence of a parclose screen that originally delineated a chantry chapel in the eastern bay of the south aisle. This timber screen would likely have been removed some time following the abolition of the chantries in the mid-16th century. A documentary source records someone as having been carried "around the font" in 1636 (Keeton 1973, 19n). As the font is presently against the south wall of the tower, this strongly implies the font has been relocated since the mid-17th century. Other post-medieval alterations can be more firmly dated through documentary evidence, such as the removal

of the medieval rood screen in 1636 (Keeton 1973, 18). The same commission of 1636 also ordered the unblocking of the window in the west wall of the south aisle (fig. 7.9) (Keeton 1973, 16). Interestingly, the commissioners also ordered the whitewashing of the wall around the fireplace, which Keeton (1973, 16) hypothesises was located in the south aisle, although no evidence of it survives today. The present altar rail (fig. 7.10) and altar/communion table date both from the late 17th century, reflecting known changes in religious worship within the Church. The open pine bench pews in the nave match those described by Glynne in 1863 (Butler 2007, 68), which were installed in 1788. The two bells hanging in the west tower date from 1665 and 1705 (Keeton 1973, 15) and the crude font cover dates from the 17th or 18th century (fig. 7.11). The present porch (fig. 7.12) is vernacular in style with little in terms of datable architectural features, so it is not known when it was added to the north elevation of the tower. In 1863 Glynne noted a porch in the present location (Butler 2007, 67), although it is not known if it is the same structure. The English Heritage list description states the porch to be "19th century" (see Appendix 2.10), whereas Keeton (1973, 15) dates it to the 16th century, although he does not provide evidence for this dating.

7.2.3 The 1855 Restoration Campaign

In 1855, a year after Rev Peach was installed as vicar at All Saints, Appleton-le-Street, the two principle windows of the north aisle (fig. 7.13) were heavily restored. This restoration appears to represent the entirety of the Victorian restoration work within the bounds of this study. Unfortunately, no faculty papers or other documentation survives to record this work. Equally, no description of the church survives predating this restoration, so it is unknown if the present north aisle windows represent faithful restorations or replacements for different, earlier windows. Keeton describes the windows as having been "reconstructed in 1855" (Keeton 1973, 15), but there is no evidence to directly support this.

The Victorian windows are in the Decorated Gothic style (fig.7.14), which was the prevalent architectural style at the time, so it is possible their design may not respect the earlier windows. The small window in the east elevation of the aisle stylistically dates to the same period as the aisle's construction, suggesting it is a remnant of the original fenestration (fig. 7.15). Examination of the internal reveals of the restored north windows (fig. 7.16) shows the western sill to be crude in comparison to the Victorian tracery, suggesting the sill at least likely pre-dates the 1855 windows. The western portion of this sill is roughly cut out of a monolithic stone forming the lintel of a blocked doorway. That this stone has been hacked away suggests a post-medieval alteration rather than being part of

the refined Victorian work of the window tracery. Externally, the 1855 arches to the windows have been set vertically within the leaning north wall, resulting in large concave hollows and building breaks around the top of the windows (fig. 7.17). This indicates that the walls were rebuilt around the top of the 1855 windows, so the earlier arch design cannot be determined. A stone bearing the inscription '[JA]MES GR[?] 1714' is reset upside down immediately next to the western bay window (fig. 7.18), likely commemorating an early 18th-century restoration of the north aisle wall. The north wall of the aisle leans significantly outwards, but appears well supported by a very large stepped buttress (fig. 7.19) tentatively dated to the 15th century (Page 1914, 469). As the dated stone likely came from the disturbed stonework areas around the two windows, it is hypothesised that the 1714 work represented the re-fenestration of the two north aisle windows. The presence of two large 18th-century (and therefore likely Neo-Classical) windows inserted into these bays would explain why they alone were replaced in the 1855 restoration campaign.

7.2.4 Features/fabric altered, added or removed 1855-Present

While the church today remains substantially medieval, there have also been a number of repairs and alterations made to All Saints since 1855, both to the fabric and the fixtures and fittings. The oak panelling in the chancel must have been added at some stage in the later 19th century as it covers over Victorian wall paintings (see Section 7.2.1 above). The female effigy on the south side of the chancel (fig. 7.20) partially covers a grave slab dated 1782, and must therefore have been moved to its present location at some stage in the 19th century, although it is not known if this was before or after the 1855 restoration of the north windows.

Following the death of Rev Charles P. Peach in 1886, a memorial stained glass window was installed in the east window of the south aisle. This window commemorates Rev Peach's thirty-two years of service to the churches of Appleton-le-Street and Amotherby. In late 1892 the tower was entirely scaffolded in order for "absolutely needful works of reparation" (Anon 1893, 2) under the architect, Mr. Channon, of Malton. Morris describes the tower as being "very carefully restored in 1893" (Morris 1904, 44), and this restoration presumably included the re-roofing of the tower, replacement of the parapet cornice, and insertion of internal floors on new corbels. A surviving photograph of the church prior to this restoration (see fig.7.8) supports that little alteration was made. It is unclear if the tower cornice was fully replaced, but the waterspout on the western elevation certainly appears to have been moved (fig. 7.21).

Whilst the majority of work undertaken during the 20th century has been conservation-led repairs, there were also a number of changes to the fabric of the church. For example, the present pulpit in the north-east corner of the nave was installed in 1950, and was a gift from the Parish of Richmond. This replaced a pulpit which was described in 1863 as "new" (Butler 2007, 68) – might this have also dated from the 1855 restoration campaign? The remaining documented alterations all relate to the insertion of stained glass, with the Fairbank memorial glass installed in the east window in 1901. In 1627, Roger Dodsworth recorded that the east window bore the following inscription: ORATE PRO ANIMA DOMINI ROBERTI POWER, VICARII DE APPLETON (Keeton 1973, 17-18). Translating at 'Pray for the soul of Robert Power, vicar of Appleton', no vicar of that name has been associated with the church (Keeton 1973, 18). Based on the roll of known vicars, Keeton (1973, 18) suggests this window may either have dated from the late 14th century, or actually commemorate Robert Papes, vicar from 1438 to 1480. It is not known if this earlier memorial window survived up to 1901 or if it had been lost in the intervening years. That this window and the rood screen both survived into at least the mid-17th century suggests the church escaped serious attention from 16th-century reformers. In 1944, a stained glass memorial to Miss Clara Rose Peach was inserted into the east window of the north aisle, and in 1963 memorial glass to Lord Grimthorpe was installed in the south aisle window. In 1863, Glynne had noted that "some of the windows have mediocre stained glass" (Butler 2007, 68), which has presumably all been replaced by these 19th and 20th-century stained glass memorials.

7.3 Discussion

All Saints, Appleton-le-Street is only church in this study to not undergo a major campaign of restoration and rebuilding. Instead, the church appears to have received regular, small-scale investment in both the fabric and fixtures and fittings throughout the 18th and 19th centuries (continuing the medieval tradition), with the 1855 replacement of the north aisle windows being simply one such example. The paucity of documentary evidence for this church hampers detailed analysis of the Victorian story of All Saints. However, a number of interesting questions can be asked and some possible explanations posited.

Perhaps the most interesting question is why Victorian restorers treated All Saints so differently. A numbers of potential factors might be considered, the first of which is that, unlike the other 'Street Parish' villages, Appleton-le-Street did not grow substantially during the 19th century. Indeed, Appleton-le-Street village was located on the far edge of a parish that contained three substantially larger population centres (Amotherby, Swinton,

and Broughton), all of which had grown significantly due to their proximity to the regional market town of Malton (fig. 7.22). Therefore, by the mid-19th century, Amotherby served the majority of parish's population, and Appleton-le-Street, which remained the mother church, had become functionally peripheral. The reduced circumstance of Appleton-le-Street village is also reflected in it being the only 'Street Parish' village to not receive a railway station (fig. 7.23). The Victorian railway network provided important infrastructure for enabling parish church restoration, cheaply transporting materials and people to rural churches, and Appleton-le-Street's lack of station would have logistically inhibited any major restoration work. Unlike the earlier case studies, this church also lacked a wealthy, elite patron to fund any restoration campaign. The patronage for the church was held by the incumbent, Rev Peach, who was a gentleman but lacked the resources of the other patrons discussed in this study. The role of Rev Peach as both patron and vicar is explored in more depth in the following chapter (Chapter 8). The final consideration is that of the church's condition in the mid-19th century. Appleton-le-Street had been a well-endowed parish in the medieval period, with Pope Nicholas' 13th-century taxation valuing the parish at 50l. 13s. 4d – greater than the combined values of Hovingham (13l. 6s. 8d.), Slingsby (14l.) & Barton-le-Street (20l.) parishes (Lawton 1842, 513). Perhaps as a consequence of this, and its ownership by the wealthy St Albans Abbey, Appleton-le-Street appears to have always been well maintained, as demonstrated by its documentary record of alterations and repair (see Keeton 1973). The extent of post-medieval investment in the church, as detailed above, suggests that this trend continued following the Reformation. Crucially, this post-medieval investment does not seem to have included those objects that so offended Victorian restorers, such as box pews or galleries. The 1865 return (RD.RET.1) implies that the church remained in a good condition during the mid-Victorian period. The combination of the church's peripheral geographical and functional role, the comparably low circumstances of its patron, and its seeming good condition go far towards offering an explanation as to why All Saints, Appleton-le-Street was not subjected to a more comprehensive campaign of restoration and rebuilding in the mid-19th century.

With no documentary evidence to inform our understanding of the 1855 restoration of the north aisle windows, any analysis of this campaign remains largely conjectural. If the hypothesised Neo-Classical fenestration had been inserted into the north aisle in 1714, this offers a clear motive for their Victorian replacement with Decorated Gothic style windows. A contemporary author described the church as having undergone "restoration some years ago, but not in accordance with its date and style" (Black & Black 1863, 233). If this comment relates to the 1855 refenestration, this provides a fascinating glimpse into

Victorian views on restoration. As discussed in Section 1.2.4, standard narratives of mid-Victorian restoration suggest that the Decorated Gothic-style was privileged at the expense of earlier and later styles. Yet here the use of that style appears to be condemned for not respecting the architectural context of the parish church. Despite the lack of restoration and the lack of documentary sources, the Victorian treatment of All Saints, Appleton-le-Street still prompts interesting questions about the 19th-century treatment of parish churches. This chapter highlights that even substantially 'medieval' parish churches have post-medieval and modern aspects worthy of exploration in order to tell the full story of the parish church.

Chapter 8: St Helen, Amotherby

8.1 Introduction

This final case study will explore the Church of St Helen, in the small village of Amotherby. A dependent chapel of All Saints, Appleton-le-Street (Chapter 7), this small church was substantially restored in 1871 under the patronage and personal attention of the incumbent, Rev. Charles Pierrepont Peach. The most easterly of the churches in this study, the fabric of St Helen's was also the last to undergo a Victorian restoration campaign.

The restoration and partial rebuilding of the church arose following an attempted re-roofing in 1870, which eventually resulted in the rebuilding of much of the body of the church. Displayed within St Helen is a treasury of reused early sculptural elements, including some of the earliest fabric identified at any of the churches in this study. This sculpture has received some, if limited, scholarly attention (e.g. Lang 1991, 124-125), but the wider building is the least represented of the churches in terms of research or public awareness. Designated at Grade II (see Appendix 2.12), the list description provides a comparatively detailed architectural description of the church, highlighting the surviving and reused elements of the earlier fabric. This is perhaps unsurprising given the amount of pre-Victorian fabric surviving in the church. Pevsner provides a sparse description of the church focused on surviving 12th-century elements, and describing the 1871 north arcade as being in an "uncommonly ugly Neo-Norman" (Pevsner 1966, 60). The only significant research conducted on St Helen's church has been Rev. Keeton's (1973) historical account of the church fabric and history.

The restoration campaign at St Helen's church differs substantially from the earlier restorations at Hovingham, Slingsby and Barton-le-Street, in that it entailed only a partial rebuilding, leaving much of the earlier fabric in situ. More than any other case study barring All Saints, Appleton-le-Street, this campaign may be viewed more in terms of restoration rather than wholesale rebuilding. This case study will explore the role of the 19th-century vicar as patron, and the importance of engaged and enthusiastic individuals in driving forward Victorian church restorations. The recurring theme of changing architectural fashion will also be highlighted, as will the Victorian desire for architectural uniformity. Sadly, despite discoveries made during the restoration work engaging the interest of several renowned antiquarians, surprisingly little information survives for the earlier church or for finds made during its partial demolition and restoration.

8.1.1 Historical Background - Amotherby Village

Amotherby is the third village from Malton to be situated on the B1257, being approximately 2.5 miles north-west of the town (fig. 8.1). Like the preceding villages of Broughton and Swinton, Amotherby is located immediately to the north of the road, on the downward slope into the Vale of Pickering. Today the village is of similar size to Swinton, and it is significantly larger than either Appleton-le-Street or Broughton. As already discussed, evidence of early human activity has been discovered throughout the area and there are several tumuli of probable Bronze Age date nearby. It is believed that the present village of Amotherby sits near to the junction of two early road systems. As well as lying along the former Roman vicinal way, it is also held that the present Amotherby Lane (fig. 8.2) roughly traces Wade's Causeway, a presumed Roman or possibly early medieval road linking Malton with Cawthorne Camps and Whitby (English Heritage 2007b). Traces of this early road are apparently still visible in the fields known as The Knolls, immediately west of the present village (Ryedale District Council 2008, 2). Excavations near the meeting of these two roads in 1736 uncovered large areas of paved floor and varied Roman artefacts, indicating the likely site of a Roman building (English Heritage 2007c).

The Domesday Book of 1086 provides the earliest documentary evidence for Amotherby, where it appears as "Aimundrebi" (Williams & Palliser 1992, 80) and was recorded as a berewick, or outlying estate, of Hovingham. Some time shortly afterwards this berewick appears to have been divided, with part of the land remaining with the lords of Hovingham, 2.5 carucates being granted to Robert Brus, and one carucate and two carucates respectively being granted to the Basset and Luttrell families (Page 1914, 466). These fees passed through a number of hands during the later medieval period, including the Brus fee being enfeoffed to the Bordesden family in the early 14th-century (Page 1914, 466). The Lay Subsidy Roll of 1301 records that fifteen households were subject to tax in Amotherby (Brown 1897, 51), providing insight into the size of the village during the medieval period. By 1624 the manor had been conveyed to William Strickland, whose family then held it for over a century (Page 1914, 466). During the 18th and 19th centuries, the rights of the manor passed through a number of hands via both marriage and sale, with it being held by the Thellusson family in the later 19th-century (Page 1914, 466).

As with many of the other villages in this study, Amotherby expanded significantly during the 19th century (Ryedale District Council 2008, 3), particularly following the arrival of the railway. Built in 1853, Amotherby Station was the first stop on the line to the west of

Malton (*Yorkshire Gazette* 21/05/1853, 7). Many of the village's larger buildings date from the second half of the 19th-century, including the Queen's Head pub, the new Girl's School (now The Old School), and the Parish Room (now Sycamore House) (Ryedale District Council 2008, 3-4). St Helen's church is the only place of worship in Amotherby village, but there are two Non-Conformist chapels in nearby Swinton.

8.1.2 Historical Account – St Helen's Church

There is circumstantial evidence to suggest a church in Amotherby prior to the Conquest, however neither church nor priest were recorded in the Domesday accounts of 1086 (Williams & Palliser 1992, Folio 300V). The dedication to St Helen, mother of the Roman emperor Constantine, is often an indicator of an early church foundation, perhaps prompting the *Amotherby Parish Plan* to state that "the church may well date back to Roman times… and certainly Anglo-Saxon" (Ryedale District Council 2008, 2). Parts of two pre-Conquest crossheads discovered in the church during the 1871 restoration provide further evidence of early worship in the area.

As St Helen's church appears to have always been a dependant chapel of All Saints, Appleton-le-Street, its limited documentary history is intimately tied to that of its mother church. The earliest direct historical evidence for a church at Amotherby is found in a 1218 charter by Pope Honorius III confirming the gift of the churches at both Appleton-le-Street and Amotherby to St Alban's Abbey, Hertfordshire (Keeton 1973, 3). Keeton's (1973, 29) exhaustive documentary research reveals several examples of patronage and bequests to St Helen's church during the medieval period, particularly during the 14th century. As with Appleton-le-Street, the patronage of the church passed to the Crown after the Dissolution, before being given into private hands (Page 1914, 471). By 1764 the patronage was held by Mrs Grace Thompson, who still held it in 1817, after which it passed briefly to Trinity College, Cambridge (Page 1914, 471). By 1829 the patronage was held by the incumbent, the Rev. James Jarvis Cleaver, whose family retained it for the remainder of the 19th century.

Having explored the wider historical context of Amotherby village, the following will explore the fabric of the church, based on a systematic archaeological survey carried out in 2011. As St Helen's retains much of its earlier fabric surviving in situ, this case study chapter will follow a slightly different format than earlier chapters. The following section contains a detailed description and analysis of the present structure, differentiating surviving medieval and post-medieval elements from the Victorian fabric, including reused material identified within the 19th-century restoration. This analysis will then be combined

with documentary research to reconstruct the church as it appeared immediately prior to its restoration and expansion in 1871, culminating in a posited phased development of the church. Finally this chapter will examine the factors relating to the restoration of the church, including the reuse of material.

8.2 Description of the Current Church

Documentary evidence states that St Helen's (fig. 8.3) was largely remodelled in 1871 (fac. 1871/9), although some later sources erroneously date the work to 1872 (e.g. English Heritage n.d.(b)). The York-based architect for this restoration campaign was George Fowler Jones, and the patron, who was also the incumbent, was the Rev. Charles Pierrepont Peach (previously Cleaver[72]). Rev. Peach personally designed and executed much of the decorative detailing in the church, including stone carving, woodcarving and glass painting (PR.AM.6). The repair and remodelling of the church cost approximately £2000 (Bulmer 1890, 644) and was funded by subscription, with the Rev. Peach being the largest contributor (*York Herald* 18/11/1871, 7).

The present church comprises a nave with continuous chancel, north aisle, north vestry, south porch, and west tower (fig. 8.4). The building is constructed in two distinct geologies, with the tower, nave south and west walls, and chancel east wall being constructed in pale limestone ashlar. The remaining elements of the church, including the chancel south wall, porch, north aisle, and vestry are constructed from yellow, calcareous sandstone masonry. This rock-faced masonry externally faces brick walls that are plastered internally (fac.1871/9). Decorative features, such as the window details and north arcade, are constructed from a reddish sandstone ashlar, and the church has Westmorland slate roofs throughout.

8.2.1 Setting of the Current Church

St Helen's church, Amotherby, sits within a large churchyard near the south-eastern edge of the village, close to the B1257. The churchyard is bounded by stone walls, with access to the churchyard through an iron gate near the north-west corner. To the right of the gate is a small cottage overlooking the churchyard, one wall of which forms part of the churchyard wall. With several windows overlooking the churchyard, this cottage may represent an early vicarage. The modern vicarage for the benefice is located to the immediate north-west of the churchyard. Gravestones are located throughout the churchyard, with those to the south of the church largely dating to the 19th century.

---

[72] See Section 8.4.3 for discussion of this name change.

Immediately to the west of the south porch is situated a rough circular font of probable12th-century date, which is presently employed as a planter (fig. 8.5).

8.2.2 Nave

The nave comprises four bays without a clerestory, beneath a steep-pitched slate roof with cast-iron brattishing along the ridge. The south elevation is constructed in limestone ashlar and the porch, which projects from the second bay (from the west), contains the south doorway. This Romanesque doorway (fig. 8.6) features a round-headed, roll-moulded arch with hoodmould terminating on beakhead stops in the form of reused Romanesque arch voussoirs, all in limestone. The stone immediately beneath the eastern beakhead stop features incised graffiti bearing the date 1703 (fig. 8.7). The arch rests on scalloped capitals with heavily weathered attached shafts, forming the jambs. The other three bays of the south nave wall each contain a single light window within a round-headed arch composed of alternating pale and red sandstone voussoirs, with a sandstone sill (fig. 8.8). The windows in the two bays to the east of the porch have limestone jambs, while the western bay window has jambs of alternating pale and red sandstone. It is presumed that the two eastern bay windows represent surviving earlier fenestration with Victorian sills and arches. In contrast, the coursing of the limestone ashlar is disturbed around the western bay window, where the masonry has been cut into irregular shapes to accommodate the sandstone quoins. This combined with the use of non-local sandstone, which remains largely un-weathered, confirms this window has been inserted into earlier limestone masonry (fig. 8.9). High up, immediately to the west of the western bay window, is a single stone with a deeply incised inscription reading: "JOHN SPAVIN, CLARK; JAMES SNARRY; JOHN H. SNARRY, MA; JOHN SPAVIN; WILLIAM POSTGATE." This inscribed stone (fig. 8.10) likely dates from the early 18th century and is one of five such stones to be found in the church, this being the only one to remain in situ.

The south wall of the nave is delineated from the chancel by a stepped offset buttress. Constructed of limestone ashlar with sandstone quoins, this buttress is a clear later addition that is not coursed or keyed in with the nave wall. The nave south wall rests on a plinth of limestone ashlar four courses high. This plinth ceases abruptly approximately one metre from the west end of the wall, where disturbed coursing reveals the south-western corner has been rebuilt, with the addition of a shallow stepped buttress to the west wall of the nave (fig. 8.11). A similar remodelling occurred at the north-west corner of the nave, but the rebuilt section and stepped buttress are slightly recessed and thus are not co-terminus with the nave north wall (fig. 8.12). The west tower largely obscures the western elevation of the

nave, but the visible sections to either side are blank, featuring only the shallow, stepped buttresses mentioned above. Only the westernmost bay of the nave north wall presents externally, with the other three bays obscured by the north aisle. This western bay matches the corresponding bay of the south elevation, being limestone ashlar with a single-light window above a weathering offset plinth, although the latter is a course lower than on the south wall. The window matches that of the corresponding window on the south, including the sandstone jambs inserted into earlier limestone fabric.

Internally, the nave measures ~5.2m wide north to south, and is continuous with the chancel, totalling 24.5m in length from east to west (fig. 8.13). The interior doorway reveal features partially shafted jambs, a crude, thick roll-moulded pointed arch, and a chamfered hoodmould terminating on blank, uncarved, voussoir stops (fig. 8.14). The crudeness of this doorway reveal suggests it pre-dated the Victorian restoration, and its lack of unity likely represents later alteration. The blank voussoir stops are very crisp and are likely unfinished Victorian work, possibly originally intended to mirror the exterior beakhead stops. The floor inside the doorway is stone flags, but steps up onto carpeted timber in the western bay. Raised on two circular steps, the font is located immediately west of the doorway and is carved in a highly decorative Romanesque style (fig. 8.15). Designed by Rev. Peach in 1871 and carved from Hildenley limestone (Bulmer 1890, 644), the bowl rests on red marble shafts. Leaning against the south wall behind the font is a carved rectangular stone of Hildenley limestone (fig. 8.16), which has been interpreted as part of an altar or tomb, with the *Malton Messenger* (PR.AM.6) suggesting it may have formed part of the base supporting the knight effigy (see Section 8.2.5 below). Featuring an arcade of three trefoiled-arches, the central arch contains a heavily worn crucifix, while the two outer compartments contain heraldic shields, again worn beyond legibility, and smaller shields are carved in the spandrels of the arcade. Although not discussed in any other descriptions, raking light reveals faint incised text across the top of the carved face, sadly now illegible[73] (fig. 8.17). This stone was discovered during the 1871 demolition of the porch, where it had been reused as a quoin (PR.AM.6). Another fragment believed to be from the same structure was also found during the porch demolition (PR.AM.6), which was described as "smaller but of similar character" (Page 1914, 471). This stone was displayed in the vestry during the early 20th century but seems to have since disappeared.

---

[73] Might this text be revealed through Reflectance Transformation Imaging (RTI) recording (see English Heritage 2013)?

The interior walls of the nave are all plastered and painted, which unfortunately obscures all of the internal masonry. The western wall of the nave is blank. The nave windows all have splayed internal openings with chamfered rounded-headed arches. In the south wall, the western-most bay window contains striking modern stained glass commemorating Alec Hornby, 1930 - 1968, (fig. 8.18). Designed by W. Harvey of York, it was installed in 1970 at a cost of £150 (Anon n.d.(d)). The corresponding north window contains clear glass quarries in a diaper pattern within a narrow border of blue glass. The windows in the two remaining bay of the south wall are similarly glazed, but with the eastern-most window containing red glass in its border.

Bench pews sitting on a timber floor fill the two eastern bays of the nave. The rounded pew ends contain carved roundels with a variety of patterns, all designed and carved by Rev. Peach (*York Herald* 18/11/1871, 7). A stone pulpit of Caen Stone occupies the south-east corner of the nave (fig. 8.19), which was again carved by Rev. Peach (*York Herald* 18/11/1871, 7) in a Neo-Romanesque style. The floor surrounding the pulpit and across the eastern end of the nave is paved with Broseley tiles (PR.AM.6). The key architectural feature of the nave is the arcade connecting it to the north aisle (see fig. 8.13). This four-bay arcade springs from corner-shafted responds and contains three narrow monolithic sandstone piers sitting on high rectangular bases. The sandstone arches, which spring from wide, shallow scallop capitals with chamfered rectangular abaci, are decorated on both sides with a roll mould and a shallow chevron moulding. The exposed timber roof has principal rafters with arched braces and collar-beams, which delineate each bay of the nave and chancel. The principal rafters terminate on wall posts sitting on stone corbels carved in an abstract Romanesque style (fig. 8.20).

The nave of St Helen's church represents a mix of Victorian and earlier fabric. The limestone ashlar walls, excluding the fenestration, represent an extant portion of the pre-1871 church. The sandstone nave windows are Victorian insertions, while the limestone window jambs raise the possibility that some of these Victorian windows utilised existing openings - this will be discussed in more detail in Section 8.3.2. The internal fixtures and fittings, such as the pews, font and pulpit, all date from the 1871 campaign, as does the roof structure, including the wall plates and corbels. The stained glass window is 20th century, while the simple bordered glazing is presumed to be original to the Victorian restoration. Overall, the architecture of the present nave is overwhelmingly decorated in the Romanesque style, mostly being heavily stylised, Victorian Neo-Romanesque, but also incorporating a 12th-century Romanesque doorway. The exception to this is the exterior stepped buttresses, which are a feature of later Gothic styles.

8.2.3 Porch

The south porch (fig. 8.21) is constructed from calcareous sandstone that is externally detailed with a rock-face finish and is internally ashlar. The east and west walls are blank with no architectural detailing, and low stub walls project from these to form the south elevation and entrance. Set behind these is a timber and glass wall, containing a bi-fold door providing access to porch. Internally measuring ~2.25m east to west by ~2.68m north to south, the porch has a timber gabled roof with slate covering. Low stone benches run against both the east and west walls inside the porch, upon which are cemented a treasury of sculptural stonework, all discovered during the 1871 restoration work (figs. 8.22 & 8.23). It is unfortunate that this treasury of reused antiquities, which includes some of the earliest carved work to be found amongst the 'Street Parish' churches, is set in cementitious mortar and currently lacks any modern interpretation or detailed information.

Filling the western bench is a large 14th-century grave slab featuring a quatrefoil enclosing the bust of a female figure "holding her hands to her breasts and wearing a flowing headveil and wimple" (Page 1914, 471). This grave slab was found buried beneath the floor of the earlier church, to the north-east of the old font (PR.AM.6). It has been erroneously suggested (Turner 1905, 272) that this may be the grave slab described by Sir Stephen Glynne at Barton-le-Street in 1863.[74] Two fragments have been set on top of this slab, one being part of a late 13th or early-14th-century cross slab, and the other possibly being part of a late 12th or early 13th-century standing marker[75] (McClain pers. comm. 2013). Cemented together immediately to the left of the doorway is a collection of four stones, including two 12th-centuy Romanesque arch voussoirs with crisp chevron decoration (see fig. 8.22). In the corner, below one of these voussoirs is a small roll-moulded and chamfered column base, consistent with a 12th-century nook shaft. With these fragments is a large stone featuring part of a crude Maltese cross, likely a grave marker dating to the 12th century (McClain pers. comm. 2013).

On the eastern bench is a large, richly floriated cross slab dating to the early 14th century. It was discovered in 1871 in an arch recess in the chancel north wall of the earlier church and, as with the knight effigy, was hidden behind pews and held by the Victorian restorers

---

[74] "In the churchyard is an ancient stone coffin; also a sepulchral slab with the head only in relief, sunk within a trefoiled arch" (Butler 2007, 83). The coffin and grave slab are no longer in the Barton-le-Street churchyard and were presumably removed during the 1870-1 rebuilding of the church.

[75] Or possibly a post-medieval imitation.

to already be out of its original position (PR.AM.6). To the north of this cross slab is a large rectangular stone containing a medieval piscina drain of unknown date (see fig. 8.23). Cemented on top of the cross slab are four carved stones, one of which appears to be a cut down late 12th or early 13th-century standing marker (McClain pers. comm. 2013), while another appears to be a cut down 13th-century bracelet cross slab. The remaining two stones have been identified as parts of pre-Conquest crossheads, with the stone inside the porch dating to the 10th century, while the stone outside the porch entrance dates from the 9th - 10th century (Lang 1991, 124-5). Apart from the two large cross slabs, all of the stones in the porch treasury were found reused within the pre-restoration church walls during their demolition (PR.AM.6). Architecturally, the simple porch is vernacular in style, with no discernable Romanesque or Gothic style elements, and dates entirely from the 1871 restoration campaign.

8.2.4 North Aisle

The four-bay north aisle corresponds to the western bay of the chancel and three bays of the nave. The aisle (fig. 8.24) is constructed in brick with a rock-faced sandstone exterior facing and sandstone ashlar quoins. The walls all sit upon a sandstone plinth approximately 4 courses high. Each bay contains a window matching that in the western bay of the nave south elevation, being single lights within round-headed arches, and constructed from alternating pale and red sandstone. To the east, the north aisle is delineated from the vestry by a narrow chimney that steps out from the line of the north wall. The west elevation contains a single-light window matching those of the north elevation, and an apex stone in the form of a simple Celtic cross surmounts the gable end (fig. 8.25).

Internally, the aisle measures ~16.35m east to west, and ~3.78m north to south, with walls uniformly measuring ~600mm in thickness. The north aisle is separated from the nave by an arcade, as described in Section 8.2.2 (Nave) (fig. 8.26). A single row of oak bench pews, which sit against the north wall on a raised timber floor, occupy the majority of the aisle, with a narrow passageway running immediately against the arcade. The window in the west elevation contains plain glass quarries in a diaper pattern with a narrow red border. The window in the first (western-most) bay of the north elevation is similarly arranged but with a blue glass border. To the east of this window a modern timber board is fixed to the wall, recording the names of the chaplains & curates from 1347 onwards. The next window contains stained glass commemorating George Neville & Eustace Edward Strickland, who died in 1896 and 1898 respectively. To the east is another timber board recording the names of the clergy (rectors and vicars) from 1232 to 1985, which is continued to the

present on a third board in the following bay. The next bay's window contains very similar stained glass, this time in memory of Jack Alan Warren, who died in 1912. Both of the north aisle stained glass windows (fig. 8.27) were designed and made by the firm of James Powell & Sons, London (fac.1902A/26 & fac.1913/60). The window in the fourth bay contains clear glass quarries with a narrow red glass border. This eastern bay of the aisle has a raised dais, on which sit a secondary altar in front of the church's organ. To the east the north aisle is architecturally delineated from the vestry by a wall punctuated by a wide segmental-arched opening. This arch is almost entirely filled by the church organ, which dates from 1889 (*Musical Opinion and Music Trade Review* 1889, 76).

The overall architectural styling of the north aisle is the same uniform Neo-Romanesque employed in the decoration of the nave. With its sandstone-clad brick walls and Neo-Romanesque styling, the entire north aisle dates from the 1871 restoration campaign, and appears to contain no reused elements within its fabric. Apart from the two stained glass windows and the timber roll boards, which are both 20th-century additions, this aisle appears little changed from its construction in 1871.

8.2.5 Chancel

The south elevation of the two-bay chancel is a continuation of the nave south wall, but in contrast to the limestone ashlar of the nave, the chancel wall is constructed of rock-faced sandstone (fig. 8.28). This sits upon the same low, limestone plinth that continues from the nave. The western bay window matches those of the nave and north aisle, while the eastern bay contains a two-light window of Romanesque-style design. A mullion separates the two lights and each has a round-headed arch with small chevron halo. This window is chamfered and has broach stops near the base. There is a diagonal offset buttress of sandstone ashlar at both the south-east and north-east corners of the chancel. The eastern elevation is constructed of limestone ashlar and is dominated by the triple lancet east window (fig. 8.29). Four reused inscribed stones (fig. 8.30) are arranged into a single masonry course below the east window. They read, from left to right: 'JAMES SPAVIN 1708'; 'JAMES SNARRY WC; ILC: 1708'; 'JOHN SPA2 1703)('; 'CORNELIQUS HOLDFORTH JULY YE... ANNO...1708'. These four stones, which are similar to the inscribed stone in the nave south wall, were placed here during the Victorian rebuilding, having been removed from their previous locations in the nave walls (PR.AM.6).

Inside the church, the chancel (fig. 8.31) measures ~5.2m wide, and is continuous with the nave. The only architectural delineation of the chancel from the nave is a raised floor level, with a single step situated immediately behind the pulpit. The chancel floor is covered with

Minton tiles, although a modern raised timber floor covers most of the space. The window lighting the pulpit (western bay of south elevation) contains stained glass commemorating the former vicar, Harry Ward, who died in 1934 (fig. 8.32). To the east of this is the two-light window, each light of which has an internal roll moulding running around the arches and down the jambs. The lights are filled with clear glass quarries within a narrow border of red glass. The eastern half of the eastern bay of the chancel forms the sanctuary, and is delineated by a step, richer flooring tiling, and an altar rail. Without the present raised timber floor in the chancel, there would be a second step, making the sanctuary three steps (representing the Trinity) above the level of the nave floor. The timber altar rail features wrought iron brackets decorated with acanthus leaves. The floor of the sanctuary features Minton tiles enriched with decorated encaustic tiles. Below the east window is the large timber altar with an inscription across its base, recording that it commemorates Harry Ward, the same vicar memorialised in the stained glass window behind the pulpit. This English Oak altar is by Robert (Mouseman) Thompson, of Kilburn, and dates from 1946 (fac. 1946/89). Above the altar is a shallow recess containing a curtain, beneath a simple chevron moulding. This reredos recess continues up to form the east window. The three splayed lancets of the east window are contained within a large Romanesque-style arch surround, with nook shafts featuring stylised proto-waterleaf capitals and flat, moulded bases. The round-headed arch has a chamfer with widely spaced nailhead mouldings, and a zigzag moulding (see fig. 8.31). This is surrounded by a moulded hoodmould terminating on swan-neck stops. The lancets each contain stained glass of geometric patterns with a beaded border. The central light, which has a different geometric pattern, also features a central panel depicting Christ on the cross (fig. 8.33). These three stained glass windows were designed and painted by Rev. Peach, with help provided on one pane (presumably the Crucifixion scene) from a friend, Mr Kershaw, of Southam, Warwick (PR.AM.6). A text string across the base of the window record that the lights commemorate, from left to right: the vicar's brother, James Peach Peach; his parents, James Jarvis Peach and Ellin Subilla; and his younger son: George Cruger Peach.

To the right of the altar, within the south wall is a large niche formed by a round-headed arch with a broach-stopped chamfer. It is claimed (PR.AM.6) that this niche was formed from reused elements of two arched recesses found in the north wall of the earlier church, although the crispness of the arrises and uniformity of the arch make this questionable. Within the recess sits a 14th-century effigy of a knight, possibly representing Sir John de Bordesden (fig. 8.34). The effigy was discovered in an arch recess during the 1871 demolition of the north wall, its existence hidden behind pews (PR.AM.6). The *Malton*

Messenger stated that that was not the effigy's original position, although sadly the article does not justify this analysis (PR.AM.6). The knight, whose arms are held in prayer, is depicted wearing chainmail with a sword belted at his waist. The knight carries a large shield bearing the three boar's heads of the Bordesden arms, and its feet rest upon a lion. A controversial figure, Sir John de Bordesden held the manor at Amotherby from 1294 until his death in 1329 (Yorkshire.com, n.d.).

Immediately to the north of the altar, within the wall separating the chancel from the vestry, is another niche, similar to that found in the south wall. This recess (fig. 8.35) features crude nook shafts with scalloped cushion capitals and bases, and moulded abaci. The broad arch has a wide chamfer with broach-stops, and a chamfered hoodmould terminating on charismatic carved faces. Stylistically these elements are convincingly Romanesque, dating the feature to the late 12th century. Within the niche is a tall, reused 14th-century tomb featuring a bracelet cross and the Norman French inscription 'ICI GIT WILLEM DE BORDESDEN PRIZ PUR LA ALME'.[76] William De Bordesden is generally held to be the brother or nephew of Sir John de Bordesden, mentioned above. This inscribed tomb was moved to its present location during the 1871 restoration, having previously been located in the graveyard, to the west of the south porch, near the base of the tower (PR.AM.6). The *Malton Messenger* related that this tomb was "found" (PR.AM.6), and an information panel (Anon n.d.(d)) within the church speculatively suggests that the tomb may have been moved into the churchyard during the early 18th-century remodelling of the church, which seems plausible and would also account for its crisp condition. To the left of the recess, and outside the sanctuary, is the simple door connecting the chancel to the vestry (see fig. 8.31). With exposed quoins and voussoirs, it has a round-headed arch with a chamfer that continues down the jambs to terminate on broach stops near floor level. To the west of the doorway is the eastern bay of the north aisle arcade.

The present chancel at St Helen's church represents a mix of in situ pre-1871 fabric, new Victorian elements, and reused materials and features, making it the most archaeologically complex area of the 1871 restoration. The limestone plinth on the south elevation of the chancel may be in situ earlier fabric, or it may be rebuilt using the existing material. The rock-faced sandstone north and south walls and stepped buttresses all date to the Victorian restoration campaign. As will be discussed in more detail below, the limestone east elevation also dates entirely from the 1871 restoration, having been constructed from reused masonry, and incorporating reused inscribed stones. The internal fixtures and

---

[76] "Here lies William de Bordesden, pray for his soul"

fittings are Victorian, with the exception of the stained glass window in the south elevation and the altar, which are both 20th-century additions. Despite utilising numerous reused elements, principally the sanctuary recesses and their funerary monuments, the chancel dates entirely from the 1871 restoration of St Helen. This is reflected in the representation of several architectural styles, in contrast to the nave and north aisle. While still predominantly decorated in the Romanesque style, the grouped lancets of the east window demonstrate the Early English style common in the early 13th century. Finally, the stepped diagonal buttresses employed at the exterior angles stylistically date to the 14th-century.

8.2.6 Vestry

The single bay vestry occupies the north-east corner of the church, between the north aisle and the chancel. The north elevation is a continuation of the north aisle and is similarly constructed of rock-faced sandstone on a sandstone ashlar plinth (see fig. 8.24). The east gable elevation (fig. 8.36) is surmounted by an apex stone matching that at the western end of the north aisle gable. Centred within this elevation is a single window, matching those of the north aisle. In the southern corner, where the east wall meets the north wall of the chancel, is a small door. It is accessed by two steps, and the doorway has an angle roll that continues down the jambs to terminate just above the plinth. Internally the vestry is separated from the north aisle by a wide arch, as described above in Section 8.2.4 (North Aisle). In the south-east corner is the small round-arched doorway that leads out into the churchyard. Similar to the doorway connecting the vestry and chancel, both have simple, splayed internal reveals. The window in the eastern elevation contains clear rectangular quarries of leaded glass. The vestry contains very little architectural detailing, but the window and doorways are executed in a Neo-Romanesque style matching that of the nave and north aisle. As with the north aisle, this vestry dates entirely to the 1871 restoration and rebuilding campaign, with no reused earlier material.

8.2.7 Tower

The rectangular west tower (fig. 8.37) is of two stages with no architectural delineation, and is constructed in fine limestone ashlar of generally uniform appearance. Externally the ashlar of the tower is largely covered by lichen, with large areas of delamination and no visible tooling. There are a number of filled putlog holes identifiable, along with some reused material, including two stones scored by a former roofline (one of which is high on the exterior west elevation (fig. 8.38), while the other is low in the south internal elevation). At the base of the three external elevations is a high weathering offset or plinth of seven courses. Approximately two-thirds of the way up each exterior elevation, the masonry

appears to become smaller, less rectangular, and less uniformly coursed. A Classical-style moulded stringcourse runs immediately beneath a simple embattled parapet, which surmounts each elevation of the tower. On the western elevation the parapet stringcourse is interrupted by two simple projecting waterspouts. Below the parapet, each elevation contains a belfry opening, which is square-headed and of two lights separated by a mullion. The north, south and east elevations are otherwise blind. The west wall of the nave, and its associated buttresses, project slightly across the south & north elevations of the tower (fig. 8.39). A doorway in the western elevation, which interrupts the high weathering offset or plinth, provides the only access into the tower. This doorway features a simple round-headed arch with a heavily weathered hoodmould terminating on lozenge corbel stops (see fig. 8.37). Immediately above the doorway is a two-light window, providing internal lighting to the tower. Like the belfry openings, it is square-headed, mullioned, but with a flat label above.

Internally the tower is very simple, with whitewashed walls and simple ladders providing access to the uppers stages, each of which is separated by a heavy timber floor. The bell frame holds two early bells, with the treble bell inscribed 'Campana beate Helene,' and the second 'Campana beate Marie I.H.S.'. These inscriptions are written in Gothic script, stylistically giving the bells probable dates in the 15th century (Page 1914, 471). Within the eastern internal elevation is a blocked, round-headed doorway, which previously connected the tower and the nave (fig. 8.40). The majority of the ashlar in the interior of the lower stages features regular striated tooling marks consistent with a 12th-century date (fig. 8.41). Sitting in a corner inside the tower, not incorporated into the present church fabric, is a shallow octagonal capital with stiff-leaf carvings (fig. 8.42). It is possible that this is the same stone described by Page (1914, 471) as lying against the south wall of the nave. That stone was identified as part of a medieval sundial (Page 1914, 471). However, given its mix of decorative motifs and crude carving, it more likely dates from the post-medieval period. Also stored within the tower is a timber Bequest Board, dated 1677 (fig. 8.43). Painted black with yellow text, it records that Henry Stockdale bequeathed seventy pounds, the interest from which was to be distributed twice a year for the poor of Appleton-le-Street parish.

The tower demonstrates a variety of different architectural styles, with the two doorways[77] being in the Romanesque style. The hoodmould over the exterior doorway is reminiscent of the Early English style, while the fenestration, stringcourse, plinth and parapet are very

---

[77] Including the blocked internal doorway.

late Gothic/Classical in style. The tower has clearly been heavily rebuilt or remodelled in the post-medieval period. The Victorian County History dates the tower to the late 16th-century (Page 1914, 470), while Pevsner suggests an early 17th-century construction date. Given the extent of 12th-century tooling visible on the interior elevations, it is more likely to be of substantively 12th-century construction, with later additions and alterations. The tower windows, which were described in 1871 as "comparatively modern insertions" (PR.AM.6), may also date from this 16th or 17th-century phase of work. There is no evidence that the tower was substantially altered or restored as part of the 1871 campaign and the fabric appears to contain only in situ earlier material.

8.2.8 Analysis of Current Church

The present church of St Helen, Amotherby (fig. 8.44) is constructed from two distinct geologies, which should render phasing the 1871 restoration a simple process. Generally speaking, those areas of the church constructed of limestone masonry pre-date the Victorian restoration and constitute the surviving in situ earlier fabric. Those elements of the church constructed in sandstone, especially walls built of rock-faced sandstone facing brick, relate to the 1871 restoration campaign. This also broadly corresponds with the extent of intended restoration shown on the 1871 drawings that accompany the faculty (fac. 1871/9) (fig. 8.45), although some differences are noticeable. Fig. 8.46 presents a phased plan of the current church, showing the extent of in rebuilding. As the following section will demonstrate, the principal exception to this simple phasing is the east wall of the chancel, which although constructed of limestone ashlar, represents a Victorian rebuilding employing reused material. The rebuilding of the east gable wall is not featured on the 1871 faculty plans (see fig. 8.44), suggesting it was not intended as part of the original scheme.

8.3 Reconstruction of the Pre-Restoration Church

Having established the extent of the Victorian restoration, the following section will describe the church of St Helen, Amotherby as it appeared immediately prior to the 1871 restoration campaign. This reconstruction is based on a combination of the surviving and reused elements of the pre-restoration church along with archival and documentary research. Shortly before its 1871 restoration, St Helen, Amotherby consisted of a continuous nave and chancel, with a west tower and south porch. Described by a contemporary account as a "most unpretending, barn-like, red-tiled building" (PR.AM.6), its interior was described by Glynne in 1863 as "pewed and ugly" (Butler 2007, 66). There is no evidence for this church ever having had aisles or a vestry, and the Rural Dean's

Returns of 1865 confirm there was no vestry at that time (RD.RET.1, 493). Fig. 8.47 presented a reconstructed plan of St Helen, Amotherby prior to its 1871 restoration.

8.3.1 Sources

There is scant documentary evidence for St Helen prior to 1871. However, as significant amounts of fabric survive within the present structure, the material evidence is more abundant than in any of the previous case studies. Therefore the standing building, with surviving pre-restoration elements and reused material, represents an important source for understanding the church fabric prior to the 1871 restoration. Of the sparse documentary evidence for the pre-restoration church, Sir Stephen Glynne's description of 1863 (Butler 2007, 66), and an article in the *Malton Messenger* detailing the reopening of the restored church in November 1871 (PR.AM.6), are the key sources. There are a number of other primary and secondary sources, such as faculty applications and parish records that further elucidate the pre-restoration church.

Another, surprising, and invaluable source for the pre-restoration St Helen can be found in the churchyard. Under a yew tree amongst the gravestones is a pile of abandoned stones, which were previously stacked by the vestry door at the east end of the church, and which are generally held to relate to the pre-restoration church (Borret pers. comm. 2011). Once cleaned and recorded, the pile was found to contain sixteen fragments of window tracery, matching many of the windows described in the pre-restoration church. These include three sections of lancet window arches, several fragments of mullion or transom, and identifiable segments of both Geometric and Perpendicular tracery (fig. 8.48). The largest of these stones is the central section from the top of a square-headed Perpendicular Gothic window, measuring approximately 390mm wide and 318mm tall.

8.3.2 Setting of the Pre-Restoration Church

There is little surviving evidence for the churchyard or immediate setting of St Helen prior to 1871. The 1892 OS map (fig. 8.49) shows the churchyard occupied only the rectangular core of the present one. The Archbishop of York consecrated a new section of churchyard on 25 March 1899 (Anon. 1899, 3), likely referring to a large extension at the south-eastern corner, forming the current dog-legged churchyard. A further modern extension was added to the north of the churchyard in the mid-20th century (PR.AM.56). Finally, it was recorded in 1865 that the height of the churchyard was slightly above the level of the interior of the then church (RD.RET.1, 493).

8.3.3 Nave & Porch

As in the present church, the pre-1871 St Helen featured a continuous nave and chancel with no internal architectural delineation. Described in a contemporary account as "barn-like" (PR.AM.6), this implies the nave and chancel were under a single roof,[78] which was recorded prior to the 1870 re-roofing as being covered with red pantiles (RD.RET.1, 493). There is strong evidence that the north and south walls of the nave and the porch were partially or fully rebuilt during the opening years of the 18th century. The three inscribed stones dated 1708[79] (described above) were all previously located in the exterior north wall of the nave "between the windows" (PR.AM.6). The 1703 'JOHN SPA2' stone was previously set in the exterior south wall to the east of the porch, joining the existing undated inscribed stone to the west of the porch in the same elevation. It has been argued that these inscribed stones commemorate restoration or rebuilding campaigns, with the *Malton Messenger* stating: "The nave was clearly rebuilt, presumably at the commencement of the last [18th] century" (PR.AM.6). The article goes on to cite the four inscribed stones, and a similar inscription on the pulpit (see below) as evidence of this rebuilding. As one of the principle sources for the earlier church, later authors have relied heavily upon the Malton Messenger article, although they vary on the extent of rebuilding. For example the Victoria County History is more cautious, simply stating "there is evidence of considerable repairs in the eighteenth century" (Page 1914, 470). The carved stone beside the Romanesque south doorway is similarly dated 1703 (see fig. 8.7), indicating this earlier feature may have been restored or reset at the part of this rebuilding campaign. It may be at this time that the 12th-century beakhead voussoirs were employed as label stops.

The three sources for the pre-restoration nave windows are Glynne's written description of 1863, the church plan of 1871 (fac. 1871/9), and the window tracery fragments located in the churchyard. Through these the pre-1871 nave fenestration scheme can be largely reconstructed. Glynne notes the church as having "some single lancet windows, some with obtuse heads, rather questionable" (Butler 2007, 66), and as he separately describes the chancel windows, it is inferred that these lancets were principally located in the nave. The ground plan associated with the 1871 faculty application for the church's restoration (fac. 1871/9) reveals four of these earlier nave windows, including the three bays of the south elevation, and the window in the western bay of the north elevation (see fig. 8.45). All four

---

[78] Although this term may have been applied generically as a disapproving judgment of the church as a whole.

[79] Stones inscribed 'James Spavin'; 'James Snarry'; and 'Cornelious Holdforth'

windows are shown as narrow single-lights with an exterior chamfer and deep internal splays, consistent with lancet windows. Interestingly, the window in the western bay of the south elevation is shown as only ~250mm wide, which if accurate made it a very narrow lancet. The other three windows vary between 465-490mm wide, with the two occupying the eastern bays of the south nave wall appearing matched. Amongst the window fragments found in the churchyard were three stones, each representing half of a lancet window head (fig. 8.50). When two of these were fitted to form a complete lancet window head, the resultant window measured approximately 420mm wide (fig. 8.51). Allowing for mortar this reconstructed window roughly equates to those depicted on the 1871 plan and confirms the presence of lancet windows of this size in the nave. Glynne (Butler 2007, 66) was presumably referring to these wider lancets, when he described some of the windows as being obtuse and questionable. Glynne's implication of these windows as questionable (i.e. not 13th-century originals), suggests they may date from the early 18th-century restoration of the nave.

The Romanesque south doorway as described by Glynne in 1863 matches that found in the church today, and its location on the 1871 plan (fac.1871/9) confirms that the doorway was not moved during the Victorian restoration. Several sources (e.g. Butler 2007, 66; PR.AM.6) confirm the existence of a south porch at St Helen's church prior to the 1871 restoration; sadly, however, no known descriptions survive. The *Malton Messenger* implies that the porch was also rebuilt as part of the early 18th-century remodelling of the nave (PR.AM.6). As medieval sculptural stone fragments were recovered during its demolition (PR.AM.6), it must have been a masonry structure, but there are no wall scars or building breaks visible on the surviving fabric of the nave south elevation. As the south doorway remains in situ,[80] the pre-1871 porch must have been either an unbonded structure, or more likely, the same width and location as the present porch, thus concealing its earlier connection to the nave wall. The surviving nave plinth carries through behind the present porch, confirming that any porch structure would have been a later addition.

There is limited evidence for the interior of the nave prior to 1871, with Glynne describing the church in 1863 simply as "pewed and ugly" (Butler 2007, 66). The Borthwick Institute for Archives holds three early faculties for the erection of pews in the church, dating between 1765 and 1809 (Fac.Bk.1, 394; Fac.Bk.2, 412; Fac.Bk.3, 507-8). These faculties each give the dimensions of the pew to be constructed and their intended location within the church. This location information often also provides clues to surrounding pews and

---

[80] At least in terms of the Victorian restoration.

features, allowing for a partial reconstruction of the nave interior in the early 19th century. This reveals that the interior of the pre-restoration St Helen featured a central passageway flanked by a mixture of common pews and large box pews (see fig. 8.47). We also know that in 1765 the Minister's Reading Desk was located in the south-east corner of the nave, near the present pulpit. The rough, round font currently found outside to the west of the porch is generally held to be from the church, and matches the one described by Glynne on his visit in 1863 (Butler 2007, 66). Cox (1973, 229) has suggested that the font may be pre-Conquest, presumably based on the crudeness of its execution, although it is more likely of 12th-century date. The font was moved to its present position as part of the 1871 restoration and its previous location within the pre-restoration church is not recorded. Thankfully, however, a contemporary description of one of the reused funerary slabs provides clues as to the previous location of the font. The grave slab featuring the female figure[81] was reported as being found "just within the church" while excavating the furnace, and that it was located "just N.E. of the old font" (PR.AM.6). It further describes another feature at the head of the slab, which was about two feet within the old foundation wall. By correlating these clues (see fig. 8.47), the pre-1871 font must have been situated in roughly the same location as the present font, just to the west of the door.

8.3.4 Chancel

The present arrangement of continuous nave and chancel is preserved from the pre-restoration church. The scaled 1871 plan for the rebuilding (fac. 1871/9) shows that the east wall of the chancel was intended to be retained (see fig. 8.45), and thus reveals the dimensions of the earlier chancel, which match those of the current. The 1871 plan also reveals that the east wall was approximately 840mm thick, and that the east window had a ~2575mm internal splay light, with each light roughly measuring 360mm. Little is known about the arrangement or fenestration of the chancel; however some details can be pieced together. In his 1863 description Glynne stated that this east window had "three equal lancets, under a pointed arch hood" (Butler 2007, 66), which matches the window as depicted in a small section drawing for the planned rebuilding (PR.AM.38). This drawing shows an east window of three equal height lancets within a deeply splayed reveal (fig. 8.52). This is the only pre-1871 window for which visual documentary evidence survives.

An early plan associated with the proposed restoration (fig. 8.53) reveals more details of the chancel, including the south wall and small extensions to the east wall at the north and south corners, presumably small buttresses. The *Malton Messenger* records that the south wall

---

[81] Currently displayed on the west side of the porch treasury.

of the chancel was fully three feet thick and that during its demolition "a hollow piece of wood, evidently a child's coffin, was found walled in the centre" (PR.AM.6). The same article (PR.AM.6) also mentions the presence of a priest's door in the south wall of the old chancel, which is likely shown by two dotted lines drawn through the proposed south chancel wall on the 1871 plan (PR.AM.5) (see fig. 8.53). On the plan these lines have been infilled, suggesting the doorway was originally going to be blocked in the 1871 campaign. The only documentary evidence for the fenestration design of the chancel south wall comes from Glynne, who described a window on the south that was "square-headed and Perpendicular" (Butler 2007, 66). Although Glynne does not specifically locate this window, that it was described in the same sentence as the east window suggests it was likely in the chancel, where later fenestration is often found. Thankfully some physical evidence of this window exists within the churchyard today. Within the mound of stones in the churchyard were a number of pieces of Perpendicular Gothic window tracery (fig. 8.54). Enough fragments are present to attempt a conjectural digital reconstruction to match Glynne's description of the south chancel window (fig. 8.55). This two-light window must correspond with that shown beside the pulpit on the faculty plan, immediately to the west of the priest's door (see fig. 8.53).

When Glynne stated that "the masonry of the chancel is rougher than the rest" (Butler 2007, 66), he was likely referring to the north wall, which was described by the *Malton Messenger* as "partly rubble walling – a curious feature" (PR.AM.6). Nothing else is known of the composition of this wall, although it may have made an interesting comparison with the 13th-century rubble north wall of the chancel at its mother church at Appleton-le-Street (fig. 8.56). Glynne is again the only source for the fenestration of the north chancel wall, noting a window that was "square-headed, of two-lights, of Decorated character" (Butler 2007, 66). As with the south elevation window, fragments of Decorated Gothic tracery were found amongst the churchyard stones, providing enough detail to allow for a conjectural reconstruction drawing, although the result is a rather unusual tracery design (see fig. 8.55). It is not known if this window mirrored the Perpendicular window on the south or if it occupied the eastern bay of the chancel.

As with the exterior, there is limited evidence for the interior arrangement and decoration of the chancel before the Victorian restoration. Presumably lit by the two-light Perpendicular window and thus occupying a similar position to the present pulpit, the pre-1871 pulpit was of black oak and featured an inscription: "I:POSTGATE M:SKINNER C:WARDENS 1710" (PR.AM.6). Glynne noted that there was "a small square recess north of the chancel" (Butler 2007, 66), possibly referring to an aumbry, where the vessels

used for mass and communion were stored. The *Malton Messenger* records the presence of a piscina and credence, presumably together, in the south wall of the chancel (PR.AM.6). It is not known if this piscina was the same one presently on display in the porch. There was also an arched wall niche in the south elevation of the chancel, between the altar and the priest's door (PR.AM.6) – a description which also confirms that the altar remained in the sanctuary at the east end of the chancel. The description of this arched recess as having "very curious Norman jambs" (PR.AM.6) matches that of the present north recess. Two similar recesses were discovered behind pews on the north side of the chancel, within the eastern recess was the knight effigy, and the western recess held the floriated cross slab in the current porch (PR.AM.6). Interestingly, this reveals that the north wall of the chancel was largely covered by pews, which in order to hide the recesses must have been box pews. That these recesses were unknown to the parishioners of 1871 indicates that these box pews had been in place for longer than living memory. Based on this evidence, it is possible to venture a reconstruction of the major elements of the chancel prior to its demolition and Victorian rebuilding (see fig. 8.47).

8.3.5 Tower

The west tower is the most significant element of the pre-1871 structure to survive as part of the standing church today. As such, it requires little extra description, although it must be noted that the tower has undergone several repairs and restoration schemes during and since the Victorian remodelling of the church (see Borthwick Institute for Archives for details). Despite this, the only significant alteration to the fabric of the tower during the 1871 campaign was the blocking of the arch connecting it to the nave. Glynne notes that in 1863 access between the nave and tower was by a "door only" (Butler 2007, 66), revealing that prior to the 1871 restoration, this archway was open and fitted with a door.

8.3.6 Architectural Phasing

Having described the church of St Helen, Amotherby, as it appears today, and reconstructed the church prior to its 1871 restoration, it is now possible to interpret its phased development from the medieval period through to the present.

12th-Century Church

There remains some evidence for a 12th-century church at Amotherby, including the Romanesque south doorway and the Romanesque-moulded chancel recess, both incorporated within the present fabric. Along with these are the three reused Romanesque

carvings in the porch treasury, as well as the significant quantities of worked masonry in the interior elevations of tower that demonstrate typical 12th-century tooling marks (see below for discussion). One contemporary writer also described the pre-restoration church as having "Norman proportions" (Murray 1867, 230).

Tooling also provides valuable evidence for a 12th-century date for much of the west tower. Despite being identified as post-medieval (e.g. Page 1914, 470; Pevsner 1966, 60) much of the interior masonry (see fig. 8.41) demonstrates tooling consistent with 12th-century work, especially at the lower stages. Page (1914, 471) does note the 12th-century tooling inside the tower; however he interprets it simply as reused earlier stone. Given the uniform extent of 12th century tooling marks within the lower two stages of the tower, it seems more likely that the tower is of that date, with significant later remodelling, particularly to the belfry stage. Internally, there is a perceptible change in tooling at the upper stage that approximately corresponds with the change in exterior stonework. Based on this variance in tooling, along with the changing architectural styles, it seems likely that the upper stage of the tower has been added or rebuilt. This remodelling also includes the addition of the weathering offset / plinth at the base of the tower, and the hoodmould around the west doorway. Changes in the external coursing also suggests that the mullioned window was inserted into the existing west elevation, with internal tooling on the window reveal corresponds with the window being cut from the existing fabric. Despite this significant post-medieval remodelling, it is argued that the core of the west tower at Amotherby remains a 12th-century structure.

13th-Century Rebuilding?

The 1871 demolition of the chancel and most of the north nave wall produced much of the 12th-century architectural spoila at the porch today (PR.AM.6), suggesting a major rebuilding event some time after the 12th century. In 1871 it was reported that the earlier church had "most clearly been rebuilt, most probably in the 14th century, out of the remains of an early Norman structure, some of the features of which were retained, and parts of the Norman and earlier work were walled in, in various places" (PR.AM.6). This is an intriguing statement that highlights the extent of identifiable 12th-century material in the pre-1871 church. This statement also raises one of the most contentious issues of the St Helen phasing; namely the construction date of the body of the church. The belief that the church was rebuilt in the 14th-century was shared by the Yorkshire Architectural Society, who, following a visit in June 1871, stated that the "church gave evidence of having existed in Decorated times" (*York Herald 06*/01/1872, 9). In contrast Page (1914, 470) and English

Heritage (n.d.(b)) have both suggested that the nave and chancel may date to the late 16th-century. The only in situ evidence for the dating of the nave is the low offset plinth, which is not a common Romanesque feature, thus supporting the notion that the walls were rebuilt at some stage.

The research outlined above allows for a reinterpretation of this dating. The discovered tracery remains along with 1871 faculty drawings reveal that prior to its Victorian restoration Amotherby featured lancet windows throughout the nave (although only the western bay of the south wall looks to have been original) and a triple-lancet east window. It therefore seems more likely that the church was actually substantially rebuilt in the 13th-century incorporating elements of the 12th-century structure.

14th and 15th-Century Fenestration

During the later medieval period the church saw some investment in its fenestration with two new windows being inserted into the existing fabric. With its square-head and reticulated tracery, the window in the north wall of the chancel is stylistically datable by its tracery to the 14th-century, while the Perpendicular Gothic window in the south chancel wall dated stylistically to the 15th-century.

16th-Century Remodelling

As already discussed above, the church appears to have undergone another significant restoration in the late16th-century, which included the remodelling of much of the exterior of the tower. It seems likely that the parts of the nave walls were remodelled at the same time, as the nave walls contain similar stonework and plinth to that employed on the tower. It is this work which may have led to suggestions that the church largely dated from the 16th century (see above). While the extent of the 16th century remodelling can no longer be determined, the differing masonry of the chancel north wall at least excludes it from this remodelling.

18th-Century Repairs

Archbishop Sharp's 1693 Visitation Return for St Helen, Amotherby, notes that the fabric of the church was in a poor condition (V.1693-4). It appears that shortly afterwards, in the opening years of the 18th-century, the nave was substantially restored. This investment in the church fabric following a period of neglect may correspond to the patronage of the church passing from the Crown, which presented in 1605, to the manor of Amotherby from 1688 (Page 1914, 471). As discussed above (Section 8.4.3), the church retains five

inscribed stones, which have been interpreted as commemorating this remodelling. The stones were located across the exterior elevations of the nave with those on the south wall dated 1703 and those on the north wall 1708. A further, now lost, indicator of this early 18th-century work is an inscription recorded on the, now lost, timber pulpit: 'I:POSTGATE M:SKINNER C:WARDENS 1710'. It is clear that the church underwent significant repairs during the opening decade of the 18th century, which probably included the addition of the buttresses at the west end of the nave, the replacement of at least two of the nave lancet windows, and the remodelling of the Romanesque south doorway.

Despite being a small church with a simple plan, the pre-restoration St Helen had a medieval and post-medieval phasing as complex of any of the 'Street Parish' churches. The tower presented a mix of architectural styles largely due to its heavy late 16th-century remodelling, while still retaining its two 12th-century doorways. The nave, with its unknown level of 16th and early 18th-century rebuilding, featured a fine Romanesque doorway and Early English lancet fenestration, some of which were likely to have been post-medieval copies. Perhaps the most complex architectural element of the earlier church, the chancel contained a mix of architectural styles and masonry. The triple-lancet east window was 13th-century Early English in style, while one each of the north and south windows were respectively in the Decorated Gothic and Perpendicular Gothic styles of the 14th and 15th centuries. Unfortunately, nothing is known of the architectural detailing of the porch that likely dated to c.1703. The masonry of the church walls also offered evidence of different phases of construction, with the rough, rubble walling of the north chancel wall contrasting with the fine limestone ashlar of the nave and tower. Combined this phasing suggests the Victorian restorers were approaching a building with obviously early origins, but which in terms of architectural features largely presented as being post-medieval in date.

Victorian Church

The predominant architectural style employed in the body of St Helen's church is Romanesque, while the west tower demonstrates both the Romanesque and very late Perpendicular Gothic styles. There are a number of geologies present and several visible building breaks in the exterior elevations, all suggesting multiple construction phases. At a superficial level, the change from limestone ashlar to rock-faced sandstone appears a clear marker between the Victorian and earlier elements of the fabric. Similarly, the change in stone geology and disturbed stonework surrounding the nave windows and buttresses indicates their Victorian insertion into earlier fabric. The walls of the tower and nave vary

between 800-900mm in thickness, while the majority of the remaining church walls are approximately 600mm thick, offering further evidence for the differing Victorian and earlier fabric.

The two exceptions to this are the chancel east wall at approximately 750mm thick, and the east wall of the vestry at only ~460mm thick. It may be concluded that these variances are based on their comparative structural loading, and as it is constructed entirely in rock-faced sandstone, the vestry wall clearly relates to the Victorian work of 1871. The chancel east wall is constructed of limestone ashlar masonry and features a triple lancet east window in the Early English style of the early 13th-century. Faculty plans (fac.1871/9) suggest this wall was not intended to be rebuilt as part of the 1871 restoration, and at first glance that appears to be the case, especially from the exterior. The earlier wall is, however, shown as being ~820mm thick on both existing plans (fac.1871/9; & PR.AM.38), whereas it currently measures only ~750mm. The presence of the reused inscribed stones immediately beneath the east window, itself a Victorian feature, all point toward the chancel east wall having been rebuilt utilizing the earlier limestone ashlar masonry. A similar situation can be demonstrated with the chancel south wall, which sits upon a plinth of limestone ashlar that appears to run consistently from the nave south wall. Victorian commentators record that the earlier chancel south wall was "quite three feet [941mm] thick" and that it was demolished during the 1871 restoration (PR.AM.6). As the wall currently measures only ~620mm in thickness, this plinth must date from the Victorian restoration, again reusing the earlier limestone masonry. The 1871 plan for the church (fac.1871/9) records the presence of a Priest's door in this elevation, but there are no building breaks in the plinth to indicate it's former presence. It remains unclear as to why limestone ashlar was reused in these two elevations, rather than the rock-faced sandstone employed elsewhere.

In conclusion, it is hypothesised that there are a number of different construction phases evident in the current church fabric, including medieval, post-medieval and Victorian work. The earliest surviving fabric appears to be the lower stages of the tower, the south doorway, and the chancel north recess, which all date to the 12th-century. On stylistic grounds, the tower appears to have been heavily remodelled in the late 16th or early 17th-century. The five inscribed stones and pulpit inscription (now lost) indicate that the nave walls were heavily restored or remodelled in the early 18th-century, obscuring their earlier origins. The changed geology and disturbed stonework around the present nave windows confirms these as later insertions dating to the Victorian restoration of 1871. This 19th-century work has largely removed any diagnostic evidence for the 18th-century

remodelling, of which the west end buttresses are likely the best remaining evidence. The chancel, north aisle, vestry, and general fenestration all date in their entirety to the 1871 remodelling, although the chancel incorporates some reused earlier fabric.

8.4 Analysis of the 1871 restoration of St Helen's, Amotherby

Having analysed the present structure, identified the extent of reused material, and reconstructed, so far as is possible, the medieval church, the following section will attempt to analyse the rebuilding and to set it in a wider context. Initially, the decision process that led to the full rebuilding of the church will be explored, followed by the analysis of the reuse of material and the architectural styling employed.

8.4.1 Analysis of the Restoration

In contrast to many of the previous case studies, the present church of St Helen retains significant in situ fabric from the earlier building including the west tower and parts of the nave walls. Documentary evidence (PR.AM.6) states that early in 1870 attempts were made to re-roof the church, seemingly referring to a re-covering of the existing roof structure. However during this work it was discovered that the condition of the church fabric was very poor, and so it was determined that a complete re-roofing was required (Keeton 1973, 31). It was this abortive repair work which directly prompted the faculty application for the 1871 restoration of the church. The architect employed for this new campaign was George Fowler Jones, whose practice operated out of York, but who lived in nearby Malton. The *Malton Messenger* noted that the architect's design "adhered to the prevailing Norman style in which the original building had been raised." (PR AM6). This offers a fascinating insight into the restoration process, as it confirms that the style of the Victorian church was a direct response to the perceived earliest phase of the medieval structure. Rather than reflecting the architectural development of the church, as they had at Slingsby, this campaign sought to evoke the original design of the parish church, thus having more parallels with the rebuilding of Barton-le-Street. However, unlike Barton-le-Street, there was little visible architectural or decorative evidence of the Norman church surviving at Amotherby beyond the south doorway.

The opportunity was taken to add the north aisle as part of the restoration campaign, considerably increasing the seating capacity of the church (Keeton 1973, 31). Unlike at Hovingham, this new aisle appears to have been a simple reflection of the growing 19th-century population in the villages forming the hinterland of Malton. In 1865, Rev Peach recorded that St Helen had larger attendance figures than Appleton-le-Street, noting that

the church served both Amotherby and the much larger population of Swinton (V.1865 Ret). The decision to refenestrate is less readily linked to a single factor. Interestingly, the faculty application (fac.1871/9) merely states that all of the windows were to be re-glazed, but the accompanying plan shows new Neo-Romanesque style windows throughout, demonstrating that completely new fenestration was planned from early on in the process. This refenestration would have been an easy way to re-'Normanise' the appearance of the church, removing both the later medieval windows and those post-medieval windows "with obtuse heads, rather questionable" (Butler 2007, 66). If this was the case, then the decision to rebuild the triple-lancet east window (even if now contained under a Neo-Romanesque arch) stands out.

Poor fabric condition was clearly the primary driver/ignition source for the restoration and rebuilding campaign, but the opportunity was taken to undertake additional works reflecting a number of factors. The faculty application (fac. 1871/9) notes a number of elements of the church that required repairing or rebuilding, including the raising and rebuilding of some walls in order to take the new roof. It appears the condition also resulted in greater rebuilding than was originally envisaged. For instance the 1871 plans indicate that the south and east walls of the chancel were not intended to be rebuilt, and their eventual rebuilding necessitated by their poor condition.

Changing architectural fashion must also be considered as an influence on the restoration campaign at Amotherby. This is highlighted by report of the Yorkshire Architectural Society's summer excursion to Amotherby in June 1871, which noted that the church "gave evidence of having existed in Decorated times, yet it was now so altered in character that nothing was feasible but a complete restoration." (*York Herald* 06/01/1872, 9). This demonstrates that beyond fabric condition, the character of the later alterations impacted on Victorian perceptions of the building, influencing the restoration process.

8.4.2 Analysis of Reuse and Retention

By 1871 Amotherby had undergone two major post-medieval remodelling and little medieval architectural decoration survived in the church. This perhaps explains why relatively few architectural elements were retained in the Victorian restoration. As discussed above, the east gable, including the east window, was taken down before being rebuilt in 1871, with the current triple lancet east window being distinct from the one it replaced. As already noted, this seems at odds with the intended return to a Romanesque style building, raising the question of why an Early English-style east window was reinstated during the rebuilding of the gable - it was presumably a meaningful decision,

although that meaning is now obscured. Similarly, the reuse of other architectural features within the rebuilt sections of the church raise more questions than they answer and sadly again there is little documentary evidence to elucidate the process. Particularly curious is the treatment of the medieval chancel recesses. Why was the 12th-century recess moved from the south wall to the north and why were the two northern niches condensed into a single southern arch of roughly the same size? The resulting southern arch is formed from very crisp stonework (so crisp that many modern scholars have assumed them (perhaps correctly) to be 19th-century work e.g. Pevsner 1966, 60), so fabric condition seems an unlikely factor.

There is a substantial collection of early medieval sculpture reused within the church, almost all of which form part of an architectural treasury within the current porch. In contrast there are surprisingly few post-medieval funerary monuments to be found in Amotherby, possibly reflecting its status as a subsidiary chapel to Appleton-le-Street. In fact only four substantially complete funerary monuments have been identified as reused material, all of which are medieval and no longer in situ. It is not known if there were many post-medieval memorials in the church prior to 1871, but it seems unlikely they would not have been reinstated. As a dependent chapel it might be assumed that memorials were instead placed in Appleton-le-Street, although they are not much in evidence there either. Might this lack of post-medieval monuments reflect a dearth of wealthy patronage throughout the period? Dame Strickland of nearby Swinton Grange held a box pew at Amotherby in the early 18th century (see fig. 8.47), so it would be interesting to know where the Strickland family and other owners of Swinton Grange and Hildenley Hall are commemorated, perhaps in Malton?

Of the medieval funerary monuments, the knight effigy and Bordesden tomb were previously unknown, but they have been "carefully preserved" (*Cheltenham Chronicle* 21/11/1871, 3) and installed in the Victorian chancel. This raises the question of why, when they were previously unknown and uncommemorated, were these memorials reused in the chancel while the others were relegated to the porch? Was this an attempt to represent early church patrons, or simply that they are the most decorative and aesthetically pleasing monuments? Although little concrete analysis has been possible with the reuse and retention of fabric in the Victorian restoration of Amotherby, it highlights that this process was meaningful and complex. Sadly, without documentary evidence answers to these questions remain hypothetical.

8.4.3 The Decision Makers

Vicar and Patron

The vicar and patron for the restorations at both Appleton-le-Street (1855) and Amotherby was the Rev Charles Pierrepont Peach (previously Cleaver), who was appointed to the parish of Appleton-le-Street in 1854. The previous incumbent had been his father, Rev James J. Peach (previously Cleaver), who had died that year. Rev J J Cleaver had assumed the name of Peach by Royal Licence in 1845, as a condition to succeeding to the estates of his father-in-law, Samuel Peach-Peach, Esq., of Tockington, Gloucester (Halhead Genealogy and Family Trees n.d.). In 1867, the Tockington estate passed to Rev. Charles Pierrepont Cleaver, who in 1868 likewise changed his name to Peach (Bulmer 1890, 644). For the purpose of this study, he will be referred to as Rev Peach. Rev Charles Peach came from a good middle class family and was educated at Repton School in Derbyshire, which is based around the monastic ruins of a C12 priory, and received a BA from Magdalene College, Cambridge, in 1853. He was ordained in 1853 and the following year became curate of Holme Pierrepont, Nottinghamshire (also his father's parish), and vicar of Appleton-le-Street, Yorkshire (Venn 1944, 64). He appears to have held both posts until his death.

Unlike Hovingham, Slingsby and Barton-le-Street, there was no wealthy aristocratic patron to finance the rebuilding at Amotherby, which was instead funded entirely through subscription. The biggest contributor was the Rev Peach (£300), and it is interesting to note that the restoration campaign was embarked upon shortly after he inherited the Gloucestershire estate (1868). Rev Peach's personal estate at time of death (1886) was £854 10s. 10d. (Halhead Genealogy and Family Trees n.d.), a far cry from the wealth of the Howard or Worsley families. That the restoration campaign at Amotherby was funded through subscription perhaps suggests why it was a less ambitious rebuilding than those of the other 'Street Parish' churches.

The 1871 restoration of St Helen's church appears to have been strongly driven by the Rev Peach. Interestingly, the *Malton Messenger* suggests it was the vicar and Rev James Robertson of Swinton who had "carefully preserved every fragment of historic interest" (PR.AM.6). Therefore, presumably it was the Revs Peach & Robertson who were also responsible for engaging the interest of so many antiquarians in the rebuilding, including Canon Greenwell and Fairless Barber (*Leeds Mercury* 16/11/1871, 5). This antiquarian interest might explain the creation of the architectural and archaeological stone treasury in the south porch. It is also recorded that Rev Peach was personally responsible for most of

the decoration of the church, including the carving of the font and pulpit, as well as carving of the bench ends and the painting of the stained glass.

Architect

The architect, George Fowler Jones, was appointed to oversee the 1871 restoration and rebuilding of St Helen. Originally from Scotland, Fowler Jones trained in London before moving to York in 1844, where his practice was based for the rest of his career. In London he trained under William Wilkins, the designer of the National Gallery, London, and then under Sydney Smirke, who restored the Nave roof of York Minster in 1841, a project on which Jones assisted (DSA n.d. (b)). During his career Fowler Jones worked on a wide range of commissions throughout the UK, being principally but not exclusively ecclesiastical, including many church restorations. He was also involved in a number of Neo-Romanesque church construction and restoration programmes during his career, including two other churches in Ryedale, being Stonegrave (near Hovingham) and Foxholes. He would go on in 1877 to restore the 12th-century Malton Priory. Fowler Jones has a reputation amongst modern scholars for undertaking insensitive restorations (Proctor pers. comm. 2012) and Pevsner described the restored St Mary's, Foxholes as "one of the ugliest churches in the Riding" (Pevsner 1972, 232). His 1861 restoration of Holy Trinity, Stonegrave, (fac. 1861/2), led to the church being described as having had "all history of the fabric between the 12th and 15th centuries … entirely obliterated by the restorations which the church has undergone during the 19th century" (Page 1914, 564).

The *Malton Messenger* credits Fowler Jones with dictating the overall architectural style chosen for the church restoration (PR.AM.6), but the role of the vicar must not be overshadowed. It has been demonstrated that Rev. Peach was actively involved in the decoration of the church, especially in its fixtures and fittings. It must be assumed that the overall Neo-Romanesque design for St Helen's represents a coming together of these two men, while constructional decisions were likely to have been down to Fowler Jones. For example the construction of stone-clad brick walls for the aisle and vestry is a technique Fowler Jones had employed identically at the Church of St Philip and St James, Clifton, York, completed in 1867 (fig. 8.57).

Parishioners

The opinions and involvement of the Victorian parishioners in this rebuilding, as with all of the earlier case studies, remains difficult to trace. There are no surviving documents to detail their thoughts on the restoration, however some clues can be gathered by looking at

the funding of the rebuilding programme. The 1871 repair and restoration of Amotherby, costing approximately £2000, was funded through public subscription. At the time of the church's reopening, the *York Herald* (18/11/1871, 7) reported the subscription stood at £850, of which the vicar had contributed £300 and the lay rector a further £100. The lay rector of Swinton, and the Carlisle Trustees of nearby Castle Howard Estate each gave £50, and £200 pounds was raised through a local bazaar. This left contributions of £150 presumably made by the church parishioners, from an average church attendance in 1865 of 90-130 (Royle & Larsen 2006, 15). £150 equates to roughly £12,000 in current terms, representing a significant investment from the local community. Beyond direct financial contributions, the parishioners also donated much of the new church's fixtures and fittings. The following gifts were reported at the reopening: altar rails (Mr Robert Smith); the lectern (Mrs Baker and family); Bible and Prayer Book (Mrs Granby Burke); communion service books (Rev. Legard); altar step kneeling cushions (Mrs Peach and Miss Legard); and reading desk kneeling stool (Mrs R Smith, Amotherby) (PR.AM.6). While the true input of the parishioners remains elusive, that the local community contributed so strongly to the cost of restoring and fitting out the church suggests their active involvement and support of the restoration campaign.

8.4.4 Amotherby Case Study Conclusions

The archaeological investigation of St Helen's has significantly refined the understood architectural development of this small church, elucidating both the medieval development and its significant post-medieval alteration prior to the 19th-century restoration campaign. It has concluded that the nave and chancel were likely rebuilt in the 13th century, significantly earlier than previously thought, and has shown that the west tower remains a substantially 12th-century structure with late 16th-century alteration. The restoration campaign was clearly driven by fabric condition; however patronage and architectural fashion were also contributing factors in shaping the parish church that stands in Amotherby today. The lack of documentary evidence for this restoration campaign has made concrete analysis difficult; however it has allowed for a number of interesting questions to be raised, especially around the retention and reuse of fabric. By 1871 St Helen's appears to have been a complex multi-phase building, with significant post-medieval features. This case study has demonstrated the importance Victorian restorers placed on connecting the rebuilt parish church to its earlier medieval development. The reconstruction of the pre-1871 church suggests there was a mix of fenestration from the 13th, 14th, 15th centuries, with additional 18th-century copies of Early English lancets. Instead of representing this composite history of piecemeal investment, it was decided to

return the church to the "Norman style in which the original building had been raised." (PR.AM.6).

The restoration campaigns at both Appleton-le-Street and Amotherby differ considerably from those presented in the first three case studies. This variance can likely be traced to the differences in patronage between these parishes. Appleton-le-Street and Amotherby had no wealthy patron to invest in the fabric, either through largess, vanity, or social paternalism. This has resulted in very different levels of investment in the fabric of these churches during the mid-19th century. It is interesting to consider that both the restorations at Appleton-le-Street and Amotherby occurred shortly after major events in the patron's life. The 1855 restoration of the north windows at Appleton-le-Street took place the year after Rev Peach was installed at the church, while the re-roofing and subsequent restoration at Amotherby was set in motion a year after Rev Peach inherited his Gloucestershire estate, which presumably affected both his income and his standing in Victorian society. Following the major restorations at Hovingham, Slingsby and Barton-le-Street, might Rev Peach have felt obliged to invest in the fabric of Amotherby? This change in circumstance might also have contributed to the different treatments of Appleton-le-Street and Amotherby. Another differing factor between these two churches was the extent of post-medieval architectural detailing. While Appleton-le-Street appears to have had very little post-medieval investment, it is hypothesised that the 18th-century north windows were in a neoclassical style, making them readily identifiable as non-Gothic elements of the church. In contrast, although Amotherby saw significant post-medieval change, the architectural detailing appears to have been Gothic in style. Another significant difference between the two churches was their respective conditions, with the fabric of Amotherby being considerably poorer, despite the extent of post-medieval investment. The final consideration is their respective needs in terms of serving the parish. As early as 1764 the vicar had suggested that the chapel at Amotherby must have been constructed for "greater convenience of the parishioners" as the village was "more in the heart of the parish than Appleton" (Annesley & Hoskin 1997, 20). With the arrival of the railways and the growth of nearby Malton as a market town, the population of the parish increased appreciably in the mid-19th century. Importantly much of that growth was in the east of the parish, marginalising the role of Appleton-le-Street (which is on the western edge of the parish). As such Amotherby was arguably more in need of investment and expansion.

Rev Peach was clearly a driving force in this restoration campaign, which must count as an almost unique example of a vicar cum patron cum principle craftsman! While the overall architectural design came from the architect, Rev Peach provided the detail, and the

parishioners supplied the soft furnishings. That Amotherby lacked a wealthy patron resulted in this restoration campaign having the most engagement with its local community, as demonstrated by the notable donations of both cash and fittings for the church.

Chapter 9: Conclusions

This chapter will return to the issues and questions raised at the beginning of this thesis and explores how the analyses presented in the case study chapters have impacted on our understanding of 19th-century parish church restoration. Importantly, it will show that through the systematic archaeological investigation of Victorian restoration and rebuilding it is possible to not only ask interesting questions about the 19th century, but also to recapture a vast, and otherwise ignored, set of data about the medieval parish church and its post-medieval investment.

The parish church has traditionally meant more than other buildings in a community. Throughout the medieval period it was fundamental to the key moments of personal and community life. This identity was challenged throughout the post-medieval period and made more complex by other outlets for religious expression and identity, and by national movements and trends. The mid 19th-century history of parish churches is immensely important, representing the biggest change to the material culture of Anglican worship since the Reformation. Despite this significance, Victorian ecclesiastical developments remain the least studied aspect of parish churches. Indeed, despite the wealth of scholarship on the Gothic Revival, we do not know a great deal about what actually happened to parish churches in the 19th century, and very little archaeological investigation has been undertaken on these significant buildings. This omission is due to a number of factors, including tensions between academic disciplines, periodisation within disciplines, and significant agenda bias. The late 19th-century backlash against Victorian restoration still informs much of modern thinking about the period, often associating restoration solely with loss and destruction.

This thesis has engaged critically with the Victorian restoration of individual parish churches and has demonstrated that existing scholarship is valuably augmented by an archaeological focus on the fabric of these buildings and the people who invested in them. It has shown that such a focus informs our understanding of 19th-century churches, the people who invested in them, and the choices they made when undertaking restoration and rebuilding. These themes also have the bonus of being fundamental to Victorian society's concept of themselves, religion and social relationships. This study has shown the study of 19th century churches informs our understanding of the longer story of the parish church through its different developments.

9.1 The 'Street Parish' Benefice

In 1855, shortly after the installation of a new vicar cum patron at All Saints, Appleton-le-Street, the medieval parish church underwent a small scheme of restoration to the north aisle windows. This campaign marked the start of a period of intensive investment and improvement at the churches that today form the core of 'The Street' benefice. Over the course of 11 years between 1860, when Hovingham parish church was rebuilt, and December 1871, when Amotherby parish church reopened after major extension and restoration, this group of churches – with the exception Appleton-le-Street – were all radically transformed.

Today it is difficult to find a parish church that totally escaped the attention of Victorian restorers. However, consideration must be given as to whether the 1855-1871 campaigns at the 'Street Parish' churches is representative of the 19th-century restoration phenomenon. The proliferation of church restoration in the region of this study was noteworthy at the time, with one local newspaper proudly claiming Malton as a centre around which, "a remarkable degree of church work has been of late undertaken, new or restored churches being met with everywhere" (*York Herald* 02/08/1869, 10). This story was picked up in the same year by a new national periodical, *The Architect*, which noted that over £100,000 had already been spent on church improvements within a 20-mile radius of Malton (Anon 1869, 118). By 1871, even *The Bath Chronicle* was reporting that, "the work of church building seems to flourish in Yorkshire" (26/01/1871, 6). These contemporary accounts all suggest that the enthusiasm for restoring parish churches in Ryedale was significantly more extensive than many other regions. As already discussed (see Chapter 1), this area was chosen by the anti-restoration campaigner Sidney Colvin (1877, 471) to highlight the regrettable ubiquity of rural parish church restoration. This thesis suggests Colvin was slightly misguided in his criticisms, as the restoration of the 'Street Parish' churches demonstrates significant respect for the form and fabric of the medieval church, even during complete Victorian rebuildings. The expansion of this sort of study to encompass more parish churches restored in the mid-19th century might reveal if the treatment of the 'Street Parish' churches was actually exceptional at a local, regional or national level. If the implied regional variability in parish church restoration bears out, such research might elucidate its determinants, potentially offering insights into local and regional social and intellectual networks, 19th-century economic structures, and variable fabric conditions, amongst other factors. As noted in Chapter 3, the restoration of parish churches continued unabated into the early 20th century (see Appendix 1), and the study of later parish church

restoration (e.g. 1877-1938) might also prove rewarding, as a means of exploring the diffusion and physical impact of the anti-restoration movement.

9.2 Towards an Archaeology of Victorian Restoration and Rebuilding

This thesis has uncovered the complexity of Victorian church restoration at the level of individual parish churches. As such, 19th-century restoration should no longer be viewed in terms of monolithic, national trends, but instead as a nuanced, negotiated, and highly variable process, as can be seen in the case studies explored here. One consequence of this complexity is that a single recording method cannot be rigidly applied to the study of these churches. However, this variability need not impede the research agenda. This thesis has presented an innovative and flexible methodology that makes equal use of metric recording, detailed visual analysis, 3D reconstruction, and documentary research, and fully integrates this diverse range of evidence and analytical models when constructing interpretations. The methodological approach is designed to dynamically respond to the available evidence and individual circumstances of parish church restorations, and it provides a template for future archaeological investigation of 19th-century churches. The following sections will explore some of the common threads and discordant notes revealed by this methodological examination of the 'Street Parish' churches.

Victorian designs, or medieval churches in disguise?

An assumed disjunction between the fabric of Victorian rebuild churches and their earlier incarnations has resulted in modern scholars rarely distinguishing between these replacements buildings and new build Victorian designs. This uncritical assumption may be rooted in the negative narrative that characterises Victorian restoration as solely the destruction of the medieval church. In contrast, the case studies presented in this thesis have revealed rebuilt Victorian parish churches to be intimately linked to their earlier incarnations. Virtual reconstruction of the pre-restoration churches has shown the medieval church to almost universally dictate the plan form, scale, and architectural styling of their Victorian successors. While the medieval identity of the parish church continues through Victorian restoration and rebuilding, it is the post-medieval, Neo-Classical, elements of the churches, in terms of both fixtures and fittings that are being consistently swept away. This may be viewed in terms of the Victorian desire to evoke both the liturgy and the architectural setting of the medieval church. It further reflects the association placed on Gothic architecture as Christian, as championed by AWN Pugin (see *Contrasts* 1836). This revelation unlocks Victorian restored and rebuilt parish churches as a massive untapped resource for the examination of the medieval and post-medieval church.

The 19th-century St Helen's, Amotherby, is the only church in the study to deviate substantially from the footprint of its predecessor, although only through the addition of the north aisle. This expansion may be viewed in terms of the growth of Malton as a regional centre. The remainder of the Victorian church follows the plan and dimensions of the earlier church. The 1860 rebuilding of All Saints, Hovingham, also included the addition of an aisle, but in this instance to replace an earlier aisle that had been demolished in the preceding century. In this campaign the Victorian restorers can be seen to have intentionally reinstated the medieval plan of the church, actively undoing post-medieval alterations to the building.

In all of the case studies, with the possible exception of Hovingham, documentary evidence suggests the existing churches also significantly influenced the architectural style of the Victorian restorations. As Miele suggests, Victorian restoration of parish churches often represented a negotiation between the fashionable Decorated Gothic style and the desire to reveal the original architectural style, with the influence of the earlier structure explaining why Barton-le-Street and Amotherby churches were restored and rebuilt in the Romanesque style rather than the Decorated Gothic. This is confirmed by a contemporary newspaper, which noted that in restoring St Helen's church, Amotherby, the architect had "adhered to the prevailing Norman style in which the original building had been raised." (PR.AM.6). A similar piece recounting the restoration of All Saints, Slingsby, wrote, "it was felt that in rebuilding the church, every care should be taken to preserve so far as possible its identity, and that its appearance ought to be as far as possible that of the old church, as it was before it fell in dilapidation. It was therefore decided to adhere exactly to the original ground plan" (*Yorkshire Gazette* 28/09/1867, 4). The Victorian restorers could instead have chosen to construct an entirely new church at Slingsby, and that so much effort was invested in retaining and replicating the visual identity of the earlier building reveals that the visible history of these churches had significant meaning to the community. This revelation demonstrates how the study of Victorian churches can offer insights into unexplored aspects of 19th-century society. It also raises questions about why the individual style and history of parish churches was so important to preserve that it trumped the 'ideal' Gothic revival style. Further studies would be required to adequately answer this question, but is presumably closely connected to community identity, demonstrating the heritage of their Christian worship. Where architects have introduced new design, such as at Hovingham, it is possible their design decisions were influence by other local or regional medieval buildings. No evidence for this has been found, and the significance of the earlier

structures has been clearly demonstrated as the principal design inspiration in the rebuilding of the 'Street Parish' churches.

It has been noted by scholars that Victorian restoration was very successful in eradicating post-medieval alteration and investment in parish churches (Clarke 1969, 227; Crossley 1990, 103; Butler 1983, 92-3; Morris 1989, 399-403), with Clarke and Morris both noting that the extent of post-medieval work was likely being underestimated. The application of systematic archaeological survey, documentary research, and virtual reality modelling in this thesis has revealed a very significant amount of post-medieval alteration focused primarily in the nave and aisles, both in terms of fenestration and internal fixtures and fittings. The churches at Hovingham and Amotherby both contained significant post-medieval fabric at the time of Victorian restoration. It is noteworthy that All Saints, Appleton-le-Street, as the only church not to undergo major restoration, was also the parish church with the least post-medieval fabric. Whilst this might suggest that the amount and character of post-medieval intervention might be a driver of Victorian restoration, it is also worth noting that Appleton-le-Street also appears to have been the church least in need of repair and alteration in terms of population pressure or fabric condition.

Retention and Reuse – deciding what to keep and what to destroy

Architectural and sculptural spolia, despite being an enormously important source of evidence for earlier phases of churches, has been treated by many scholars as essentially context free. They appear in gazetteers and catalogues, but are employed primarily as a tool for comparative dating. The context and meaning of architectural retention and recycling in Victorian parish church restoration has not yet been considered in academic research agendas. The case studies in this thesis have highlighted that the retention and reuse of material in 19th-century rebuilding was undoubtedly meaningful. The retention of west towers appears to be consistent across the case studies, with Hovingham, Appleton-le-Street and Amotherby churches all retaining their earlier towers. The 15th-century tower at Slingsby was also intended to be kept and was only rebuilt because of its poor fabric condition. There are number of possible explanations for this trend. The first may be purely pragmatic and economic, in that towers are the most expensive element of a church to construct, so their retention represents a significant cost saving. Critically, given their massive scale and dwindling liturgical function during the post-medieval period, towers were the element of the medieval parish church most likely to have survived complete and unaltered into the 19th century. The west towers at Hovingham and Appleton-le-Street also represented the earliest visible fabric, providing a clear demonstration of these

247

church's antiquity and visual identity. Where present, Romanesque doorways are also retained or recycled in all of these Victorian parish churches. This again likely reflects antiquarian interest, but also respects the symbolic importance of the entrance to the medieval church (Stocker and Everson 1990, 95). This tradition clearly is not new to Victorian restoration, as demonstrated by the 18th-century repair and reuse of the Romanesque doorway of St Helen, Amotherby.

Perhaps the best example of the value-led choices of the Victorian restorers is the case study of St Michael's church, Barton-le-Street, where over 250 pieces of 12th-century sculpture were incorporated into the Victorian parish church. Archaeological investigation of this rebuilding campaign has determined that although the sculpture was moved inside the church for its preservation, the Victorian restorers were careful to maintain its spatial and decorative hierarchy (see Smith 2012). The 1869 demolition of the medieval church also uncovered elements of the sculptural scheme destroyed in the intervening years, allowing the reconstruction of lost parts such as the chancel arch and pillar piscina. By investigating this 19th-century rebuilding, the thesis has shown that the Victorian rebuilding actually enhances our understanding of the 12th-century scheme, which must have been one of the most richly decorated of any parish church in England.

The amount of fabric retention and reuse appears to have been influenced by the extent of medieval fabric to survive up to the 19th-century restoration. The case studies have demonstrated that the pre-Victorian parish church of Hovingham, and to a lesser degree Amotherby, had been significantly altered during the post-medieval period, resulting in little medieval architectural detailing surviving. This will have impacted significantly on the 19th-century architectural recycling process. By contrast, Slingsby retained much of its medieval fabric into the 19th century, although, perhaps surprisingly, very little of this was reused in the Victorian parish church. The now lost *Architect's Report* on the condition of Slingsby provides graphic insight into the extremely poor state of the fabric, which must have been a key determinant in that choice. Descriptions of the leaning walls and poor roof at Barton-le-Street (RD.RET.1, 494) tell a similar story. Butler notes that it is difficult to gauge the true condition of these buildings, as accounts are "usually eager to describe the new church in glowing terms and to dismiss the old church as mean, dilapidated, or inconvenient" (Butler 1976, 21). This was certainly the case in descriptions, particularly newspaper articles, relating the Victorian rebuilding and restoration of the 'Street Parish' churches, where the terms 'mean' and 'dilapidated' were used to describe both Barton-le-Street and Amotherby. However, research of other documentary evidence, such as contemporary descriptions, parish records, and architect's reports all concur that these

churches were suffering from extremely poor condition. There can be no real doubt that condition played a significant role in both the extent of rebuilding and restoration, and in the reuse and recycling of architectural spolia.

Consideration must also be given to the perceived value of the material available for reuse. The reuse in the 'Street Parish' churches suggests that early fabric (Anglo-Saxon or Romanesque) was highly valued by Victorian restorers, which equates both with contemporary antiquarian interests and with demonstrating the antiquity of Christian worship in these villages. An 1863 description of the rebuilt All Saints, Hovingham, states that "the fine old church with Norman work no longer invites the antiquarian" (Black 1863, 232), highlighting that contemporary Victorian society was acutely aware of the antiquarian value of the church fabric. This suggests that the Victorian restorers believed the perceived benefits of restoration outweighed that loss of material heritage. Such decision making is clearly seen in R J Johnson's archaeological investigation and phasing of the medieval church at Slingsby, which was subsequently reproduced in the Victorian parish church.

The retention of funerary monument and memorials is another common factor within these restoration campaigns. That these monuments were valued and respected is signified by their redisplay being specified in many of the faculty applications. As they presumably often commemorated ancestors of living parishioners, the redisplay of these memorials is unsurprising. The church to retain the most memorials was All Saints, Hovingham, all of which were connected to the patron's family. The retention and display of recumbent effigies and highly-carved cross slabs (Slingsby, Appleton-le-Street, and Amotherby) may represent a mixture of antiquarianism, romanticism and perceived artistic value, but that they were placed in chapels and chancels (rather than with other sculptural and funerary markers in porches or south aisle treasuries), shows that the Victorians valued them differently from other early monuments.

This study has demonstrated that the retention and reuse of material in Victorian rebuilding was meaningful and reflects a wide variety of influences beyond national trends, including condition, perceived age, architectural style, artistic merit, commemoration, and visual identity. Stocker & Everson (1990) and Nancarrow (2013) have explored the medieval and post-Reformation architectural recycling process; this thesis has demonstrated that similar questions can be asked about both the retention of fabric and the reuse of architectural and sculptural elements through the process of Victorian parish church restoration.

Church Interiors and Liturgical Change

Given the general continuity of footprint and architectural detailing, perhaps the most significant change to these restored parish churches was to their interior fixtures and fittings. The pre-restoration churches presented in the case studies reveal naves dominated by 18th-century galleries and box pews, along with 17th-century pulpits and reading desks. The chancels contained 17th-century altar rails, communion tables, and at Barton-le-Street at least, there is potential evidence of a Decalogue (list of Commandments). Of these elements, the 17th-century communion table is the only fitting to have been regularly retained through the Victorian restoration campaign (as at Hovingham, Slingsby, and Appleton-le-Street), although at both Hovingham and Slingsby it is relegated to a side altar. The galleries, pulpits, altar rails, box pews, and even the fonts were all removed or replaced[82]. The elimination of box pews may be viewed as a triumph by the Ecclesiologist's in their self-proclaimed "war" (Anon. 1842, 145). More broadly however, this dramatic change to church interiors reflects a shift in liturgical practice initiated by the Tractarians earlier in the century. The return to a more sacrament-focussed medieval style of worship necessitated a corresponding change to the setting of worship, including the fixtures, fittings, and internal arrangements of the church (see Yates 1991; Miele 1992; McWilliams 2015 for detailed discussions). This mid 19th-century shift away from the 'Word' made redundant the triple-decker pulpits and text panels (such as Decalogues and scriptural wall paintings) of the post-medieval period, and placed the focus of worship back in the sanctuary. This change in focus can also be seen in the introduction/reintroduction of decorative hierarchies to church interiors, with important ritual spaces and objects receiving higher levels of decoration to correspond with their liturgical status (Miele 1992, 196-7). This is most clearly evidenced by the rich encaustic tiles laid in the raised Victorian sanctuaries, but may also offer an explanation for the replacement of medieval fonts. The removal of 12th-century fonts, which had been used to baptise the parish community for hundred of years, initially seems odd, but it is possible that these plain, even austere, objects were no longer felt to visually reflect their ritual significance. The replacement Victorian fonts installed at Hovingham, Slingsby, Barton-le-Street, and Amotherby, are all highly decorated and constructed from expensive materials, including Caen stone and marble (Carolyn Twoomey's current PhD research may offer fascinating insight into this area). It is not clear to what extent the desire to rearrange the church interior directly contributed to the Victorian restoration of the 'Street Parish' churches, or if they were simply

---

[82] The font at Appleton-le-Street survives, but at the four restored and rebuilt churches the 12th-century fonts are all replaced

opportunistic acts. One contemporary account of the rebuilding at Slingsby notes: "The church will be correctly arranged for the accommodation of the clergy and choir, with appropriately furnished oak stalls" (*York Herald* 28/09/1867, 9), hinting that in this case at least the liturgical arrangement of the church was an active consideration in the planned restoration.

Repair, Restore, or Rebuild?

Current scholarship has tended to explore the Victorian restoration debate through key personalities and their publications. However, these studies have not engaged with the fabric of individual parish church restorations, thus excluding the principle resource for understanding the impact of Victorian restoration. The archaeological approach to examining 19th-century parish church developments demonstrated in this thesis has revealed the restoration process to have been negotiated, responding to local and national trends, but also to individual personalities and the existing architecture. The complexity of these campaigns can be seen in their development from initial planned repairs, through incremental restoration schemes, to eventual rebuildings. Indeed, despite three of the churches being largely or totally razed, St Michael, Barton-le-Street, was the only campaign envisioned from the outset as a full rebuilding. Examination of faculty plans reveals that the restoration and rebuilding process was a fluid one, with variances between the proposed buildings and the original plans, such as the complete redesign of the chancel at Slingsby, and the rebuilding of the chancel at Amotherby.

The 1860 rebuilding of Hovingham perhaps best fits with the rhetoric of the CCS and the commonly understood Victorian restoration trend, in that the earlier church was replaced (bar the tower) by a Decorated Gothic church arranged ready for 'correct' medieval worship. However this scheme deviated from the expected in retaining the Saxo-Norman tower and reused other 12th-century elements. It also reveals the emphasis placed on recovering the medieval plan form. This suggests the visual and historic context of the parish church were as equally important to the Victorian restorers as those national trends. The restoration campaigns at Barton-le-Street and Amotherby placed great significance on returning the church to its earliest architectural style, resulting in Neo-Romanesque churches. This highlights that representing the antiquity of a 12th-century church – "the original scheme of the edifice" (Anon. 1842, 65) – trumped the espoused notion of Gothic as the only spiritually appropriate architectural style for Anglican worship. In contrast to the other campaigns, and most unusually, the rebuilding at Slingsby sought to closely replicate the entire medieval (but definitely not the post-medieval) development of the

parish church. All of these campaigns were affected by the big liturgical and architectural changes in the 19th-century Anglican world, but these influences were negotiated through the individual parish church, community, and personalities involved. This presents a very different picture of Victorian restoration than the destruction and vandalism presented by Anti-Scrape campaigners and modern perceptions of the period.

The 'Genius' Architect or collective enterprise

The material fabric of the Victorian parish church is the result of a complex, negotiated decision-making process, involving patrons, architects, vicars and parishioners. Previously this story has been entirely lost through the privileging of the Victorian architect as genius, thus obscuring both the role of other stakeholders and of the earlier structure in directing the architecture of Victorian parish churches. Unfortunately, these relationships have proved difficult to trace in the five case studies in this thesis, primarily due to the loss of personal correspondence. The 1869 time capsule at All Saints, Slingsby, is said to contain a full account of the circumstances leading up to the rebuilding of the church, and if this document survives it will surely offer significant insight into the Victorian restoration process. In the meantime, however, a number of questions can be posited and some conclusions drawn about the negotiated restorations of the 'Street Parish' churches.

A change in patronage appears to have been a common trigger for parish church restoration. The 1855 campaign at Appleton-le-Street took place within a year of the new vicar cum patron being installed at the church. While contemporary documents suggest the Earl of Carlisle was planning to restore All Saints, Slingsby, it was not until the arrival of Admiral Howard that plans are established to restore and rebuild the church. Similarly, Barton-le-Street's 1870-71 restoration campaign began shortly after Hugo Meynell Ingram took possession of the estate, following the death of his father. In the case of Hovingham and Slingsby the patrons for the restorations were not the holders of the church's patronage, instead being their uncle and brother respectively.

Consideration must also be given to the status of the patrons and how this impacted on the restoration campaigns. The Howards and Meynell-Ingrams were both aristocracy, the Worsleys were part of the gentry, while Rev. Peach was a gentleman. Not only would these distinctions reflect their differing levels of available resources, but also their sphere of connections (for example to high-status architects, and the London-centric restoration discourse). Such difference in status might also have been reflected in their local influence, on parishioners and incumbents. The paucity of documentation for the restoration campaigns in this thesis have prevented any meaningful exploration of this theme, but

further research might prove fruitful. A similar examination of the status and networks of regional architects might prove similarly enlightening. R J Johnson, architect for the archaeologically informed reconstruction of All Saints', Slingsby, had trained in G G Scott's London offices, presumably connecting him closely with leading personalities involved in shaping architectural trends and the restoration debate.

It has been suggested that patronage was an opportunity for the self-aggrandisement of Victorian patrons, with one Edwardian description of a hypothetical restored church suggesting the new font had been "placed there more for the gratification of the Jones than for the glorification of God" (Heath 1911, 143). Whilst faith, paternalism, and social duty may all have played their role in the decision to restore a parish church, the desire for patrons to leave their mark must also be considered. Three of the restoration campaigns in this study may be viewed, in full or in part, as a form of memorialisation and commemoration. The restoration at Hovingham was undertaken in memory of the patron's late wife, while the restored church at Slingsby contains windows commemorating the late Earl of Carlisle and the Slingsby-born Archdeacon of Ely. The rebuilding at Barton-le-Street was envisaged as a memorial to Hugo Meynell-Ingram's father, but following his own tragic death shortly before the reopening of the church, instead contains a memorial to the patron himself. That these three campaigns also feature elite patrons restoring churches associated with their estates demonstrates 19th-century paternalism, offering insights into the attitudes of elite society, and the growth of Victorian social consciousness in the wake of industrialisation and economic polarisation. This research informs our understanding of the elite's relationship with the wider community and its material manifestation through the rebuilding of important community buildings.

The campaigns at Hovingham and Barton-le-Street demonstrate a patron-driven rebuilding of parish churches as personal family memorials. While there is little direct evidence to elucidate this process, the incumbents and parishioners do not appear to have any meaningful engagement with these two restoration campaigns. The lack of press coverage for the rebuilding at Hovingham may reflect the lack of public subscription, and thus public engagement, in this campaign. By contrast the restoration at St Helen's may be viewed more as a community rebuild driven by its vicar patron. Paid for entirely by subscription and with press coverage detailing the parishioner's many gifts of furnishings and decorations for the new church, the restoration at Amotherby was a truly community endeavour. Despite being funded almost entirely by its patron, the rebuilding of All Saints, Slingsby, also appears to have had significant public engagement, reflected in its large press coverage and the significant pomp and ceremony attached to the rebuilding process. A

newspaper article reporting the foundation laying ceremony noted, "although harvest work yet engaged the attention of the rural population, the inhabitants of the village turned out en masse, their numbers being considerably augmented by the neighbouring populations" (*York Herald* 28/09/1867, 9). This highlights that while the new church was funded through elite money, the church at Slingsby was still an important and meaningful community structure.

The role of incumbents in Victorian restoration has rarely been considered. In 1872 the Bishop of Peterborough gave the following speech: "What did a restored church mean? It meant, in the first place, that the parish had a clergyman who was liked by his people. I do not believe that an unpopular parson ever succeeded in restoring his church… A restored church means the restoration of other churches. There is nothing so infectious as the restoration of churches, for when you restored a church you excited a spirit of admiration and emulation, amongst your neighbours, who would not be satisfied until they also restored their church" (The Bishop of Peterborough at the re-opening of Althorpe, Northamptonshire, in 1872, quoted in Ferriday 1964, 89). This speech highlights the importance of incumbents and parishioners as supporters, instigators, and facilitators of parish church restoration. Obviously, in the case of Appleton-le-Street and Amotherby, the vicar was also the patron. This forced the incumbent to lobby his parishioners and friends to fund the restoration, as there was no wealthy patron with a social conscience to prick. Rev. Carter of Barton-le-Street stated in 1865 that he hoped a new church was being contemplated (V.1868/Ret.), suggesting his active engagement with the process. Sadly, little other information about this theme has been found, although given the poor relationship between Rev Munby and the patron's brother, it seems unlikely that he played any role in the restoration process, although he indicated that he was pleased with the outcome (RD.Ret.1, 1865).

The Bishop of Peterborough's speech also hints at the importance of social pride and competition in parish church restoration. This thesis has highlighted that parish church restorations did not occur in isolation, but were affected by a number of factors, including local, regional and national trends. Factors included the social networks of patrons and architects and vicars, and the restoration of nearby churches. Accounts of church re-openings in the area (e.g. at Whitwell and Howsham, as reported in the *York Herald* 25/08/1860, 5) reveal that incumbents and patrons from all around the diocese attended these celebrations, and were clearly influenced by each other's restoration campaigns. It is an unlikely coincidence that plans for the restoration at Barton-le-Street commenced just as the shining new church in neighbouring Slingsby was nearing completion. As Ferriday

noted, "the restoring movement gathered force from a sense of example – the vicar and more active and prosperous citizens could not relish their tumble-down fabric when the no-better next village had glossily re-equipped its church and noisily reopened it" (Ferriday, 1964, 89).

Movements, Ideologies and Trends

The Victorian restoration of parish churches has often been considered as a monolithic process responding to overarching movements and ideologies, including the Oxford Movement, the Cambridge Camden Society (CCS), the Gothic Revival, and the Anti-Scrape movement. This is typified by Chatfield's statement that, "The Ecclesiologist, first published in 1841, virtually dictated the whole course of church building, restoration and re-equipping for the succeeding fifty years" (Chatfield 1979, 9). While these trends were unquestionably influential, the restoration of the 'Street Parish' churches categorically demonstrates that other factors were equally important to the restoration decision-making process.

Perhaps the greatest influence of these national movements was in successfully demonising non-Gothic (and therefore post-medieval) architectural decoration in churches, resulting in a complete shift in 19th-century architectural fashion. This is graphically demonstrated in a newspaper article covering the restoration of nearby Norton parish church, which described the 1814 structure as a "hitherto unattractive edifice" "of the Italian style, and of little or no architectural merit" (*Yorkshire Gazette*, 27/02/1858, 9). During the course of the Victorian parish church restoration craze, this shift in architectural fashion resulted in the eradication of much of the post-medieval investment in churches. As a motivator for restoration, it is visible in several of the 'Street Parish' campaigns, including at Hovingham, Slingsby and Amotherby. Indeed, it seems likely that along with condition, the desire to remove post-medieval work, dictated the extent of restoration in these churches. At Hovingham the body of the church, which was entirely lost in the restoration campaign, largely dated from the post-medieval period, including all of the nave fenestration and the entire south elevation. The Victorian restoration saw the reinstatement of the lost-south aisle, returning the church plan form and its architectural decoration to its perceived medieval forms. A similar trend can be seen at Slingsby, with the rebuilding of the 1835 chancel, which was described as "so destitute of architectural character as to render its re-construction imperative" (Johnson, 1867, as cited in Brooke, 1916, 2). The above paragraphs highlight the rich data that can be gained through an archaeological investigation of the 19th-century restoration of parish churches.

9.3 Conclusion

Virtually every parish church in England underwent a scheme of Victorian restoration and reordering. These campaigns ranged from simple repairs and reordering through to the complete razing and rebuilding of the church. The ubiquity of Victorian intervention is revealed by Chatfield's estimate that approximately 140 of the over 8000 pre-Victorian churches in England "retain interiors that, historically at any rate, can be regarded as truly 'Anglican'" (Chatfield 1979, 9). This thesis outlines an intellectual and methodological approach in order to access this vast resource in order to explore the 19th century and the broader narrative of parish churches. Victorian churches are fundamental to anyone who wants an understanding of 19th century economy, society, values, and industry. This thesis study is important not just to church archaeologists or buildings archaeologists, but also to any historian or archaeologist of the modern period. Victorian church restorations would have been impossible without the railway infrastructure needed to cheaply transport people and materials, and restorations were largely funded off the back of money generated through industry and agricultural improvements. Victorian parish churches vividly represent two conflicting aspects of Victorian identity, one looking towards the new order and wealth of Empire and industry, while the other seeks security and spirituality in a nostalgic perceived medieval past. That so much money and energy was directed towards the repair, rebuilding, and embellishment of parish churches reveals just how important they were to Victorian life. It highlights that the parish church was a hugely integral part of 19th century community life, especially rural / village life, and it has remained so since the medieval period. That longevity undoubtedly contributed to community identities and social bonds. The restoration of parish churches also illuminates key relationships between important and powerful figures and personalities within these communities. Parish churches represent a great example of 19th-century paternalism, offering insights into the attitudes of elite society, the growth of a social consciousness, and its material manifestation through the rebuilding of an important community building and locale.

As well as augmenting study of the 19th century, this research is also significant for the understanding of medieval buildings. This thesis has shown that the disjunction between medieval and Victorian fabric is overstated and in some cases non-existent, meaning that echoes of the 'lost' medieval church may survive in the plan form, dimensions and architectural developments may survive in Victorian churches. By employing the analytical techniques espoused here, both the medieval and post-medieval iterations of the parish church can be reconstructed. While this study has offered insight into five parish churches, there are thousands of similar churches that currently go unexplored. The vast majority of

England's parish churches reflect Victorian intervention (far more than there are surviving, untouched medieval churches), and by engaging critically with Victorian restoration and rebuilding, archaeologists may access a huge dataset that represents a major strand of evidence for medieval standing buildings.

The 19th-century story of parish churches has not featured in the research agendas of the various post-medieval archaeological disciplines, despite calls to arms in the 1990s (Crossley 1990, 88; Rodwell, 1996, 90; Parkinson 1996, 146; Gilchrist and Morris (1996). This thesis establishes that current studies can be valuably augmented through the archaeological investigation of Victorian church developments. Buildings archaeology has ceded its agenda to architectural history when it comes to 19th-century churches. This work suggests the 'fabric first' focus employed by buildings archaeologists for older buildings is equally valid for Victorian churches. In terms of method this thesis has demonstrated the value of integrated systematic archaeological analysis and recording, documentary research, and virtual reality modelling. It has also highlighted the necessity of expanding archival research beyond standard church records and faculties, to include newspaper articles, personal correspondence and other documentary records. Building on Masinton's (2006) work, it has also confirmed the benefits of 3D modelling for analysing earlier phases of church development.

9.4 Future Directions

This thesis has demonstrated the rewards to be gained through a critical engagement with the 19th-century developments of parish churches. It highlights the need for church archaeologists to embrace a broader narrative that encompasses the entire story of parish churches, and which acknowledges Victorian rebuilding and restoration is a valid and integral part of that narrative. The restoration of parish churches was a key facet Victorian society, and as such, the post-medieval parish church needs to form part of the British post-medieval archaeological agenda. Equally, buildings archaeology should employ its 'fabric first' focus, currently reserved for older buildings, on 19th-century churches, as a counterbalance to the traditional discourse on great men and architectural style. This study provides clear evidence that archaeology methods bring an entirely new perspective on a type of buildings previously ceded to architectural historians. The exploration of the Victorian restoration of the 'Street Parish' churches uncovered the complex decision-making process underlying these campaigns, revealing the dictates of national trends were in practice adapted to reflect local and regional factors. As such, discourse on the history of restoration needs to move away from a focus on key personalities and the rhetoric of the

debate, towards a more nuanced exploration of the physical impact of Victorian restoration on parish churches.

There has been an assumption that England's parish churches have been studied, and are well understood and protected from threat of development or alteration. This is simply not the case. The inherited negative value judgements of 19th-century restoration have coloured popular and scholarly interest in the Victorian narrative of parish churches. As a consequence, they have not been at the forefront of any discipline's research agenda, and the significance of these buildings has not been explored or understood. The archaeological study of Victorian restoration and rebuilding has allowed the significance of the 'street parishes' churches to be re-evaluated. All Saints' church, Slingsby, was initially designated at Grade II, reflecting its value as an aesthetically pleasing Victorian church by an architect of some note. This thesis has revealed this parish church to also be an early example of an archaeologically informed reconstruction of the medieval church it replaced – counter-intuitively, despite the complete rebuilding of the church, this campaign may be viewed as a conservative restoration. This reassessment informed English Heritage's 2012 decision to upgrade the designation of All Saints to Grade II*. A similar re-evaluation of significance was undertaken at St Michael's church, Barton-le-Street. The methodology and approach advocated by this study revealed the Victorian restoration had carefully maintained the decorative hierarchy of the reused Romanesque sculptural scheme. This new understanding of the church is now displayed on visitor information boards at the church (fig. 9.1) and in a new church guidebook, engaging parishioners, residents and visitors in this previously undervalued building. In response to this new analysis, English Heritage upgraded the church's designation from Grade II to Grade I in 2014. This case featured in English Heritage's publication of significant designation cases for 2013-14 (English Heritage 2014, 68), highlighting the significant impact of this research.

The archaeological study of 19th century restoration and rebuilding recaptures a vast, and otherwise ignored, dataset, with the potential to provide valuable insights into the process and physical impact of Victorian restoration, as well as recapturing the 'lost' medieval parish church and post-medieval investment. Such an approach allows for the significance of parish churches to be re-evaluated, informing strategic decisions for these parish churches, many of which face an uncertain future.

Appendix 1

A list of church restorations and consecrations in the Malton district following the 1871 re-opening of All Saints, Amotherby. Taken from *Baker's Chronology of Local Events in Malton, Norton & District* 1869-1898, compiled by George Brown. [Online]. Available at: http://www.maltonhistory.info/resources/Directories/B-C-1869.pdf [Accessed 29/10/2014].

15 November 1871 Re-opening of Amotherby church, after restoration.

11 April 1872	Weatherthorpe Church reopened after restoration.
12 April 1872	Huttons Ambo Church reopened.
01 October 1878	Opening newly restored peal of bells at Hovingham.
02 August 1883	Reopening Allerston Church.
11 August 1883	Church Consecration at Nawton.
18 September 1883	St Michael's, Malton, reopened after thorough internal restoration.
07 August 1884	Reopening of Nunnington Church.
11 June 1885	Middleton Church reopened after restoration.
16 October 1885	Rillington Church reopened after restoration.
10 June 1886	Oswaldkirk Church reopened after restoration.
26 July 1886	Dalby Church reopened after restoration.
27 July 1886	Reopening of Middleton Church, Pickering.
22 April 1887	Crambe church reopened after restoration.
17 October 1888	Heslerton Church reopened.
25 March 1889	Opening of Priory Church, Old Malton, after internal restoration.
21 November 1889	Unveiling of the newly restored Frescoes in Pickering Church.
20 April 1892	Reopening of Rillington Church after restoration.
18 October 1893	Wintringham Church reopened after restoration
28 June 1894	Opening of St. Peter's Church, Norton, (chancel and nave only).
26 October 1895	Normanby Church reopened after restoration.
06 October 1898	Bulmer Church reopened after restoration.

Appendix 2: List Descriptions

Appendix 2.1

```
LB UID
- - - -
329055

BUILDING NAME
- - - - - - -
CHURCH OF ALL SAINTS

STREET NUMBER
- - - - - - -

STREET NAME
- - - - - -
CHURCH STREET

GRADE
- - - -
II*

DATE OF ENTRY
- - - - - - -
25/01/1954

LIST ENTRY TYPE
- - - - - - - -
LISTED

LIST ENTRY DESCRIPTION
- - - - - - - - - - - - -
```

HOVINGHAM	CHURCH STREET
SE 6675	
	(west side, off)
8/99	Church of All Saints
25.1.54	
GV II*	

Church. C11 tower; nave and chancel of 1860 incorporating some medieval features, by Rhode Hawkins, tower roof of c1970. Limestone with Westmorland slate roof. West tower, 4-bay aisled nave with south porch, 2-bay chancel with vestry to north. C19 section in Decorated style. 3-stage west tower articulated by square-section string courses. Round-arched west door with free-standing angle shafts and 4 orders, the inner one recessed, the third with roll-moulding. C9 Anglian cross carved in high relief set into wall above doorway and below a single course of herringbone masonry. Second stage: double-splayed round-headed window to south; small rectangular slit windows immediately below string course to west and north. Third stage: tall, narrow, double belfry windows to each face. C10 wheel cross set into wall above south belfry window. Rebuilt corbel table and roof. South aisle: 2-light windows. Norman doorway of 2 orders reset in south porch. 3-light window to east wall. North aisle: central 3-light gabled window flanked by 2-light windows, with 2-light windows to vestry. Chancel: to south a reset round-arched doorway with 2 reset lancets to left and a C19 two-light window to right. East end: 3-light window to chancel and 2-light window to vestry. Interior: very fine Saxon carved stone repositioned as reredos to altar in south aisle with 8 arched panels containing figures, those to left representing the Annunciation, above a narrow vine-scroll frieze with birds and beasts. Comparative material from Breedon-on-the-Hill in Leicestershire suggests an C8 date but this is disputed. C10 carved cross with knotted strapwork in relief, repositioned in chancel. Monuments: to Thomas Worsley, died 1715. Sarcophagus with sloping sides on a base, surmounted by an urn. Simple plaque to Thomas Worsley, builder of Hovingham Hall, died 1778, and members of his family, by G Willoughby of Malton. Pevsner N, Yorkshire: The North Riding, 1966. Taylor H M and Joan, Anglo- Saxon

Architecture, Vol 1, 1965. Vaughan P H, A Visitor's Guide to All Saints'
Church, Hovingham, Revised 3rd Edition 1983.

Listing NGR: SE6666075730

Appendix 2.2

```
LB UID
- - - -
329057

BUILDING NAME
- - - - - - -
TOMB TO MEMBERS OF STOCKTON FAMILY APPROXIMATELY 7 METRES SOUTH OF CHURCH
OF ALL SAINTS

STREET NUMBER
- - - - - - -


STREET NAME
- - - - - -
CHURCH STREET

GRADE
- - - -
II

DATE OF ENTRY
- - - - - - -
22/06/1987

LIST ENTRY TYPE
- - - - - - - -
LISTED

LIST ENTRY DESCRIPTION
- - - - - - - - - - - - -
                     HOVINGHAM                   CHURCH STREET
SE 6675
                                                 (west side, off)
8/101                                            Tomb to members of
                                                 Stockton family
                                                 approximately 7 metres
                                                 south of Church of All
                                                 Saints
GV                                               II
```

Chest tomb. Earliest legible date 1798. Sandstone. c.75 metres in height.
Central inscribed plaque flanked by curving panels bearing fluted ovals
with paterae to centre. Tuscan columns, that to left missing, support
cover. Inscriptions largely illegible.

Listing NGR: SE6666175719

Appendix 2.3

```
LB UID
- - - -
329056

BUILDING NAME
- - - - - - -
MAUSOLEUM APPROXIMATELY 20 METRES NORTH OF CHURCH OF ALL SAINTS

STREET NUMBER
- - - - - - -

STREET NAME
- - - - - -
CHURCH STREET

GRADE
- - - -
II

DATE OF ENTRY
- - - - - - -
22/06/1987

LIST ENTRY TYPE
- - - - - - - -
LISTED

LIST ENTRY DESCRIPTION
- - - - - - - - - - - -
                HOVINGHAM                    CHURCH STREET
SE 6675
                                             (west side, off)
8/100                                        Mausoleum approximately
                                             20 metres north of Church
                                             of All Saints
GV                                           II
Mausoleum of the Worsley family. Mid-late C18 with C19 addition.
Sandstone rubble with stone slate roof. Square on plan with additional
porch to south. Semi-subterranean. Steps down to board door in gabled
porch with Chi-Rho symbol in relief to gable end. Small rectangular
unglazed opening to each side. Pyramidal roof surmounted by finial.


Listing NGR: SE6666675748
```

Appendix 2.4

```
LB UID
- - - -
329100

BUILDING NAME
- - - - - - -
CHURCH OF ALL SAINTS

STREET NUMBER
- - - - - - -


STREET NAME
- - - - - -
CHURCH LANE

GRADE
- - - -
II

DATE OF ENTRY
- - - - - - -
25/01/1954

LIST ENTRY TYPE
- - - - - - - -
LISTED

LIST ENTRY DESCRIPTION
- - - - - - - - - - - - -
                SLINGSBY                    CHURCH LANE
NORTH YORKSHIRE
RYEDALE
5340
SE 6974

                                            (north side)
10/143                                      Church of All Saints
25.1.54
GV                                          II
```

Church. 1867-69 incorporating features of C13 church on same site. By
Austin and Johnson of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Clock by James Harrison of
Hull 1838. Limestone ashlar, lead roof. West tower, aisled 3-bay nave
with south porch, 2-bay chancel with chapel to south and organ chamber to
north. Perpendicular style. West front: 3-stage tower articulated by
string courses with diagonal buttresses, that to left containing
staircase turret. 3-light window with small trefoil-headed window and
clock to second stage and 2-light square-headed belfry windows to each
face of third stage. Panelled battlements and angle finials. South aisle:
pointed doorway in embattled porch. 2-light square-headed windows to
south aisle, chapel and clerestory. North side: 2-light square-headed
windows to north aisle and clerestory. 3-light window and pointed doorway
to organ chamber. East end: 5-light chancel window, vesica to south
chapel and 2-light window to organ chamber. Interior contains 2 restored
C13 piers to north arcade. South chapel effigy of knight c1250, hands in
prayer, legs crossed, feet missing, believed to be a member of the
Wyville family. Brooke A St C, Slingsby and Slingsby Castle, 1904.
Pevsner N, Yorkshire: The North Riding, 1966.

Listing NGR: SE6968374984

Appendix 2.5

```
LB UID
- - - -
329101

BUILDING NAME
- - - - - - -
TOMB CHEST COMMEMORATING MEMBERS OF THE MARKINFIELD FAMILY APPROXIMATELY
3 METRES TO SOUTH OF PORCH OF ALL SAINTS CHURCH

STREET NUMBER
- - - - - - -


STREET NAME
- - - - - -
CHURCH LANE

GRADE
- - - -
II

DATE OF ENTRY
- - - - - - -
22/06/1987

LIST ENTRY TYPE
- - - - - - - -
LISTED

LIST ENTRY DESCRIPTION
- - - - - - - - - - - - -
                SLINGSBY                        CHURCH LANE
SE 6974
                                                (north side)
10/144                                          Tomb chest commemorating
                                                members of the
                                                Markinfield family
                                                approximately 3 metres to
                                                south of porch of All
                                                Saints Church
GV                                              II
Tomb chest. c1730. Commemorating members of the Markinfield family.
Limestone ashlar. Oblong on plan approximately one metre x 2 metres and
one metre high. Tomb chest has recessed oval inscription plates to each
side. To corners are cavetto-moulded posts with strapwork decoration and
at diagonals are tapering balusters supporting slab with ovolo-moulded
edges. Inscriptions largely illegible.


Listing NGR: SE6968374971
```

Appendix 2.6

```
LB UID
- - - -
328738

BUILDING NAME
- - - - - - -
CHURCH OF ALL SAINTS

STREET NUMBER
- - - - - - -


STREET NAME
- - - - - -
MAIN STREET

GRADE
- - - -
II

DATE OF ENTRY
- - - - - - -
10/10/1966

LIST ENTRY TYPE
- - - - - - - -
LISTED

LIST ENTRY DESCRIPTION
- - - - - - - - - - - - -
          BURYTHORPE                    MAIN STREET
SE 76 NE
                                        (west side, off)
2/33                                    Church of All Saints
10.10.66
G                                       II
Church. 1858. By J B and W Atkinson. Limestone ashlar, Welsh slate roof.
4-bay nave with south porch, single-bay chancel with vestry to north.
Gothic Revival. West front: central buttress supporting bell-cote flanked
by trefoil-headed lancets with diagonal buttresses to angles. South
porch:
pointed arch with keeled and roll moulding. Paired lancets to nave.
Chancel: octofoil to south and vestry with paired lancets to north. East
end: stepped lancets and cinquefoil above. Interior: C12 tub font.
Pevsner N, Yorkshire, York and the East Riding, 1972.


Listing NGR: SE7890265046
```

Appendix 2.7

```
LB UID
- - - -
239001

BUILDING NAME
- - - - - - -
CHURCH OF ST MARY THE VIRGIN

STREET NUMBER
- - - - - - -

STREET NAME
- - - - - -
CHURCH ROAD

GRADE
- - - -
II

DATE OF ENTRY
- - - - - - -
28/04/1969

LIST ENTRY TYPE
- - - - - - - -
LISTED

LIST ENTRY DESCRIPTION
- - - - - - - - - - - - -
                    STANNINGTON              CHURCH LANE
NZ 27 NW
                                             (south side)
8/96                                         Church of St Mary the
Virgin
28.4.69
GV                                           II
```

Parish Church. 1871 by R.J. Johnson of Newcastle, incorporating C13 north arcade of medieval church. Squared stone with ashlar dressings; Lakeland slate roofs. 4-bay aisled nave with west tower, south-west choir vestry and south porch; 3-bay chancel with organ chamber. Decorated Gothic style. Tall 4-stage tower has 3-stepped angle buttresses, and south-west stair turret, string courses and embattled parapet with corner pinnacles. 3-light west window, paired 2-light belfry openings in square-headed panels. Body of church: plinth, sill string, eaves cornice, moulded parapets. South porch has double boarded doors, with external wooden grid, under pointed arch. 2-, 3- and 4-light windows; lancet clerestorey. Coped gables with finial crosses. Interior: 4-bay nave arcades have pointed double-chamfered arches and round piers with moulded capitals and bases; both arcades have C13 waterleaf capitals to responds. Double-chamfered tower and chancel arches. Sanctuary has wall arcade with moulded arches on marble shafts. Good late C19 glass and elaborate wall monument to Lady Ridley d.1899, on south of chancel. Monument to 1st Viscount Ridley d.1904, Secretary of State to Queen Victoria 1895-1900, at east end of north aisle: bronze effigy by Sir. W. Reynolds Stephens on cruciform marble tomb chest by D. Blow. Medieval heraldic glass in organ chamber window, presented to church in 1772 by 2nd Baronet Ridley; carved openwork pulpit, lectern and altar rails, stalls in similar style. Re-set in floor under tower 10 medieval cross-slab grave covers including two with unusual Celtic-style crosses, and late medieval limestone slab with marginal inscription. Also in tower stone with small dancing figure above skull and cable-moulded edges, possibly Pre-Christian.

Listing NGR: NZ2098879421

Appendix 2.8

Name: Church of All Saints, Slingsby

List Entry Number: 1149788

Location Church of All Saints, Church Lane, Slingsby, York, YO62 4AD

The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

County: North Yorkshire

District: Ryedale

District Type: District Authority

Parish: Slingsby

National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.

Grade: II*

Date first listed: 25-Jan-1954

Date of most recent amendment: 17-Feb-2012

Legacy System Information

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.

Legacy System: LBS UID: 329100

Asset Groupings

This List entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

List Entry Description Summary of Building

Church of England parish church largely rebuilt by R J Johnson of Newcastle upon Tyne in 1867-69, incorporating features of the original C13 church.

Reasons for Designation

All Saints' Church is designated at Grade II* for the following principal reasons: * Conservative restoration: dating to 1867-9, All Saints' is an early example of sensitive rebuilding designed to respect the original history and character of the church. This is in marked contrast to the more sweeping approach typical of the architectural mainstream in the 1860s and predates the foundation in 1877 of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. * Architectural: an early, cutting edge example of the revival of English Perpendicular architecture, as particularly demonstrated by the low pitched roofs, a style not generally employed until the 1880s-90s. This is an early example of the reaction against High Victorian, eclectic, 'muscular' gothic architecture, instead drawing on English models, employing blunt sublimity to picturesque effect. * Architectural influence: for the possibility that RJ Johnson's design of the church influenced G F Bodley, a nationally significant architect who was also an early exponent of English Perpendicular architecture. In particular, a number of Bodley's churches of the 1870s feature carved panels within the base of windows in a similar way to the east window at Slingsby.

History

All Saints' Church, Slingsby, was reconstructed on the site of the medieval church by Robert James Johnson of Newcastle upon Tyne in 1867-69, funded by Admiral Edward Howard of Castle Howard, brother of the Earl of Carlisle. Johnson, an early critic of Victorian restoration practice (characterised by wholesale rebuilding to new designs, typically Middle Pointed Gothic, rather than careful restoration and conservation of the original (Faulkner, 1995)), reconstructed the church to its original, mainly Perpendicular design, reusing much medieval stonework including some C13 arcading. This is attested by a circa 1840 engraving of the earlier church and an 1863 description by Sir Stephen Glynne. As a result, All Saints' Church appears to be stylistically more typical of an 1880s-90s date, drawing on the concept of refinement, rather than its actual 1860s date when more eclectic, High Victorian architecture is generally expected.

Details

Parish church. 1867-9 by R J Johnson incorporating medieval fabric. English Perpendicular style.

MATERIALS: medieval stone is calcareous sandstone and includes some carved grave-slab fragments, C19 stone is sandstone (possibly Whitby sandstone).

PLAN: west tower, three-bay aisled nave with a south porch. Two-bay chancel flanked by a single bay chapel to the south, and an organ chamber/vestry to the north.

EXTERIOR: the tower is of three unequal stages marked by string courses and supported with diagonal, stepped buttresses, that to the north incorporating a stair turret. The lower stage has a large west window with a pointed-arch and elongated reticulated tracery; the short second stage has a clock to the south elevation and a small trefoil-headed window to the west; the taller upper stage has 2-light square-headed belfry windows to each face; the roof has panelled battlements and angle finials, each corner having a projecting animal sculpture to the base of the parapet in addition to two medieval gargoyles on the north side.

North and south side elevations have stepped buttresses and 2-light square-headed windows to both the nave clerestory and aisles. The low pitched roofs are concealed by plain parapets. The chancel has a 2-light south window similar in design to the west (tower) window. The south door is pointed and has an embattled porch incorporating an elaborate niche above the entrance retaining a weathered statuette carved from oolitic limestone.

The east end has prominent angle buttresses and a boldly moulded plinth. The 5-light chancel window is similar in design to the west window, but incorporates carved panels to the base of the lights. Above there is another elaborate niche also retaining a statuette. The east window of the side chapel is a small window in the form of a vesica. The organ chamber has a 2-light window.

INTERIOR: the internal walls are stone ashlar, floors are tiled with timber beneath the pews with encaustic tiling to the chancel, increasing in richness towards the east end. The north arcade to the nave includes two C13 arches complete with their piers as well as a C13 stiff-leaf corbel reset at the west end. The nave arcades are asymmetric, subtly indicating some of the history of the building. The chancel is elaborately treated, with marble shafts and carved capitals to the arches and an alabaster dado to the east wall. The reredos is formed by the carved and painted panels to the base

of the east window, decorated with shields bearing the Instruments of the Passion. The chancel and west windows contain stained glass by Clayton and Bell, with further stained glass to the vesica and three of the aisle windows.

MONUMENTS: in a recess in the side chapel there is the effigy of a mid-C13 knight with hands in prayer and legs crossed (lower portion missing) believed to be a member of the Wyvill family.

FITTINGS: oak choir stalls, pulpit and other fittings, the altar rail also incorporating elaborate ironwork. Carved oak screen dated 1928 to the tower arch. C17 bobbin-ended oak bench, other pews, forming a complete set, are also oak, but C19. The very large brass chandelier in the nave is thought to have come from Sledmere church and to have been designed by either Street or Pearson. The tower retains a clock of 1838 by James Harrison of Hull as well as a set of 3 bells dated 1803 hung on early bell frames.

Selected Sources

Books and journals

Brooke, A S C, Slingsby and Slingsby Castle, (1904)

Curl, J S, Piety Proclaimed: An introduction to places of worship in Victorian England, (2002)

Pevsner, N, The Buildings of England: Yorkshire: The North Riding, (1966)

Faulkner, T E , 'Durham University Journal' in Robert James Johnson, Architect And Antiquary, (1991), 3-11

Hall, M, 'Architectural History' in The Rise of Refinement: GF Bodley's All Saints, Cambridge and the Return to English Models in Gothic Architecture of the 1860s, (1993)

Appendix 2.9

```
LB UID
- - - -
328959

BUILDING NAME
- - - - - - -
CHURCH OF ST MICHAEL

STREET NUMBER
- - - - - - -

STREET NAME
- - - - - -
MAIN STREET

GRADE
- - - -
II

DATE OF ENTRY
- - - - - - -
25/01/1954

LIST ENTRY TYPE
- - - - - - - -
LISTED

LIST ENTRY DESCRIPTION
- - - - - - - - - - - - -
```

	BARTON-LE-STREET	MAIN STREET

```
SE 77 SW

                                    (east side, off)
6/3                                 Church of St Michael
25.1.54
GV                                  II
```

Church. 1871 incorporating many C12 features of earlier building on same
site. By Perkins and Sons of Leeds with organ case by Temple Moore.
Sandstone ashlar, Westmorland slate roof. 4-bay nave with north porch and
south organ chamber, 2-bay chancel. Moulded plinth and continuous moulded
sill broken by flat buttresses with roll-moulded angles and billet
decoration to window heads throughout. West end: 2 round-headed windows
with nook shafts, with oculus above. Corbel table supports double-arched
bellcote. South side: round-arched windows with nook shafts beneath
corbel table. 3 orders to north door of porch, with carved jambs with
some very worn original Norman blocks, one to right depicting 2 angels,
and scrolls and beakhead to left. Victorian nook shafts and capitals.
Arch: Norman inner order with chevrons, largely Victorian middle order
and Norman outer frieze depicting mythical beasts and Christ in majesty.
Inside porch: reset sections of Norman corbel table. North door: carved
jambs retaining some Norman blocks depicting Sagittarius, a man, a beast,
knots, a bird, a reaper, Samson and the lion. Victorian nook shafts and
capitals. Inner arch with scroll work, outer arch with heads, a lion and
some scrolls. Above doorway several carved slabs, one with 3 Magi
approaching the Virgin, another with the Virgin and Child and 2 angels,
another with 3 male figures. North side: round-arched windows with nook
shafts. Round-arched west doorway to organ chamber. East end: 3 round-
arched windows with round window above. Interior: scrollwork to sill band
includes some original blocks. Original triple responds with richly-
carved capitals to chancel arch and original responds to archway to organ
chamber. Stretches of original corbel table reset in chancel. Organ case
in Gothic style. Pevsner N, Yorkshire: The North Riding, 1966.
Listing NGR: SE7212974228

Appendix 2.10

List Entry Number: 1148993

Location Church of St Michael, Main Street, Barton-le-Street, North Yorkshire, YO17 6PN

The building may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.

County: North Yorkshire

District: Ryedale

District Type: District Authority

Parish: Barton-le-Street

National Park: Not applicable to this List entry.

Grade: I

Date first listed: 25-Jan-1954

Date of most recent amendment: 19-Nov-2013

Legacy System Information

The contents of this record have been generated from a legacy data system.

Legacy System: LBS UID: 328959

Asset Groupings

This List entry does not comprise part of an Asset Grouping. Asset Groupings are not part of the official record but are added later for information.

List Entry Description Summary of Building

Church rebuilt in 1871 incorporating a rich, extensive and coherent decorative scheme of carved stonework from the earlier building dated to the 1160s.

Reasons for Designation

The church of St. Michael is listed at Grade I for the following principal reasons:

* Early sculpture: For the survival of a coherent and extensive decorative scheme of C12 sculpture including a number of forms with no close parallels known in England, particularly the corbel tables with carved heads placed in the soffits between corbels, as well as the carved door jambs and figurative panels; * Art historical: Particularly for the high quality of the figurative sculpture which is both technically accomplished and iconographically complex, shedding light on the mixing of Anglo-Scandinavian, Anglo-Saxon and French artistic traditions in C12 Yorkshire; * Victorian craftsmanship: Particularly for the high quality C12 style stone sculpture by Charles Mawer. The wood carving by William Matthews is also of high quality but perhaps more conventional for its date.

History

The Doomsday book records a pre-conquest church at Barton-le-Street, thought to be the origin of the Anglo-Saxon cross base (NHLE 1316063) sited adjacent to the current church's porch. Doomsday also records that by 1089, the manor of Barton-le-Street was held by Ralph Paynel: Paynel refounded Holy Trinity Priory in York, endowing it with 12 parish churches including Barton-le-Street. Around the 1160s, a new church was constructed from stone. Although this was a

simple, small church with just a nave and chancel, it was richly embellished with an extensive late Romanesque scheme of sculptural decoration. The high quality of the sculpture indicates that it was probably funded by Holy Trinity Priory or the Rector of Barton-le-Street, William D'Eu (died 1174), who was also Precentor of York Minster. In 1869-71 the church was demolished and rebuilt on the same footprint to a uniform neo-Romanesque style for the Meynell Ingrams of Temple Newsham who held the manor of Barton-le-Street. Care was taken to reuse and preserve as much of the original sculptural decoration as possible, generally with original sculpture reused internally with new sculpture employed externally.

Barton-le-Street has been cited by many authorities on Romanesque sculpture: Boase (1953, 240) states that it "must have been one of the most richly carved of the smaller churches in England"; Stone (1955, 80) highlights it as "the most splendid product of the Yorkshire School at its peak period" and Zarnecki (1953, 36) that it is the "most striking analogy between the Yorkshire School and Western France". Even Pevsner, often reserved in his praise, described the church as being "sumptuous". Recent research by Smith (2012) indicates that the original decorative scheme is nearly complete with over 250 pieces of late Romanesque sculpture (the only major missing component being the chancel arch which was rebuilt in the later Middle Ages but reconstructed on the basis of a voussoir found reused as walling stone) and that although this sculpture has been repositioned; the original positional hierarchy has been preserved. Research has also shown that much of this sculpture is without close known parallels in England: This includes the form of the door jambs and the arch rings with their figurative carvings, but also the corbel tables - the closest parallel for the inclusion of carved heads within the intervening soffits between corbels is the church of Notre Dame la Grande, in Poitiers, France.

Details

Parish church. Rebuilt 1871 incorporating extensive late C12 carved stonework from the earlier church. Designed by Perkin and Son in neo-Romanesque style with stone sculpture by Charles Mawer and wood carving by William Matthews, all from Leeds.

MATERIALS Hildenley limestone ashlar, Graduated Westmorland slate roof. Victorian decorative detail and sculpture generally in Birdsall sandstone; medieval sculptural decoration in Hildenley limestone.

PLAN Nave of 4-bays with an open north porch and a bell-cote to the west gable; 2-bay chancel with a single bay vestry/organ chamber to the south.

EXTERIORNave and chancel Moulded continuous plinth. Round headed windows with a round-billet hood-mould which continues as an impost stringcourse. This, along with the continuous moulded sill band, is broken by flat buttresses which have roll-moulded angles. The capitals of the buttresses to the north and south walls are linked by corbel tables incorporating around 100 individually carved corbels: these are neo-Romanesque featuring beasts, angels, human caricatures and other forms. The west end has two windows with an oculus above and a further corbel table supporting the double arched bell-cote. The east end has three round headed lancets also with an oculus above.

South Porch The outer doorway is thought to have originally been the church's north door. It is round arched with three rings of voussoirs, the outer being in the form of a frieze of shallow carvings of various figurative designs of Anglo-Scandinavian influence. The two inner rings consist of chevrons, the middle ring being mainly Victorian reproduction. The doorjambs have shallow, figuratively-carved panels on two faces, five of the 15 blocks being original, the remainder being high quality Victorian reproductions.

INTERIOR

South Porch The roof is supported by arcaded-corbel tables originally external to the chancel. These are elaborately carved with corbels in the form of heads or other figures, with additional heads set into the soffits of the arches. The spandrels to the arcades also have carved decoration. Although both corbel tables are thought to be mainly original, that to the east side includes some Victorian repair and replacement.

The church doorway was originally the medieval south door. It is round arched with two arch rings of voussoirs, both being figuratively carved. The inner ring of 11 voussoirs has a continuous vine scroll including a stag or goat in the foliage. The outer ring of 16 voussoirs consists of a collection of figurative carvings, mainly heads or beasts. The doorjambs, like those of the outer porch doorway, are figuratively carved, with 7 out of the 12 stones being original.

Placed above the doorway is a further set of figurative carvings including two stones depicting the "Adoration of the Magi" and seven stones forming part of a series depicting the "Labours of the Months". These shallow relief carvings are thought to be late C12, but have pre-conquest Anglo-Saxon stylistic features.

Nave The wall-plates are supported by 32 individually carved corbels featuring stylised heads and beasts reused from the exterior of the C12 church nave. Other carved heads reused as stops (such as those to the carved arch ring framing the north door) also appear to be medieval, although other internal decoration such as the billet hood-moulds and nook shafts to the window reveals are Victorian. With some elements, such as the continuous running scroll frieze forming a high dado, it is difficult to separate the original C12 work from Victorian repair.

The chancel arch with its beak-head and chevron decoration is Victorian, although its design was taken from a C12 voussoir found during the rebuilding. However six of the eight elaborately carved cushion capitals supporting the chancel arch are Norman and are firmly dated stylistically to the 1160s, the two Victorian reproductions being high quality.

Chancel Wall plates are supported by C12 arcaded-corbel tables similar to those within the porch, complete with carved heads placed in the soffits of the arches. Within the sanctuary there is a medieval piscina supported on a carved Norman pillar. The arch to the organ chamber is supported on further elaborately carved cushion capitals dated to the C12. Further C12 sculpture is believed to be concealed by the organ case.

FITTINGS and STAINED GLASS Apart from the piscina, all are Victorian or later. The oak altar rails and pulpit are elaborately carved in Romanesque style as is the Caen stone and alabaster font. The wall panelling to dado level within the nave is gothic, as are the pews with carved end

panels. The organ case is by Temple Moore and was a later addition to the church, unfortunately obscuring some more significant C12 sculpture. It is also gothic with painted and gilded decoration using a similar palette employed for the simple ring shaped candelabras within the nave. Encaustic floor tiling is by Goodwin of Hereford. Some of the windows have figurative designed stained glass, some have complex geometric designs, and some are plainer with coloured margin glazing. The stained glass to the sides of the chancel is by Barnett & Son, Leith, the east windows are by Heaton, Butler and Bayne, London. Memorials include a Romanesque tablet in the chancel to Hugo Meynell Ingram, patron of the rebuilding who died just before the new church was opened; and a First World War memorial in the nave in the form of a triptych which also lists the men who served and returned in addition to the names of the fallen.

Selected Sources

Books and journals

Boase, TSR, English Art 1100-1216, (1953), 240

Pevsner, N, The Buildings of England: Yorkshire: The North Riding, (1966), 73

Stone, L, Sculpture in Britain: the Middle Ages, (1955), 80

Zarnecki, G, Later English Romanesque Sculpture 1140-1210, (1953), 36

Smith, D, 'Church Archaeology' in St Michael and All Angels, Barton-le-Street: an important Scheme of Romanesque Sculpture, Vol. 14, (2012), 27-42

Appendix 2.11

APPLETON-LE-STREET WITH EASTHORPE   B 1257
SE 77 SW

(south side, off)
4/11   Church of All Saints
25.1.54
GV   I

Church. C11 tower; early C13 chancel, shortened in C15; late C13 north
aisle; south aisle c1300; C19 south porch. Squared calcareous sandstone
and rubble; some rebuilding in sandstone; slate roofs and Roman tile to
porch. West tower with north porch; 2-bay, aisled nave; chancel. Tower of
3 stages with original west doorway now blocked by round-arched light
with stopped hoodmould. Gabled porch to north side contains late C12
doorway of 2 chamfered orders, the inner on chamfer-stopped responds, the
outer on attached shafts with water-leaf capital to east and crocket
capital to west. Hoodmould with leaf-stops. Trefoil-headed niche over
porch contains the remains of a sculpted Virgin and Child. To south side,
blocked rectangular openings are visible. Paired round-arched bell-
openings with mid-wall shafts and chamfered imposts to second stage;
similar, smaller, openings to third stage with chevron-moulded shafts.
Raised bands to second and third stages, and cavetto-moulded eaves
cornice with water spouts. Low pyramidal roof. South aisle: dwarf
buttresses to each end and to centre. 2 restored, square-arched windows
of 3 lights, those to west trefoil-headed, those to east shouldered.
Window to east wall pointed, of 3 trefoil-headed lights and intersecting
tracery, with head-stopped hoodmould. Lancet in west wall. North aisle:
massive offset buttress to centre, with low, blocked opening to west.
Windows of 2 pointed foiled lights with leaf-stopped hoodmoulds flank
buttress. Window to east wall is a lancet in a chamfered opening. Low
parapet to nave roof. Chancel. South side: 2 lancets in quoined,
chamfered surrounds. Pointed hoodmould to west beneath which a C19
memorial tablet to members of the Hebden family has been set. Dwarf
buttress to east. North side: plank door with timber lintel, and pilaster
buttress to east. Square-arched east window of 3 cinquefoil lights.
Interior: semicircular tower arch on chamfered responds with imposts
moulded on the lower edges. North arcade of double-chamfered pointed
arches on a cylindrical pier and keel-moulded responds with chamfers and
leaf-stops. South arcade of double-chamfered pointed arches with
hoodmoulds, on octagonal pier and half-octagonal responds; headstop to

eastern respond. Pointed, double-chamfered chancel arch on triple
responds, the centre one filleted. Hoodmould, with headstop to north. In
the sanctuary north wall is a round-headed aumbry; to the south, part of
a rounded piscina arch with a rough, projecting bowl beneath. There is
another piscina with a cusped pointed head, in the south aisle. C12 tub
font with C17 tall octagonal cover. Altar table and rails of 1636-37.
Effigies: in the sanctuary are 2 effigies of ladies of the Bolton family,
Lords of Appleton in C14. Monuments: 2 wall tablets on the chancel north
wall by W Stead of York, to Rev Luke Thompson (d1799) and his wife, Mary
(d1794). Pevsner N, The Buildings of England, Yorkshire — The North
Riding, 1966, p 64.

Listing NGR: SE7343773581

Appendix 2.12

```
LB UID
- - - -
328634

BUILDING NAME
- - - - - - -
CHURCH OF ST HELEN

STREET NUMBER
- - - - - - -

STREET NAME
- - - - - -
CHURCH LANE

GRADE
- - - -
II

DATE OF ENTRY
- - - - - - -
25/01/1954

LIST ENTRY TYPE
- - - - - - - -
LISTED

LIST ENTRY DESCRIPTION
- - - - - - - - - - - - -
                    AMOTHERBY WITH HILDENLEY          CHURCH LANE
SE 77 SE
                                            (east side, off)
5/6                                         Church of St Helen
25.1.54
GV                                          II
```

Church. C16 tower; nave probably rebuilt c1708; extensive restoration of
1870-72, by G Fowler Jones, during which the nave windows and chancel
were rebuilt, and the south porch, north aisle and vestry added.
Limestone ashlar with rebuilding in rock-faced sandstone and sandstone
ashlar; slate roof. West tower; 4-bay nave and continuous chancel; north
aisle and south porch; north vestry. Single-stage tower on tall chamfered
plinth has round-arched doorway to west, beneath hoodmould with lozenge-
shaped stops. 2-light, square-arched window above, with chamfered mullion
and square hoodmould. Bell-openings to all 4 faces are similar. Moulded
eaves course beneath embattled parapet with vestigial pinnacles, and
stone waterspout to west. Gabled south porch contains reset C12 doorway
with roll-moulded round arch on attached shafts with scalloped capitals :
hoodmould with re-used beakhead mouldings as stops. The C19 door has fine
wrought-iron hinges. Nave has offset buttress to east and single round-
arched lights in quoined surrounds of contrasting stone. Windows to north
aisle and vestry are similar. Chancel windows are paired, with chevron
mouldings to the round heads. East end is on a chamfered plinth with
diagonal offset buttresses flanking the window of 3 stepped lancets.
Beneath the window 4 carved stones have been set, dated 1708, and
probably recording the names of the masons for the restorations of that
date. Coped east gables to chancel and north aisle; gable crosses to
both. Interior: traces of a blocked round tower arch, probably C12 or
earlier, are visible within the tower in east wall. C19 arcade of
chevron-moulded round arches on slim columns with scalloped capitals, on
tall plinths. The north wall of the sanctuary contains a round-arched
niche with head-stopped hoodmould and slim nook shafts. Beneath is a C14
tomb slab carved with a foliated cross and inscribed: ICI GIT WILLEM DE
BORDESDON PRIZ PUR LA ALME. Sir William de Bordesdon who died c1340 was
the brother or nephew of Sir John de Bordesdon whose effigy lies in a C19
niche in the south wall of the sanctuary. He is shown with his arms and
wearing a surcoat with sleeves; he died c1329. In the porch a number of
stone fragments have been set, including 2 Anglo-Danish cross fragments,

part of a foliated grave slab and part of C14 grave slab carved with a quatrefoil enclosing a female figure. Pevsner, The Buildings of England: Yorkshire, the North Riding, 1966; p 60.

Listing NGR: SE7506773428

List of Abbreviations

BAL   British Architectural Library

BIA   Borthwick Institute for Archives

CHA   Castle Howard Archives

DSA   Dictionary of Scottish Architects

NHPP   National Heritage Protection Plan

RIBA   Royal Institute of British Architects

RVBMRG   Ryedale Vernacular Building Materials Research Group

SPAB   Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings

TST   Total Station Theodolite

WA   Worsley Archive

Bibliography

Archival Sources:

BF095444   [Hovingham] English Heritage Buildings File

Records held in the Borthwick Institute for Archives [BIA]

<u>Faculty records</u>

Fac. 1694/1   [Hovingham] Erection of a wall to fix monuments upon (removing

                              partition between Thomas Worsley's burying place & the vestry)

Fac. 1820/6   [Hovingham] Allotment of pew

Fac. 1821/6   [Hovingham] Erection of gallery, with plan

Fac. 1860/2   [Hovingham] Rebuilding of church (with 4 plans)

Fac. 1867/10   [Slingsby] Re-building of the Church with (4 plans)

Fac. 1869/10   [Barton-le-Street] – rebuilding of church (with 11 plans)

Fac. 1871/9   [Amotherby] rebuilding of church (with plan)

Fac. 1878/24   [Hovingham] Addition of a South Chapel and new seating (plans

                              a-g, correspondence & reredos drawing) C. Hodgson Fowler

Fac. 1892/4   [Hovingham] Addition of a raised step at the sanctuary with a new

                              reredos, and the corresponding raising of the east window by 3 feet

                              to accommodate them. (2 drawings) C. Hodgson Fowler

Fac.1902A/26   [Amotherby] Installation of stained glass window

Fac.1913/60   [Amotherby] Installation of stained glass window

Fac.1917/28	[Barton-le-Street] Erect a War Memorial
Fac.1920A/42	[Barton-le-Street] Remove stone reredos, replace by one of painted wood. Architect F.W. Hunt. Nb. Includes drawings and two interior photos
Fac. 1924B/21	[Hovingham] Move ancient stones
Fac.1929/1/4	[Slingsby] To erect an oak screen and to affix an oak tablet
Fac.1932/2/29	[Slingsby] To install electric light
Fac.1946/89	[Amotherby] Oak altar
Fac.1948/2/34	[Slingsby] To repair the tower of the church. To carry out other work to the fabric
Fac.1959/2/10	[Slingsby] Replacement of timbers etc
Fac.1962/2/58	[Slingsby] Interior decoration and replacement of windows
Fac.1966/1/25	[Slingsby] to sell large brass chandelier in nave, to obtain 3 small chairs (like those used in the side chapel) and to remove 2 choir kneelers and a short pew from the choir stalls.
Fac.Bk.1, 394	[Amotherby] Faculty for Pews
Fac.Bk.2, 412	[Amotherby] Faculty for Pews
Fac. Bk.2, pp.520-1	[Hovingham] 1793 Erection of loft or gallery
Fac. Bk.3, pp.337-8	[Hovingham] 1802 Erection of seats
Fac.Bk.3, 507-8	[Amotherby] Faculty for Pews
Fac. Bk.4, pp.83-4	[Hovingham] Allotment of pew

Fac. Bk.4, pp.108-110	[Hovingham] Erection of gallery 12/03/1821
Fac. Bk.5, pp.22-4	[Hovingham] Rebuilding of church (with 4 plans)

Parish and Ecclesiastical records

CD. Add.1871/1	Grant of Land: Addition to Churchyard 1871.
Ch.Ret	Cathedral and Church Returns 1871 back to 1841
Ch.Ret. 1875	Cathedral and Church Returns 1875
Hov. PR.16	Account of expenses for obtaining faculty to erect gallery 1821
Ph.45	Hovingham Parish Magazine 1877-1878
PR.AM.5	[Amotherby] Faculty for rebuilding of the church 1871
PR.AM.6	[Amotherby] Malton Messenger Article re: 1871 rebuilding
PR.AM.38	[Amotherby] Faculty plan for rebuilding 1871
PR.AM.42	[Amotherby] Papers concerning repairs of 1951-61
PR.AM.56	[Amotherby] Bill for purchase of land for churchyard extension 1940
PR.AS.75	[Appleton-le-Street] Letters from Rev Keeton regarding medieval wall paintings found at Appleton-le-Street
PR.BS.20	[Barton-le-Street] Plans for panelling to church walls and for west screen 1904
PR. SLIN.15	[Slingsby] Specification of Carpenters and Joiners Work
PR. SLIN.18	[Slingsby] 3 letters re. sale of brass corona

PR. SLIN.58   [Slingsby] 1960s redecoration

RD. RET.1   Rural Dean's Returns 1865 Vols. 1-3

SLIN.Ter.L   Glebe Terriers [Slingsby] (1727, 1743, 1749, 1760, 1764)

V.1590-1/CB1   Ecclesiastical Court Book 1590

V.1693-4   Archbishop's Visitation Returns 1693-4

V.1817/Exh. Bk. f.25 Archbishop's Visitation Returns 1817

V.1865 Ret.   Archbishop's Visitation Returns 1865

V. 1868/Ret   Archbishop's Visitation Returns 1868

Records Held in the Castle Howard Archive (C.H.A.) [Slingsby]

F5/123   T.E. Satterthwaite's account with Admiral Howard for Slingsby Church

                     alterations and For Admiral Howard's farm 1867-1873

F5/2/7   Letter Book T.E. Satterthwaite 13.08.1866-08.08.1870

08/01?/1867   P. Satterthwaite to Rev'd Fish. Letter re: quarrying?

08/05/1868   P. Satterthwaite to Mr. Du Cane. Letter re: extension of churchyard.

11/05/1868   P. Satterthwaite to Mr. Du Cane. Letter re: extension of churchyard.

15/05/1868   P. Satterthwaite to Mr. Du Cane. Letter re: extension of churchyard.

03/06/1868   P. Satterthwaite to Mr. Du Cane. Letter re: advowson at Hovingham

                     Church.

05/06/1868   P. Satterthwaite to Mr. Du Cane. Letter re: rent payable to Hovingham

                     Rectory.

14/08/1868   P. Satterthwaite to R.J. Johnson. Letter re: payment of architect's fees.

J20/6   Letters from Edward Howard, Lord Lanerton, and Diana

Lanerton (to Charles Wentworth George Howard, son of 6th Earl)

Unknown   Mrs. D. Howard to C. Howard. Letter: progress of works (Estate?)

Unknown   Mrs. D. Howard to C. Howard. Letter: visit to Slingsby church

construction.

Records held in the North Yorkshire County Records Office [Hovingham]

[ZON 1/2/8]   Deeds

[ZON/1/1/39]   Deeds "Advowson, purchased by W.C. Worsley from the Earl of
                   Carlisle. 2 docs 1861."

[ZON 3/5/2]   Enclosure

[ZON 3/5/4]   Enclosure

[ZON 10/4]   Church "Notes about the procedure to be adopted in alteration of

                  the design of the church. 1693 License to Thomas Worsley of

                  Hovingham enabling him to remove a partition between vestry and

                  two seats. 1694."

[ZON 13/11]   Personal Letters and Correspondence of William Worsley

[ZON 17/2/1/218]   Architectural Drawings

[ZON 17/3]   Hovingham Church

Published and Unpublished Sources:

ADDLESHAW, G W O. (1956) *Rectors, Vicars and Patrons in twelfth and early thirteenth century canon law*. York: St. Anthony's Press.

ADDLESHAW, G W O and F Etchells. (1958) *The Architectural Setting of Anglican Worship*. London: Faber and Faber.

ADDYMAN, P V and R MORRIS. (1976) *The Archaeological Study of Churches.* London: Council for British Archaeology

ALLEN, J R. (1889) 'The Norman Doorways of Yorkshire'. *The Reliquary & Illustrated Archaeologist III - No. 3*, pp. 153-8. London: Bemrose and Sons.

ALLEN, T. (1823) *A New and Complete History of the County of York* Vol. 3. London: I.T. Hinton.

ALLEN, J R L. (2008) *Building a Victorian Country Church: An historical archaeology of St Mary the Virgin, Stratfield Mortimer, Berkshire.* BAR British Series 457.

ANNESLEY, C and P HOSKIN. (1997) *Archbishop Drummond's visitation returns 1764*. York: Borthwick Institute of Historical Research.

Anon. (n.d. (a)) Passport of John Piggott Munby. [Online]. Available at: http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/a2a/records.aspx?cat=192-acc54&cid=5-10#5-10 [Accessed: 10/03/2013].

Anon. (n.d. (b)) *Barton Le Street*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.thestreetparishes.org.uk/barton-le-street.html [Accessed: 16/05/09].

Anon. (n.d.(c)) *Information Leaflet on the Hornby Window, in St Helen's Church, Amotherby*.

Anon. (n.d.(d)) *Information Panel in St Helen's Church, Amotherby*.

Anon. (1786) No Title. *The Gentleman's Magazine* LVI, p. 1048.

Anon. (1788) No Title. *The Gentleman's Magazine* LVIII, pp. 689-691.

Anon. (1825) *Hints to Some Churchwardens with a few illustrations relative to the Repair and Improvement of Parish Churches with Twelve Plates*. London: Rodwell and Martin.

Anon. (1832) *The Oxford University Calendar*. Oxford: W. Baxter.

Anon. (1842) 'Open Seats versus Pews'. *The Ecclesiologist Vol. 1 N.S.*, p. 145.

Anon. (1843) 'Illustration of the Foundation of Religious Houses, No. II'. *Gentleman's Magazine (1843:Mar),* pp.260-4.

Anon. (1845) 'Of Clerestories, in Reference to Church Restoration'. *The Ecclesiologist Vol.1 N.S.*, pp.103-5.

Anon. (1859) 'Opening of Butterwick Chapel'. *The Builder **17***, 23 April 1859, p. 286.

Anon. (1865) *Crockford's Clerical Directory.* 3rd Issue. London: Horace Cox.

Anon. (1869) 'New Buildings and Restorations', *The Architect Vol. II*, 04/09/1869, p. 118.

Anon. (1870) 'New Buildings and Restorations', *The Architect Vol. III*, 24/09/1870, p. 180.

Anon. (1878) *Crockford's Clerical Directory*. London: Horace Cox.

Anon. (1884) *The Builder **42***, 06/12/1884, p. ix-x.

Anon. (1892) 'Obituary'. *The Builder **62***, 07/05/1892, p. 353.

Anon. (1893) 'Notes of the Month'. *The Antiquary* (Jan 1893), pp. 2-3.

Anon. (1899) *The Parish Magazine: All Saints' Parish Church, Appleton-le-Street with S. Helen's, Amotherby.* April & May 1899. Malton: G.J. Jones & J.W. Honer.

Anon. (1904) 'Notes on Current Events'. *The British Architect,* 22/07/1904, p. 5.

Anon. (1908a) 'Notes of the Month'. *Antiquary **4:1** Jan*, p. 4.

Anon. (1908b) 'Notices of New Books'. *The Reliquary and Illustrated Archaeologist **14*** (Jan), p. 69.

Anon. (2006) *All Saints' Church, Hovingham: Church Guidebook*. 5th Edition.

Architectural Press. (1944) *Bombed Churches as war memorials.* Cheam: Architectural Press.

ARNOLD, D. (2002) *Reading Architectural History*. London: Routledge.

ARNOLD, D. (2006) 'Beyond a boundary: towards an architectural history of the non-east'. *In:* D. Arnold (ed.) *Rethinking Architectural Historiography*. London: Routledge, pp. 229-245.

BAINES, E. (1823) *History, Directory and Gazetteer of the County of York: Vol. II East and North Ridings.* Leeds: Edward Baines.

BALDWIN BROWN, G. (1937) *The Arts in Early England. Vol. VI Part II: Anglo-Saxon Sculpture*. London: John Murray.

BARKER, P et al. (1999) 'Ripon Minster: an archaeological analysis and reconstruction of the 12th-century church'. *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* **152**, pp. 49-78.

BARNWELL, P S and A PACEY (eds). (2008) *Who built Beverley Minster?* Reading: Spire Books in association with The Friends of Beverley Minster

The Bath Chronicle. (1871) *No title*, 26/01/1871, p. 6.

BETJEMAN, J. (1968) *Collins Pocket Guide to English Parish Churches*. London: Collins.

BETJEMAN, J (ed). (1980) *Collins Pocket Guide to Parish Churches of England and Wales*. London: Collins.

BETJEMAN, J with P HOGARTH. (1996) *In Praise of Churches*. London: John Murray.

BELL, R D, M W BERESFORD et al. (1987) `*Wharram: a study of settlement on the Yorkshire Wolds. Volume III: Wharram Percy: the church of St Martin'* Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph **11**. London: Society for Medieval Archaeology.

BEVAN, G P. (1878) *Tourist's guide to the East and North Ridings of Yorkshire* 4th Ed. London: Edward Stanford.

BLAIR, J (ed). (1988) *Minsters and Parish Churches: The Local Church in Transition, 950-1200*. Oxford : Oxford University Committee for Archaeology

BLACK, A and C BLACK. (1863) *Black's picturesque guide to Yorkshire: with a map of the county and numerous plans and views*. Edinburgh: R. and R. Clark.

BLACKBURN, M A S. (2009) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: Hawkins, Edward (1780–1867)*. [Online]. Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Oct 2009. Available at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12663 [Accessed 24/03/2014].

BLOXAM, M H. (1829) *The Principles of Gothic Architecture*. London: Kent & Co.

BOND, F. (1905) *Gothic Architecture in England.* London: B.T. Batsford Ltd.

BOWES, P. (2012) *Future Church: envisioning the Church of England in Southern Ryedale in the second decade of the 21st century.* Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Durham. [online]. Available at: http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/3509/ [Accessed: 10/10/14].

BRODIE, A et al. (2001) *Directory of British Architects 1834 – 1914 2nd. Ed.* London: Mansell.

BROWN, W (ed). (1897) 'The Subsidy: Wapentake of Rydale', *Yorkshire Lay Subsidy: 30 Ed. I (1301).* Yorkshire Lay Subsidy Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series, pp. 46-56.

FOSTER, J. (1882). *Burke's Peerage of the British Empire for 1882.* 44th Edition. Westminster: Nichols and Sons.

BRANDWOOD, G. (2010) *The Architecture of Sharpe, Paley and Austin.* London: English Heritage.

BRINE, J. (1990-1) "The Religious Intentions of the Cambridge Camden Society and their Effect on the Gothic Revival". *Fabrications 2:3*, pp.4-18.

Britain Express. (n.d.) *Amotherby: St Helen's Church.* [Online]. Available at: http://www.britainexpress.com/attractions.htm?attraction=4614 [Accessed: 09/02/2014].

British Geological Survey. (2010) 'Building Stones Assessment: All Saints Church, Slingsby, North Yorkshire'. Unpublished.

BRITTON, J. (1814-35) *Cathedral antiquities of England: or an historical, architectural and graphical illustration of the English cathedral churches.* London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown.

BROOKE, A St. C. (1904) *Slingsby and Slingsby Castle.* London: Methuen & Sons.

BROOKE, A St. C. (1916) *The Church of All Saints, Slingsby.* Malton: Malton Gazette Limited.

BROOKS, C and A Saint (eds) (1995) The Victorian Church: Architecture and Society. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

BROOKS, M W. (1989) *John Ruskin and Victorian Architecture.* London: Thames and Hudson.

BROWN, W. (1897) *Pedes Finium Ebor.* Durham: The Surtees Society.

BUCHANAN, A. (2013) *Robert Willis (1800-1875) and the Foundation of Architectural History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Builder. (1872) *Obituary*, 7 May 1872, p.353.

The Building News. (1870) *Contemporary British Architects*, 23 May 1870, p.720.

BULMER, T. (1890) *History, Topography and Directory of North Yorkshire Part II*. Preston: T. Bulmer & Co.

BUNDOCK, E L. (2012) *Sir Charles Nicholson: Architect of Noble Simplicity*. West Raynham: Jewel Tree Publications.

Bury & Norwich Post and Suffolk Advertiser. (1882) *Ecclesiastical Preferments*, 13 June 1882, p.7.

BUTLER, L A S. (1982) 'The Labours of the Months and "The Haunted Tanglewood": Aspects of Late Twelfth-Century Sculpture in Yorkshire'. *In:* R L Thomson (ed). *A Medieval Miscellany in Honour of Professor John Le Patourel*. Leeds: Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society, pp. 79-95.

BUTLER, L A S. (1983) 'Church building after the Reformation'. *In:* R Morris (ed) *The Church in British Archaeology*. Council for British Archaeology Research Report **47**. London: Council for British Archaeology.

BUTLER, L A S (ed). (2007) *The Yorkshire Church Notes of Sir Stephen Glynne (1825-1874)* Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society in association with the Boydell Press.

CAMBRIDGE, E. (1994) 'Early Romanesque Architecture in North-East England: a style and its patrons'. *In:* D Rollason et al (eds). *Anglo-Norman Durham*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.

Cambridge Camden Society. (1842) *A Few Words to Church Builders*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cambridge Camden Society. (1842) *A Few Words to Churchwardens on Churches and Church Ornamentation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CATFORD, N. (2010) *Disused Stations: Hovingham Spa*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.disused-stations.org.uk/h/hovingham_spa/index.shtml [Accessed 03/09/12].

CHARLTON, L. (1779) *The History of Whitby and Whitby Abbey: collected from the original records of the Abbey, and other authentic memoirs ...* York: A. Ward.

CHATFIELD, M. (1979) *Churches the Victorians Forgot.* Ashbourne: Moorland.

Cheltenham Chronicle. (1871) *No Title,* 21/11/1871, p. 3.

CHITTY, G. (1997) 'Ruskin and the Historic Environment'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Lancaster.

Church Care. (2012) *Closed and Closing.* [Online]. Available: http://www.churchcare.co.uk/churches/closed-and-closing [Accessed 14/05/2014].

Clergy of the Church of England Database (n.d.) *Ordination Record for John Piggot Munby (CCEd Record ID: 107332).* [Online]. Available at: http://ccedb.cch.kcl.ac.uk/jsp/DisplayOrdination.jsp?CDBOrdRedID=107332 [Accessed 24/03/2014].

CLARK, K. (1962) *The Gothic Revival: an essay in the history of taste,* 3rd ed. London: Constable & Co.

CLARK, K. (1964) *The Gothic Revival: an essay in the history of taste.* London: Penguin.

CLARKE, B F L. (1963) *The building of the eighteenth-century church.* London: S.P.C.K.

CLARKE, B F L. (1969) *Church Builders of the Nineteenth Century.* Trowbridge: David & Charles Ltd.

CLAY, C T. (1939) *Early Yorkshire Charters Vol.VI - Paynel Fee.* Huddersfield: Yorkshire Archaeological Society.

CLIFTON TAYLOR, A. (1974) *English Parish Churches as Works of Art.* London: B.T. Batsford.

COLE, D. (1980) *The works of Sir Gilbert Scott.* London: Architectural Press.

COLVIN, H. (1978) *A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects, 1600–1840.* Revised Edition. London: J Murray.

COLVIN, S. (1877) 'Restoration and Anti-Restoration'. *The Nineteenth-Century* (October), pp. 446-470.

COOPER, T and S BROWN (eds). (2011) *Pews, benches and chairs: church seating in English parish churches from the fourteenth century to the present.* London: The Ecclesiological Society.

COOKE, L. (2013) *Vale of Pickering Statement of Significance: English Heritage Report*. [Online]. Available at: http://m.northyorks.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=22213&p=0 [Accessed: 01/03/2014].

CORDER, P and J L KIRK. (1928) 'Roman Malton: A Yorkshire Fortress and its Neighbourhood'. *Antiquity II:5 (March 1928)*, pp. 69-82.

COKE, C A. (1864) *Population Gazetteer of England and Wales (1861 Census)*. London: Harrison.

COLLINGWOOD, W G. (1907) *Anglian and Anglo-Danish Sculpture in the North Riding of Yorkshire*. Leeds: J. Whitehead & Son.

COX, C. (1900) 'The Old and New Churches of St. Michael, Barton-le-Street'. *The Reliquary & Illustrated Archaeologist 6*, pp. 213-219. London: Bemrose and Sons.

COX, J C and A HARVEY. (1973) *English Church Furniture.* Wakefield: EP Publishing.

CRAMP, R (ed). (1984-2008) *Corpus of Romanesque Sculpture in Britain and Ireland*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.crsbi.ac.uk/index.html [Accessed 15/10/213].

CRISP, F A (ed). (1913) *Visitation of England and Wales, Vol. 17*. London: Privately Printed.

CROOK, J M (ed). (1978) *The History of the Gothic Revival*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

CROOK, J M. (1981) *William Burges and the High Victorian Dream*. London: J Murray.

CROOK, J M. (1995) *John Carter and the Mind of the Gothic Revival*. London: Society of Antiquaries.

CROSSLEY, D W. (1990) *Post-Medieval Archaeology in Britain*. London: Leicester University Press.

CROSSLEY, P. (2000) "Introduction: Frankl's Text: Its Achievement and Significance." *In:* P Frankl and P Crossley. *Gothic Architecture*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, pp. 23-24.

DALE, A. (1956) *James Wyatt*. Oxford: Blackwell.

DALTON, P. (1994) *Conquest, Anarchy and Lordship: Yorkshire 1066-1154.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DANIELS, R and G BRANDWOOD (eds). (2003) *Ruskin & Architecture*. Reading: Spire Books in association with the Victorian Society.

DAVIES, H. (1961) *Worship and Theology in England: From Watts and Wesley to Maurice, 1690–1850.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

DEAGAN, K. (1988) 'Neither History nor Prehistory: The Questions that Count in Historical Archaeology'. *Historical Archaeology* **22:1**, pp. 7-12.

DELLHEIM, C. (1982) *The Face of the Past: The preservation of the medieval inheritance in Victorian England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Dictionary of Scottish Architects (DSA). (n.d. (a)) *Henry Perkins* [Online]. Available at: http://www.scottisharchitects.org.uk/architect_full.php?id=206052 [Accessed: 15/09/2014].

The Dictionary of Scottish Architects (DSA). (n.d. (b)) *George Fowler Jones*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.scottisharchitects.org.uk/architect_full.php?id=200144 [Accessed: 04/04/2012].

The Dictionary of Scottish Architects (DSA). (2008) *Robert James Johnson*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.scottisharchitects.org.uk/architect_full.php?id=203339 [Accessed: 04/04/2012].

DODSWORTH, R. (1904) *Yorkshire church notes 1619-1631*. Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society with J. Whitehead.

DOGGETT, N. (2002) *Patterns of re-use: the transformation of former monastic buildings in post-dissolution Hertfordshire, 1540-1600*. British Archaeological Reports: British series **331**. Oxford: Archaeopress.

EARL, J. (2003) *Building Conservation Philosophy* 3rd Ed. Shaftsbury: Donhead.

EASTMEAD, W. (1824) *Historia Rievallensis containing the history of Kirkby Moorside, and an account of the most important places in its vicinity...* London: Baldwin.

EASTLAKE, C L. (1870) *A history of the Gothic Revival*, 2nd ed. with an introduction by J. Mordaunt Crook (1978). Leicester : Leicester University Press

EMERICK, K. (2003) 'From frozen monuments to fluid landscapes: the conservation and presentation of ancient monuments from 1882 to the present'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of York.

EMERICK, K. (2014) *Conserving and Managing Historic Monuments: Heritage, Democracy, and Inclusion*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.

English Heritage. (n.d.(a)) *National Heritage Protection Plan: Understanding the character and significance of Places of Worship: NHPP Activity 4D1*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/protection/national-heritage-protection-plan/activities/4d1 [Accessed: 16/11/2014].

English Heritage. (n.d.(b)) National Monument Record 'Complete Monument Report #59895 (St Helen's Church, Amotherby). NMR Number: SE 77 SE 60. Unpublished.

English Heritage. (2005) *The Presentation of Historic Building Survey in CAD*. Swindon: English Heritage.

English Heritage. (2006) *Understanding Historic Buildings: A Guide to good practice recording.* Swindon: English Heritage.

English Heritage. (2007a) *PastScape: Monument No. 59938 (Slingsby).* [Online]. Available at: http://www.pastscape.org.uk/hob.aspx?hob_id=59938&sort=4&search=all&criteria=slingsby&rational=q&recordsperpage=10 [Accessed 05/06/2011].

English Heritage. (2007b) *PastScape: Wades Causeway.* [Online]. Available at: http://www.pastscape.org.uk/hob.aspx?hob_id=1012169 [Accessed 15/06/2013].

English Heritage. (2007c) *PastScape: Monument No. 59783 (Amotherby)* [Online]. Available at: http://www.pastscape.org.uk/hob.aspx?hob_id=59783&sort=4&search=all&criteria=amotherby&rational=q&recordsperpage=10 [Accessed 15/06/2013].

English Heritage. (2008) *Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the sustainable management of the Historic Environment*. London: English Heritage.

English Heritage. (2009) *Measured and Drawn: techniques and practice for the metric survey of historic buildings (second edition)*. London: English Heritage.

English Heritage. (2011) *Designation Listing Selection Guide: Places of Worship*. London: English Heritage.

English Heritage. (2013) *Multi-Light Imaging for Heritage Applications.* London: English Heritage.

English Heritage. (2014) *New Highlights from the National Heritage List for England: Designation Yearbook 2013-14.* London: English Heritage.

English Place Name Society. (1928) *The Place Names of the North Riding of Yorkshire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Essex Standard. (1840) *Great Protestant Meeting in York*, 01/05/1840, p. 2.

FAUGHT, C B. (2003) *The Oxford Movement: A Thematic History of the Tractarians and Their Times.* Penn State University Press.

FAULKNER, T. E. (1995) 'Robert James Johnson, Architect and Antiquary'. *Durham University Journal **87:1***, pp. 3-11.

FAWCETT, J. (1976a) *Seven Victorian Architects.* London: Thames and Hudson.

FAWCETT, J. (ed.) (1976b) *The Future of the Past: Attitudes to Conservation 1174-1974.* London: Thames and Hudson.

FELSTEAD, A et al. (1993) *Directory of British Architects 1834 − 1914.* London: Mansell for the Royal Institute of British Architects.

FERNIE, E. (1988) 'Contrasts in methodology and interpretation of medieval ecclesiastical architecture'. *Archaeological Journal **145***. pp. 344-364.

FERRIDAY, P. (1964) 'The Church Restorers'. *Architectural Review **CXXXVI*** (1964), pp. 87- 95.

FERRIS, I M. (1989) 'The Archaeological Investigation of Standing Buildings'. *Vernacular Architecture **20:1***, pp. 12-17.

FERRIS, I M. (1991) 'I am not a camera'. *Vernacular Architecture **22:1***, p. 1.

FERRY, K (ed). (2009a) *Powerhouses of Provincial Architecture 1837 − 1914.* London: The Victorian Society.

FERRY, E. (2009b) 'Medievalism, modernity and memory: St Michael's church Cropthorne 1860-1920'. Unpublished paper: Kingston University Modern Interiors Research Centre.

FLEMING, R. (1991) *Kings and Lords in Conquest England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

FLETCHER, J S. (1900) *Picturesque History of Yorkshire Vol. V*. London: The Caxton Publishing Company.

FOX, G.T. (1872). *Memorial Volume of the Late Rev. Charles Hodgson*. London: James Nisbet & Co.

FRANK, G. (1888) *Ryedale and North Yorkshire Antiquities*. York: Sampson Brothers.

FREW, J M. (1979) 'Richard Gough, James Wyatt, and Late 18th-Century Preservation'. *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, **38:4** *(Dec.)*, pp.366-274.

GAIMSTER, D and R GILCHRIST. (2003) *The Archaeology of Reformation 1480 − 1580*. Leeds: Manley with the Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology.

GENT, D. (2010) 'Aristocratic Whig politics in early-Victorian Yorkshire: Lord Morpeth and his world'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of York.

Genuki. (2011) *The Ancient Parish of Slingsby*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.genuki.org.uk/big/eng/YKS/NRY/Slingsby/index.html [Accessed 05/06/2011].

Genuki. (2011) *Appleton-le-Street Parish: Incumbents Transcription*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.genuki.org.uk/big/eng/YKS/Misc/PhotoTs/NRY/AppletonLeStreet_Incumbents.html [Accessed 08/02/2014].

Genuki. (2012) *Hovingham: Geographical and Historical information from the year 1890*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.genuki.org.uk/big/eng/YKS/NRY/Hovingham/Hovingham90.html [Accessed 25/07/2012].

GERMANN, G. (1973) *Gothic Revival in Europe and Britain: Sources, Influences and Ideas*. Cambridge Mass: MIT Press.

GERRARD, C. (2003) Medieval Archaeology: understanding traditions and contemporary approaches. London: Routledge.

GILCHRIST, R and R MORRIS. (1996) 'Continuity, reaction and revival: church archaeology in England, c. 1600-1880'. In *Church Archaeology: Research directions for the future*.

York: Council for British Archaeology, pp. 112-126.

GILES, K AND A HOLTON. (forthcoming) 'Archaeological Recording and the Chapter House Vestibule of York Minster'.

GILL, T. (1852) *Villa Eboracensis: comprising the History and Antiquities of Easingwold and its Neighbourhood.* London: Simpkins, Marshall etc.

GINTER, D E. (1992) *A Measure of Wealth: the English Land Tax In Historical Analysis*. London: Hambedon Press.

GLENDINNING, M. (2013) *The Conservation Movement: A History of Architectural Preservation from Antiquity to Modernity*. Abingdon: Routledge.

GLYNNE, S. (1909) 'Notes on Yorkshire Churches'. Reproduced in the *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal **XX***, pp. 264-5.

GRAVES, C P. (1989) "Social space in the English medieval parish church". *Economy and Society **18:3***, pp. 297-322.

GRAVES, C P. (1997) 'Social space in the English medieval parish church'. *In:* C Bryant and D Jary. *Anthony Giddens: critical assessments volume 4*. London: Routledge. pp. 262-288.

GRAVES, C P. (2000) *The Form and Fabric of Belief an archaeology of the lay experience of religion in medieval Norfolk and Devon*. British Archaeological Reports, British Series No. 311: Oxford: Archaeopress.

Halhead Genealogy and Family Trees. (n.d.) *Rev. Charles Pierrepont Cleaver (later Peach)*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.halhed.com/t4r/getperson.php?personID=I8163&tree=tree1 [Accessed 01/07/2013].

HALL, M. (2000) 'What do Victorian churches mean? Symbolism and Sacramentalism in Anglican Church Architecture, 1850-1870'. *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians **59:1*** (Mar 2000), pp. 78-95.

HALL, M. (2004) 'Emily Meynell Ingram and Holy Angels, Hoar Cross, Staffordshire: A Study in Patronage'. *Architectural History **47***, pp. 283-328.

HALL, M. (2014) *George Frederick Bodley and the Later Gothic Revival in Britain and America.* London: Yale University Press.

HAMILTON-DALRYMPLE, W B. (1984) 'A Look at Ryedale Settlement Patterns'. *The Ryedale Historian* **12**, pp.31-43.

HARDY, T. (1906) *Memories of Church Restoration*. Reproduced in: C.J.P. Beatty. (1995) *Thomas Hardy: Conservation Architect*. Dorchester: Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society, pp. 72-84.

HARRISON, S A. (2004) 'Elgin Cathedral: the western rose window reconstructed'. *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* **156**, pp. 138-149.

Harrogate District Council. (2008) *Kirk Deighton Conservation Area Character Appraisal*. [Online]. Available at:

https://www.harrogate.gov.uk/plan/Documents/Heritage%20and%20Design/Conservation%20Areas/DS-P-CAA_KirkDeighton_151008.pdf [Accessed 15/03/2014].

HAWKES, A J. (1989) 'The Non-Crucifixion Iconography of the Pre-Viking Sculpture in the North of England: Carvings at Hovingham, Masham, Rothbury, Sandbach and Wirksworth'. Unpublished PhD thesis, Newcastle University.

HEATH, S. (1911) *Our Homeland Churches and How to Study Them*. London: The Homeland Association.

HEATH-CALDWELL, J J. (n.d.) *Mary Littledale Greenwood*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.jjhc.info/helshamjonesmarylittledale1913.htm [Accessed 15/10/13].

HICKS, D. (2004) 'From 'questions that count' to stories that 'matter' in Historical Archaeology'. *Antiquity* **78:302**, pp. 934-939.

HICKS, D and M BEAUDRY (eds). (2006) 'Introduction: The place of historical archaeology'. *In:* D Hicks and M Beaudry (eds). *The Cambridge Companion to Historical Archaeology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-12.

HICKS, D and A HORNING. (2006) 'Historical Archaeology and buildings'. *In:* D Hicks and M Beaudry (eds). *The Cambridge Companion to Historical Archaeology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 273-292.

HILL, R, et al (eds). (2010) *Victorians Revalued: What the twentieth-century thought of nineteenth-century architecture.* Studies in Victorian art and design, Vol.2. London: The Victorian Society.

HILL, R. (2007) *God's Architect: Pugin and the building of romantic Britain.* London: Allen Lane.

HODGES, H H. (1909) 'On some medieval grave covers of exceptional or unique character in the County of York'. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* **20**, pp. 220-4.

HODGSON, C (ed). (1854) *Family Prayers for One Month.* London: Thomas Hatchard.

HODGSON, R I. (1969) 'Medieval Colonisation in Northern Ryedale, Yorkshire'. *The Geographical Journal* **135:1** (Mar), pp. 44-54.

HOWAT, P. (2004) *The Railways of Ryedale.* 2nd Ed. Farsley: Martin Bairstow.

HOWELL, P and I SUTTON. (1989) *The Faber Guide to Victorian Churches*. London: Faber & Faber in conjunction with the Victorian Society.

HYLAND, G J. (2010) *Appendix I: One time partners and collaborator of EW Pugin.* [Online]. Available at: http://www.thepuginsociety.co.uk/i-partners.html [Accessed: 15/03/2014].

IDDON, C. (n.d.) *Lincoln College, University of Oxford. Famous Alumni: John Wesley 1703-1791.* [Online]. Available at: http://www.linc.ox.ac.uk/Famous-AlumniJohn-Wesley-1703---1791 [Accessed 28/03/2014].

Jackson's Oxford Journal. (1855) *University and Clerical Intelligence,* 29/12/1855, p. 5.

JOHNSON, R.J. (1864) *Specimens of Early French Architecture: Selected Chiefly from the Churches of the Ile de France, and Illustrated in Geometrical Drawings and Perspective Views*. Newcastle: Privately Printed.

JOKILEHTO, J. (1999) *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Oxford: Butterworth Heinemann.

KEETON, B. (1973) *An Ecclesiastical History of the Parish of All Saints, Appleton-le-Street with St. Helen, Amotherby*. Reproduced from typescript.

KETCHLEY, H E. (1907) 'Ancient Sculptures at Barton Le Street, Yorks'. *Yorkshire Architectural and York Archaeological Society Journal* **13** *(1901-1911),* pp. 1-13.

KING, C. (1970) 'Notes on Ryedale Churches, No.5 Hovingham'. *Ryedale Historian* **5**, *pp. 64-69.*

KING, C and D SAYER (ed). (2011) *The Archaeology of Post-Medieval Religion*. Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology Monograph 6. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.

KIRKBY, J. (1867) *The Survey of the County of York taken by John de Kirkby, as published by the Surtees Society*. [Online]. Available at:
http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=vuNaAAAAIAAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false [Accessed 19/04/12].

LAKE, J et al. (2001). *Diversity and Vitality: The Methodist and Nonconformist Chapels of Cornwall.* Cornwall Archaeological Trust.

LANG, J. (1991) *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon stone sculpture: York & East Riding.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LAWTON, G. (1842) *Collectio rerum ecclesiasticarum de dioecesi Eboracensi: or, collections relative to churches and chapels within the diocese of York*. York: Bellerby

Leeds Mercury. (1838) *Slingsby*, 27/10/1838, p.4.

Leeds Mercury. (1858) 'The Leeds New Workhouse: Laying of the Foundation Stone'. *Supplement to the Leeds Mercury* 10/04/1858, Vol.95, No.6779.

Leeds Mercury. (1867) The *Carlisle Memorial: Laying of the Foundation Stone,* 14/08/1867, p. 3.

Leeds Mercury. (1867) *New Church at Slingsby*, 25/09/1867, p.3.

Leeds Mercury. (1869) *Church Restoration in Yorkshire*, 03/06/1869, p.4.

Leeds Mercury. (1871) *Restoration and Reopening of Amotherby Church*, 16/11/1871, 5.

LENNARD, R. (1959) *Rural England, 1086-1135: a study of social and agrarian conditions*. London: Oxford University Press.

LEWIS, S. (1835) *A Topographical Dictionary of England.* Vol. II. London: S Lewis & Co.

LEWIS, S. (1848) *A Topographical Dictionary of England.* Vol. II. London: S Lewis & Co.

LEWIS, M J. (2002) *The Gothic Revival*. London: Thames & Hudson

The London Gazette. (1874) *Whitehall, January 1 1874*, 02/01/1874, p.1.

LONGBOTTOM, A. (n.d.) *Yorkshire Indexes: Bramham cum Oglethorpe All Saints*. [Online]. Available at:
http://www.yorkshireindexers.info/wiki/index.php?title=Bramham_cum_Oglethorpe_All_Saints [Accessed: 15/09/2014].

MACAULAY, J. (1975) *The Gothic Revival 1745-1845*. Glasgow: Blackie.

MACHIN, I. (2008) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: Howard, George William Frederick, seventh earl of Carlisle (1802–1864)*. [Online]. Oxford University Press (2004; online edn, Jan 2008). Available at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13902 [Accessed 10/04/2012].

The Malton Gazette. (1867) *Laying the Foundation Stone of a New Church at Slingsby*, 28/09/1867, p.4.

The Malton Gazette. (1871) *Opening of a New Church Organ in Slingsby Church*, 15/04/1871, p.4.

The Malton Gazette. (1871) *Opening of Barton-le-Street Church*, 24/06/1871, p.4.

The Malton Messenger. (1867) *Slingsby Feast*, 18/05/1867, p.3.

The Malton Messenger. (1867) *Funeral of a Volunteer*, 14/09/1867, p.3.

The Malton Messenger. (1867) *Demolition of an Ancient Church*, 21/09/1867, p.3.

The Malton Messenger. (1867) *New Church at Slingsby: Laying the Foundation Stone*, 28/09/1867, p.3.

The Malton Messenger. (1869) *Re-Opening of All Saint's Church, at Slingsby*, 05/06/1869, p.3.

The Malton Messenger. (1871) *Restoration and Re-Opening of Amotherby Church*, 18/11/1871, p.3.

MARI, P. (2010) 'Architecture at the Service of Ideology: William Morris, the Anglican Church and the Destruction, Restoration and Protection of Medieval Architecture in Victorian England'. Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Montreal.

MASINTON, A W. (2006) 'Sacred space: Priorities, perception and the presence of God in late medieval Yorkshire parish churches'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of York.

MCCLAIN, A. (2005) 'Patronage, Power, and Identity: the Social Use of Local Churches and Commemorative Monuments in Tenth to Twelfth-Century North Yorkshire'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of York.

MCCLAIN, A. (2007) 'Medieval cross slabs in the North Riding of Yorkshire: chronology, distribution and social implications'. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* **79**. pp. 155-193.

MCCLAIN, A. (2011) 'Parish churches in Late Medieval England'. *In:* M Carver and J Klápste (eds). *Archaeology of Medieval Europe Volume 2: twelfth to sixteenth centuries.* Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, pp. 468-478.

MCWILLIAMS, P E. (forthcoming) *The English Use: Liturgy and the Arts in the Church of England 1895-1965.* Unpublished PhD thesis, University of York.

MEHEW, E. (2006) 'Colvin, Sir Sidney (1845–1927)'. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. [online]. Available at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32518 [Accessed 12/09/14].

MIELE, C E. (1992) *The Gothic Revival and Gothic Architecture: The Restoration of Medieval Churches in Victorian Churches.* Unpublished PhD thesis, New York University.

MILNER, J. (1798) *A Dissertation on the Modern Style of Altering Ancient Cathedrals, as exemplified by Salisbury Cathedral.* London: J. Nichols.

MILNER, N et al. (2013) *Star Carr: life in Britain after the Ice Age.* York: Council for British Archaeology.

MORRIS, W. (1877) *Manifesto of the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings.* [online]. Available at: http://www.spab.org.uk/what-is-spab-/the-manifesto/ [Accessed: 02/03/2014].

MORRIS, P. (1904) *The North Riding of Yorkshire.* London: Methuen & Sons.

MORRIS, R. (1989) *Churches in the Landscape.* London: Dent & Sons.

MORRISS, R K. (2000) *The Archaeology of Buildings.* Stroud: Tempus Publishing Ltd.

MOWL, T. (2000) *Stylistic cold wars: Betjeman versus Pevsner.* London: Murray.

MURRAY, J. (1867) *Handbook for travellers in Yorkshire.* London: John Murray.

MURRAY, J. (1874) *Handbook for travellers in Yorkshire (2nd ed).* London: John Murray.

Musical Opinion and Music Trade Review. (1889) *No Title*, 01/11/1889, p.76.

MUTHESIUS, S. (1972) *The High Victorian Movement in Architecture 1850-1870.* London: Routledge.

NANCARROW, J H. (2014) *Ruins to re-use: Romano-British remains in post-Conquest literary and material culture.* Unpublished PhD thesis, University of York.

NEWMAN, R et al. (2001) *The Historical Archaeology of Britain: c.1540-1900.* Stroud: Sutton.

The North Wales Chronicle. (1860) *No Title*, 27/10/1860, p.11.

NUSSBAUM, N. (2011) 'Planning and Building without Writing: Questions of communication in Gothic masons' lodges'. *In*: Z Opačić and A Timmerman (eds). *Architecture, Liturgy and Identity: liber amicorum Paul Crossley*. Turnhout: Brepols.

PACEY, A. (2007) *Medieval Architectural Drawing.* Stroud: Tempus Publishing.

PACITTO, T and L WATTS. (2007) 'Excavations at the church of All Saints, Hovingham, Yorkshire'. *Church Archaeology **2***, pp.51-60.

PAGE, W (ed). (1914) *Victoria County History: Yorkshire North Riding Vol.1.* London: Constable and Company Limited.

PARK, D and R GRIFFITH-JONES (eds). (2010) *The Temple Church in London: History, Art and Architecture.* Woodbridge: Boydell.

PARKER, J H. (1849) *Introduction to Study of Gothic Architecture*. Oxford and London: John Henry Parker.

PARKINSON, A J. (1996) 'Reformation, restoration and revival: churches and chapels in Wales 1600-1900' *In:* J Blair and C Pyrah (eds). *Church Archaeology: Research Directions for the Future.* York: Council for British Archaeology, pp. 144-158.

PEARCE, S M (ed). (2007) *Visions of Antiquity: the Society of Antiquaries of London 1707-2007*. London: Society of Antiquaries of London.

PETIT, J L. (1841) *Remarks on Church Architecture.* London, John Petheram.

PEVSNER, N. (1966) *The Buildings of England: Yorkshire – The North Riding.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

PEVSNER, N. (1972) *The Buildings of England: Yorkshire – York and the East Riding.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

PICKLES, J D. (2004) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: Hardwick, Charles (1821–1859).* [Online]. Oxford University Press. Available at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12276 [Accessed 09/06/2014].

PICKLES, T. (2009) 'Locating *Ingetlingum* and *Suthgedling*: Gilling West and Gilling East'. *Northern History* **XLVI:2**, pp.313-25.

PICKLES, T. (2010) 'The Anglo-Saxon Church: The Church and property' and 'The Anglo-Saxon Church: Minster parishes and the development of local churches', in D Dyas (ed.) *The Story of the Church in England: Interactive CD-ROM.* York: University of York.

PICKLES, T. (2012) *Power, Religious Patronage and Pastoral Care: Religious Communities, Mother Parishes and Local Churches in Ryedale, c. 650-c. 1250*, The Kirkdale Lecture, 2009. York: Friends of Kirkdale.

PORT, H M. (2006) *600 New Churches: the Church Building Commission 1818-1856,* 2nd ed. Reading: Spire Books.

PUGIN, A W N. (1836) *Contrasts, or, A parallel between the noble edifices….* London: Privately Printed.

PUGIN, A W N. (1841) *The True Principles of Christian or Pointed Architecture.* London: Weale.

RAHTZ, P. (1998) 'Kirkdale 1998 Interim Report'. Unpublished report.

RAHTZ, P and L WATTS. (1997) *St. Mary's Church, Deerhurst, Gloucestershire: fieldwork, excavations, and structural analysis, 1971-1984.* York: Boydell Press.

RAHTZ, P et al. (2000) 'Appleton-le-Street: All Saints Church'. *Ryedale Historian* **20**, pp.24-31.

REED, M. (1997) *The Landscape of Britain: From the beginnings to 1914.* London: Routledge.

REEVE, M M. (2007) 'Jacob Schnebbelie, Draughtsman to the Society of Antiquaries (1760-92), and the Politics of Preservation in Late Eighteenth Century England'. *Transactions of the Ancient Monuments Society* **51**, pp.69-86.

RICKMAN, T. (1817) *An Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of English Architecture from the Conquest to the Reformation.* London: John Henry Parker.

RIDGWAY, C. (2004) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography: Howard, George James, ninth earl of Carlisle (1843–1911*. [Online]. Oxford University Press. Available at: http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34019 [Accessed 10/04/2012].

ROBERTS, P. (1990) *The Parish Church of All Saints, Slingsby: A visitor's guide to the Church, Castle & Village*. Unknown.

RODWELL, W. (1996) 'Church archaeology in retrospect and prospect'. *In:* J Blair and C Pyrah (eds). *Church Archaeology: Research Directions for the Future.* York: Council for British Archaeology, pp. 197-202

RODWELL, W. (1997) 'Landmarks in church archaeology: a review of the last thirty years'. *Church Archaeology* **1**, pp. 5-16.

RODWELL, W. (2012) *The Archaeology of Churches*. Stroud: Ambersley.

RODWELL, W and K RODWELL. (1982) 'St. Peter's Church, Barton-upon-Humber: Excavation and Structural Study, 1978–81'. *The Antiquaries Journal* **62:02**, pp. 283-315.

RODWELL, W and K RODWELL. (1985) *Rivenhall: investigations of a villa, church, and village, 1950-1977* (CBA Research Report No: 55). London: Chelmsford Archaeological Trust and the Council for British Archaeology.

ROFFEY, S. (2007) *The medieval chantry chapel: an archaeology.* Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.

Royal Commission on Historic Monuments (England) [RCHME]. (1986-2004) *An Inventory of Nonconformist Chapels and Meeting-Houses* (4 volumes). Swindon: English Heritage/RCHME.

Royal Commission on Historic Monuments (England) [RCHME]. (1987) *Churches of south-east Wiltshire*. London: H.M.S.O.

ROYLE, E. (2009) 'The Parish Community Through the Vicarage Window: Nineteenth-Century Clergy Visitation Records'. *Family & Community History* **12:1** *May*, pp. 6-21.

RUSKIN, J. (1849) *The Seven Lamps of Memory,* National Trust reprinted edition 1988. London: Century Hutchinson Ltd.

RUSKIN, J. (1851-3) *The Stones of Venice (3 volumes)*. London: Smith.

RYDER, P F and P GWILLIAM. (1993) *Medieval Churches of West Yorkshire.* Wakefield: West Yorkshire Archaeology Service.

Ryedale District Council. (2008) *Amotherby Parish Plan - 2008*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.ryedaleplan.org.uk/attachments/article/236/Amotherby_Parish_Plan_Final. pdf [Accessed: 15/08/2013].

Ryedale Vernacular Building Materials Research Group. (2007) *Hildenley Quarries and Slingsby Castle. Report 2/03*. [online]. [Accessed: 26/03/2012]. Available at: http://sites.google.com/site/ryedalebuildings/reports

SAINT, A. (1989) *The Image of the Architect*. London: Yale University Press.

SCHOFIELD, J and W G Johnson. (2006) 'Managing the recent and contemporary past'. *In:* D Hicks & M Beaudry (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Historical Archaeology*, pp. 104-22.

SCOTLAND, N. (1997) 'Evangelicals, Anglicans and Ritualism in Victorian England'. *Churchman* **111:3**, pp. 249-265.

SCOTT, G G. (1850) *A plea for the faithful restoration of our ancient churches*. London: Parker.

SKAIFE, R. (1896) *Domesday Book for Yorkshire*. London: Bradbury, Agnew & Co.

The Slingsby Village Website. (2012) *History of the Parish*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.slingsbyvillage.co.uk/history-of-the-parish/ [Accessed 05/06/2011].

SMART, C M and E DENHAM. (1989) *Muscular Churches: Ecclesiastical Architecture of the High Victorian Period.* Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press.

SMITH, D. (2009) 'St Michael and All Angels, Barton-le-Street: An intensive archaeological investigation'. Unpublished MA dissertation, University of York.

SMITH, D. (2012) 'St Michael and All Angels, Barton-le-Street: An important scheme of Romanesque sculpture'. *Church Archaeology* **14** (2010), pp. 27-42.

Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. (1877) *The Manifesto.* [Online]. Available at: http://www.spab.org.uk/what-is-spab-/the-manifesto/ [Accessed: 10/03/2012].

SPENCE, B. (1962) *Phoenix at Coventry: the building of a cathedral*. London: Bles.

STEPHENSON, M. (1909) 'Monumental Brasses in Yorkshire: some additions and corrections'. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* **XX**, pp. 291-317.

The Street Parishes. (n.d.) *St Helen's Amotherby.* [Online]. Available at: http://www.thestreetparishes.org.uk/amotherby.html [Accessed 12/04/2012].

STOCKER, D. (1990) 'The Archaeology of Reformation in Lincoln'. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* **25**, pp. 18-32.

STOCKER, D. (1992) 'Broken toes or interdisciplinary ballet: architectural history, archaeology and the recording of buildings'. *Field Archaeologist* **16**, pp. 302-303.

STOCKER, D. (2013) 'The Works Chantry Screen in the Great South Transept of Lincoln Cathedral'. *Church Archaeology* **15** (2011), pp. 35-46.

STOCKER, D and P EVERSON. (1990) 'Rubbish Recycled: A Study of the Re-Use of Stone in Lincolnshire'. In Parson's (ed.) *Stone Quarrying and Building in England AD43-1525.* Chichester, Sussex: Phillimore in association with the Royal Archaeological Institute, pp. 83-101.

STOCKER, D and P EVERSON. (2006) *Summoning St Michael: Early Romanesque Towers in Lincolnshire.* Oxford: Oxbow Books.

SWEET, R. (2004) *Antiquaries: the Discovery of the Past in Eighteenth-Century Britain.* London: Hambledon and London.

SYMONDSON, A and S A BUCKNALL. (2006) *Sir Ninian Comper: An Introduction to His Life and Works, with Complete Gazetteer.* Reading: Spire Books.

TAYLOR, E. E. (1924) *The Ryedale guide with intr. by T. Edmund Harvey: Helmsley and Rievaulx, Pickering, Kirbymoorside and Lastingham, Coxwold, Malton and Castle Howard, etc.* 4th Ed. York: Yorkshire Gazette.

TAYLOR, H M and J TAYLOR. (1965) *Anglo-Saxon Architecture Vol. I.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

THOMPSON, A H. (1909) 'The Village Churches of Yorkshire'. *In:* TM Fallow (ed). *Memorials of Old Yorkshire.* London: George Allen & Sons, pp. 106-164.

THOMPSON, A H. (1913) *The Historical Growth of the English Parish Church.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

THOMPSON, P R. (1971) *William Butterfield*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

THURLEY, S. (2013) *The Men from The Ministry: How Britain Saved its Heritage*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

The Times. (1886) *Deaths*, 22/09/1886, p.1.

TSCHUDI-MADSEN, S. (1976) *Restoration and Anti-Restoration: A study in English restoration philosophy*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

TURNER, J H. (1905) 'Amotherby, St Helen's'. *In: Yorkshire Notes and Queries Vol.1.* Bingley: T Harrison.

TURNOR, R. (1950) *James Wyatt 1746-1813*. London: Art & Technics.

TWOMEY, C. (forthcoming) *Living Water, Living Stone: The History and Material Culture of Baptism in Early Medieval Britain*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Department of History, Boston College.

VAUGHAN, P H. (2006) *All Saints' Church Hovingham*. Church Guidebook revised 5th edition.

VENN, J. (1944) *Alumni Cantabrigienses: a biographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge, from the earliest times to 1900 Part II Vol. II.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

VENN, J. (1947) *Alumni Cantabrigienses: a biographical list of all known students, graduates and holders of office at the University of Cambridge, from the earliest times to 1900 Part II, Vol. III.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WALKER, W M. (1845) *Some Account of the Parish of Slingsby, in Yorkshire*. York: WM. and John Hargrove, Herald Office.

WHELLAN, T. (1859) *History and Topography of The City of York; and The North Riding of Yorkshire* Vol. II. Beverley: John Green.

WHITE, J F. (1962) *The Cambridge Movement: The Ecclesiologists and the Gothic Revival*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WHITING, R. (2010) *The Reformation of the English Parish Church*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WHYTE, W. (2006) *Oxford Jackson: architecture, education, status and style.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

WHYTE, W. (2010) 'Restoration and Recrimination: The Temple Church in the Nineteenth Century'. In R GRIFFITH-JONES and D PARK (eds.) *The Temple Church in London: History, Architecture, Art.* Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer.

WILLIAMS, A and D M PALLISER. (1992) *The Yorkshire Domesday*. London, Alecto Historical Editions.

WILLIS BUND, J W. (1910) 'The Restored Churches of Worcestershire'. *Associated Architectural Societies Reports and Papers*, No.30, pp. 185-216.

WOOD, I. (2008) 'Monasteries and the geography of power in the Age of Bede'. *Northern Historian* **45:1** March 2008, pp. 11-26.

WOOD, R. (1994) 'The Romanesque doorways of Yorkshire, with special reference to that at St Mary's church, Riccall'. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* **66**, pp. 59-90.

WOOD, R. (2012) *Romanesque Yorkshire*. Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society.

WORSLEY, G. (1993) *The origins of the Gothic Revival: a reappraisal*. London: Royal Historical Society.

WORSLEY, G. (2006) 'The seduction of Elizabeth Lister and its implications for the Worsley Family'. *Women's History Review* **13:3**, pp. 289-302.

WRAGG ELGEE, F and H WRAGG ELGEE. (1933) *The Archaeology of Yorkshire.* London: Methuen & Co.

WRATHMELL, S. (1990) 'Why the archaeologist cannot be a camera'. *Scottish Architectural Review* **7**, pp. 37-40.

YATES, N. (1991) *Buildings, Faith and Worship: The Liturgical Arrangement of Anglican Churches 1600-1900.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

York Herald. (1847) *Church Missionary Society*, 14/08/1847, p. 5.

York Herald. (1855) *Yorkshire Architectural Society*, 23/06/1855, p. 6.

York Herald. (1857) *The Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*, 31/10/1857, p. 5.

York Herald. (1859) *Opening of a New Church at Butterwick-in-Ryedale*, 22/01/1859, p. 7.

York Herald. (1860) *Consecration and Opening of Two New Churches*, 25/08/1860, p. 5.

York Herald. (1867) *New Church at Slingsby – Laying the Foundation Stone*, 28/09/1867, p. 9.

York Herald. (1869) *Church Building and Church Restoration*, 02/08/1869, p. 10.

York Herald. (1870) *New Church at Barton-le-Street*, 16/04/1870, p. 10.

York Herald. (1870) *Durham and Northumberland Architectural and Archaeological Society Tour*, 24/09/1870, p. 7.

York Herald. (1871) *The Late Mr. Meynell Ingram, M.P.*, 03/06/1871, p. 11.

York Herald. (1871) *Church Restoration at Barton-le-Street*, 24/06/1871, p. 9.

York Herald. (1871) *Restoration and Reopening of Amotherby Church*, 18/11/1871, p. 7.

York Herald. (1872) *Yorkshire Architectural Society Tour*, 06/01/1872, p. 9.

Yorkshire.com. (n.d.) *St Helen's Church Amotherby.* [Online]. Available at: http://www.yorkshire.com/21447 [Accessed: 09/02/2014].

Yorkshire Gazette. (1853) *Thirsk and Malton and Malton and Driffield Railways. Celebration of the Opening*, 21/05/1853, p. 7.

Yorkshire Gazette. (1858) *Malton – Restoration of Norton Parish Church*, 27/02/1858, p. 9.

Yorkshire Gazette. (1860) *Re-opening of Hovingham Church*, 03/11/1860, p. 3.

Yorkshire Gazette. (1860) *Hovingham Church*, 22/09/1860, p 9.

Yorkshire Gazette. (1860) *Slingsby – The Parish Church*, 10/11/1860, p. 4.

Yorkshire Gazette. (1867) *To Builders*, 16/03/1867, p. 6.

Yorkshire Gazette. (1867) *Slingsby*, 18/05/1867, p. 9.

Yorkshire Gazette. (1867) *New Church at Slingsby*, 28/09/1867, p. 4.

ZARNECKI, G. (1953) Later English Romanesque Sculpture 1140-1210. London: Alec Tiranti Ltd.