

**Recapturing early modern English urban
defences: York and Kingston-upon-Hull,
c.1550-1700**

Two Volumes, Volume I

Simon Charles Webb, BA, MA

PhD

University of York

Archaeology

January 2015

Abstract

This thesis is an interdisciplinary study of York and Kingston-upon-Hull's early modern defensive walls from c.1550-1700. It seeks to consider the scope and historical value of studying structures that have either been restored or completely demolished over time. Through the use of extensive archival material and archaeological, historical, architectural and historical archaeological methodology, the thesis hypothesises that a corporation's urban defences were utilised in the administration of a town or city, the projection of civic authority, formed part of a recognisable and burgeoning civic bureaucracy and were tied up with notions of civic identity. In considering the utilisation of these structures removed from their ostensibly medieval military exigency it is possible to comprehend an urban phenomenon that was ubiquitous throughout England and Europe during the early modern period.

To date their study has often been limited to the discussion within the medieval period when they were first constructed. When discussed during the early modern period they are predominantly examined within a European and military context. This considers English urban defences as stylistically and military retrograde examples of early modern structures whose use was only rediscovered during the English Civil War of the 1640's. The thesis seeks to definitively prove that these structures were neither retrograde nor limited to historical and military flashpoints. They are an overlooked historical resource that is able to provide a conduit to better comprehend the physical and theoretical perimeters of urban centres that were harnessed in the negotiation of the periods urban, civic, social, political and moral contexts both nationally and locally.

Contents

Volume I

<u>Abstract</u>	2
<u>List of Figures</u>	6
<u>List of accompanying material</u>	16
<u>Acknowledgements</u>	17
<u>Declaration of Authorship</u>	19
<u>Introduction</u>	20
<u>Chapter 1- Literature review</u>	
- European context.....	22
- Medieval castles and urban defences- war or status?.....	31
- Early modern English urban defences.....	35
- Civic historiography within the early modern period.....	46
- Methodology and sources.....	59
- Structure of the study.....	68
<u>Chapter 2- Architectural analysis and the building phases of York's city defences</u>	
- Introduction.....	70
- York's <i>enceinte</i>	72
- York Castle.....	112
- St Mary's Abbey precinct walls.....	118
- Conclusion.....	129

Chapter 3- Architectural analysis and the building phases of Kingston-upon-Hull's town defences

- Introduction.....131
- Kingston-upon-Hull's *enceinte*.....134
- Henrician Castle and Blockhouses.....164
- The walls and Citadel post-1700.....177
- Conclusion.....183

Chapter 4- Urban walls and their officials

- Introduction.....185
- The muremasters of York.....187
- The city husband- Edmond Gyles and the professionalization of the office.....196
- Conclusion.....215
- The common officers of Kingston-upon-Hull.....217
- Matthew Hardy and the institution of the town husband.....232
- Conclusion.....260

Chapter 5- The utilisation of urban defences

- Introduction.....265
- Commonplace officialdom and established practices.....268
- Undesirables.....274
- The 'resident disorderly'280
- The plague.....290
- Ownership and leases.....305
- Conclusion.....326

Chapter 6- Conclusion.....329

Bibliography

- Manuscript primary sources.....342
- Printed primary sources.....345
- Published secondary sources.....345
- Unpublished theses.....352
- Online resources.....353

Volume II

Figures

- Chapter 2 Figures 1-68.....356-391
- Chapter 3 Figures 69-105.....392-425
- Chapter 5 Figures 106-121.....426-441

List of Figures

- Figure 1- Plan of York's defences with the numbering of the towers used within the text (Mee & Wilson 2005a, xii-xiii)
- Figure 2- Detail, Edmond Barker, *The South-East Prospect of the Ancient City of York*, 1718, etching, York Art Gallery, York (Mee & Wilson 2005a, 34)
- Figure 3- Section of wall between Towers 1 & 2, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 4- Tower 2, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 5- Tower 5, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 6- Victoria Bar, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 7- Tower 7, adjoining wall and impact damage, author's collection May 2012. Impact damage is shown on the far left
- Figure 8- Wall after Tower 11, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 9- External façade of Micklegate Bar, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 10- Inner facade of Micklegate Bar, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 11- Tower 13, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 12- Arch insertion between Towers 13 & 14, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 13- Three phases of building between arches, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 14- Wall leading to North Street Postern with musket loops in the parapet, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 15- George Nicholson, *North Street Postern, York, May 18th 1825*, 1825, Pencil, York Art Gallery, York (Mee & Wilson 2005a, 42)
- Figure 16- Lendal Tower, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 17- Lendal Hill House and Whistler House, author's collection May 2012

- Figure 18- John Storey after Nathaniel Whittock, *Bird's Eye view of the City of York*, 1858, coloured lithograph, Private collection (Brown 2012, 176)
- Figure 19- Joseph Halfpenny, *Multangular Tower*, 1807, etching, York Art Gallery, York (Mee & Wilson 2005a, 45)
- Figure 20- Exterior facade of Bootham Bar, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 21- Internal facade of Bootham Bar, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 22- Tower 27, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 23- Tower 28, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 24- Moat and rampart along Lord Mayor's Walk, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 25- External facade of Monk Bar, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 26- Internal facade of Monk Bar, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 27- Joseph Halfpenny, *Laythorp Postern*, 1807, etching, York Art Gallery, York (Mee & Wilson 2005a, 57)
- Figure 28- The Red Tower, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 29- Foundation arches and building phases and cruciform arrow slits in merlons, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 30- External facade of Walmgate Bar, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 31- Walmgate Bar barbican, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 32- Internal facade of Walmgate Bar, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 33- Thomas White, *Walmgate Bar*, 1800, watercolour, York Art Gallery, York (Brown 2012, 121)
- Figure 34- Fishergate Bar, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 35- Tower 39, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 36- Fishergate Postern, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 37- Fishergate Tower, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 38- William Lodge, *York from Fishergate Postern*, 1678, etching, The British Museum, London

- Figure 39- Francis Place, *York Castle from the mill Bank*, 1699, pen & ink, York Art Gallery, York, author's collection 2009
- Figure 40- Henry Cave, *Castlegate Postern*, 1813, etching, York Art Gallery, York (Mee & Wilson 2005a, 34)
- Figure 41- Davy Tower surrounded by floodwaters, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 42- William Lodge- *View of ruined [Clifford's] tower on mound with York on left*, 1678-90, Etching, The British Museum, London, Prints and Drawings, reg. no. 1867,0309.625
- Figure 43- York Castle from the south, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 44- View looking towards the York Crown Court and Castle Museum, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 45- Clifford's Tower from the southeast, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 46- Detail, Jacob Richards, *The City of York*, 1685, reproduction, York Archives and Local History, York (RCHME 1972, plate 62)
- Figure 47- Francis Place, *York, from opposite St Mary's tower*, 1647-1728, pen & ink, The British Museum, London, Prints and Drawings, reg no. 1850,0223.832
- Figure 48- Detail, Francis Place, *York, from opposite St Mary's tower*, 1647-1728, pen & ink, The British Museum, London, Prints and Drawings, reg no. 1850,0223.832
- Figure 49- The Water Tower, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 50- Postern doorway and first tower on St Mary's precinct walls, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 51- Section of wall between the first and second tower, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 52- St Mary's Lodge, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 53- St Mary's Gatehouse. Author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 54- Wall extending out from St Olave's Church, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 55 –29 Marygate, author's collection, May 2012

- Figure 56- Evidence of former dwellings abutting the precinct wall of St Mary's, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 57- Joist holes, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 58- The third tower on St Mary's precinct walls, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 59- Section of wall between the third tower and Marygate Tower, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 60- Marygate Tower, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 61- Henry Cave, *Marygate Tower*, 1813, engraving, author's collection
- Figure 62- Section of wall along Bootham, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 63- View of the buildings abutting St Mary's precinct wall along Bootham, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 64- Back of the White Horse pub with bricked up crenellations, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 65- The fifth tower on St Mary's precinct walls, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 66- Postern Tower near Bootham Bar, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 67- Postern Gateway near Bootham Bar, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 68- The King's Manor entrance, author's collection, May 2012
- Figure 69- Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield, <http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 70- Detail of the South End, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield, <http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>

- Figure 71- Detail of the South End, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 72- Detail of the South End Fort, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 73- Detail of Hessle Gate, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 74- Detail of Hessle Gate, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 75- William Bromley, *A view of Hessle Gate, Kingston upon Hull*, 1800, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/1032>
- Figure 76- Walmgate Bar barbican, author's collection May 2012
- Figure 77- Detail of Hessle Gate, William Bromley, *A view of Hessle Gate, Kingston upon Hull*, 1800, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/1032>
- Figure 78- Detail of the walls between Hessle Gate and Myton Gate, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 79- Detail of Myton Gate, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>

- Figure 80- Detail of Myton Gate's earthen defences, Unknown artist, *A plan of Kingston upon Hull and its environs*, 1774, Ink wash on paper, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/955>
- Figure 81- Detail of Hull's earthen defences, Unknown artist, *A plan of Kingston upon Hull and its environs*, 1774, Ink wash on paper, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/955>
- Figure 82- Detail of the walls between Myton Gate and Beverley Gate, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 83- Detail of Beverley Gate, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 84- J. Taylor, *Beverley Gate Hull*, 1776, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/1025>
- Figure 85- James Hulett, *the King and gentlemen of Yorkshire demand entrance at Hull, but is from the wall refus'd it by St. John Hotham, who is thereupon proclaim'd a traitor*, 1744, engraving, The British Museum, London,
http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=3295000&partId=1&searchText=kingston+upon+hull&page=2

- Figure 86- George Arnald, *Charles I demanding entrance at the Beverley Gate, Hull, April 23 1642*, 1819, oil on canvas, Ferens Art Gallery, Kingston-upon-Hull,
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/arts/yourpaintings/paintings/charles-i-demanding-entrance-at-the-beverley-gate-hull-23-78270>
- Figure 87- Detail of the walls between Beverley Gate and North Gate, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 88- Detail of North Gate, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 89- Detail of North Bridge, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 90- Detail of North Gate and North Bridge, John Speed, *Map of Hull*, 1610, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/960>
- Figure 91- Detail of North Gate ground, Elias Holt, *A plan of the town of Kingston upon Hull with the new dock and quays*, 1778, ink wash on paper, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/954>
- Figure 92- Detail of the banks of the River Hull, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>

- Figure 93- Detail of Herring Staith, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 94- Detail of the Henrician Castle and Blockhouses, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 95- Detail of the Castle, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 96- Detail of the Castle, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 97- Detail of the North Blockhouse, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 98- Detail of the South Blockhouse, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 99- Detail of the South Blockhouse, Wenceslaus Hollar, *The towne of Hull*, 1640, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/956>
- Figure 100- Detail of the Citadel, Elias Holt, *A plan of the town of Kingston upon Hull with the new dock and quays*, 1778, ink wash on paper, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/954>

- Figure 101- Detail of the Citadel, Elias Holt, *A plan of the town of Kingston upon Hull with the new dock and quays*, 1778, ink wash on paper, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/954>
- Figure 102- W. Maynard, *A south prospect of Hull garrison*, 1787, aquatint on paper, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/1051>
- Figure 103- Detail of Hull's earthen defences, Unknown artist, *A plan of Kingston upon Hull and its environs*, 1774, Ink wash on paper, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/955>
- Figure 104- Detail of the New Dock, Elias Holt, *A plan of the town of Kingston upon Hull with the new dock and quays*, 1778, ink wash on paper, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/954>
- Figure 105- Detail of Hull's dockyards, C. Burton, *Plan of the wet docks at Kingston upon Hull*, 1829, engraving, The Gott Collection, The Hepworth Wakefield, Wakefield,
<http://gottcollection.hepworthwakefield.org/item/997>
- Figure 106- Francis Place, *York from St Mary's Tower*, 1647-1728, Pen and Ink Drawing, The British Museum, London.
- Figure 107- C81:7 Foss Bridge Accounts 1553-1554 & C90:2 Ouse Bridge Accounts 1554-1555- - type of lease as a percentage of total rental income
- Figure 108- C81:11 Foss Bridge Accounts 1563-1564 & C91:3 Ouse Bridge Accounts 1566-1567- type of lease as a percentage of total rental income
- Figure 109- C93:1 Ouse & Foss Bridge Accounts 1573-1574- type of lease as a percentage of total income

- Figure 110- C94:2 Ouse & Foss Bridge Accounts 1583-1584- type of leases as a percentage of total rental income
- Figure 111- C95:1 Ouse & Foss Bridge Accounts 1593-1594- type of lease as a percentage of total rental income
- Figure 112- C96:5 Ouse & Foss Bridge Accounts 1607-1608- type of leases as a percentage of total rental income
- Figure 113- C97:2 Ouse & Foss Bridge Accounts 1617-1618- type of leases as a percentage of total rental income
- Figure 114- C98:2 Ouse & Foss Bridge Accounts 1625-1626- type of leases as a percentage of total rental income
- Figure 115- C66:8 Receivers' Rolls 1631-1632- type of leases as a percentage of total income
- Figure 116- C67:1 Receivers' Rolls 1634-1635- type of lease as a percentage of total rental income
- Figure 117- C68:3 Receivers' Rolls 1644-1645- type of lease as a percentage of total rental income
- Figure 118- C72:3 Receivers' Rolls 1657-1658- type of lease as a percentage of total rental income
- Figure 119- C74:2 Receivers' Rolls 1664-1665- type of lease as a percentage of total rental income
- Figure 120- C75:4 Receivers' Rolls 1671-1672- type of lease as a percentage of total rental income
- Figure 121- C77:4 Receivers' Rolls 1681-1682- type of lease as a percentage of total rental income

List of accompanying material

YALH- York Archives and Local History Library

HCA- Hull City Archive

The full list of the accompanying material is organised according to that established in the bibliography under Manuscript Sources and as referenced within the thesis, are numbered Item 1-12 and are accessible in PDF format on the accompanying disc.

Acknowledgements

In the production of this thesis I have numerous individuals to thank. Most importantly my thanks and appreciation must be primarily reserved for my supervisor, Dr Kate Giles. It was through Kate's active encouragement as an external examiner whilst studying for my MA that I realised the possibility of pursuing my research interests through a PhD. Also it was through her guidance that I was able to secure a place within the Archaeology Department at the University of York. Over the years Kate has been unstinting in her support, guidance, knowledge and understanding, without which this thesis would not have been possible and I am eternally grateful. Thanks must also go to Dr Steve Roskams and Dr James Symonds within the Archaeology Department for their time and input as members of my Thesis Advisory Panel.

Over the course of my MA and PhD the staff at York's Archive and Local History Centre have been immeasurably helpful in the conduct of my research. For almost 5 years Joy Cann, the now retired Assistant Archivist, painstakingly assisted me and went beyond the call of duty in helping to source additional materials. Over that period she has become a true friend and without her and her husband, Tony Wright, my dog and I would have found ourselves homeless were it not for their kindness following the flooding of my home in 2012. Their friendship and positivity got me through many a trying time during the production of this thesis. Through Joy and the archive I was also fortunate to be able to draw on the expertise of its volunteers, particularly Margaret Elsworth who was always available for help and advice. I am also indebted to the staff at Hull's History Centre and City Archives for their services in making available their large body of civic records.

Finally, none of this would have been possible without my parents, Christine and John Webb, who have been unfalteringly patient and supportive of me

throughout this time and themselves have lost many hours reading draft upon draft.

Declaration of Authorship

I, Simon Charles Webb, hereby declare that this thesis and the work presented is entirely my own. Where I have consulted the work of others, this is clearly stated. This work has not previously been presented for an award at this, or any other, University.

Introduction

This thesis is an interdisciplinary study of York and Kingston-upon-Hull's early modern defensive walls from c.1550-1700. It seeks to consider the scope and historical value of studying structures that have either been restored or completely demolished over time. The combination of destruction and restoration has led to an historical underrating of their relevance for the wider discussion and work on the early modern period. Within the historiography they are often confined to, and defined by, their construction and defensive medieval contexts, in spite of the fact that they were maintained within England and across Europe during the early modern period. This research will argue that they were in fact able to form a key instrument for the administration of urban centres, the exercising of authority by civic governments and corporations, were integral to the development of a recognisable civic bureaucracy, and were indelibly linked to forms of civic identity.

The static form and defensive nature of urban defences relegates them behind other forms of civic, public and ecclesiastical architecture of the period, compounded by their demolition or restoration that has eradicated the material evidence of their utilisation. The reconstruction of the physical structures and their distinctly non-military uses represents an innovative methodology that builds upon previous studies, such as Creighton and Higham's (2005b) work on medieval defences, and allows for a comprehension of their continued and developing importance throughout the period in question. They were an inescapable aspect of the early modern urban landscape for the citizens and governments that they surrounded, a fact that has been largely overlooked or harnessed merely as a cursory addendum to other considerations. For Savage (1996 cited Wood 2013, 223) 'places [were] not just passive backdrops to social process but [were] actively involved in the constitution and construction of social identities', which in the case of Hull and York, was also writ large through the stone and brick of their defences. The scope of the thesis encompasses the

proliferation and development of local and national government in the aftermath of the Reformation, continuing political, social, economic and religious transformations, as well as the tumultuous events that included the English Civil War, the era of the Republican Commonwealth, the Restoration of 1660 and the deposition of James II/VII. In seeking to establish the relevance of researching localised early modern urban centres and their defensive *enceintes*, the thesis will demonstrate their historical value in furthering our understanding of civic governance and civic participation. The painstakingly transcribed data of the archival material, primarily the minutes of corporations, reveals the wealth of knowledge that can be gleaned and which has heretofore been underutilised. In accordance with the wider research aims of historical archaeology, this will allow for ostensibly medieval defences to be comprehended within their post-medieval contexts as active agents within the built environment, as evidenced through the integration and analysis of extant remains, the reconstruction of now lost forms, archival research and available art historical resources (Hicks & Beaudry 2006, 7).

Chapter 1- Literature Review

European context

Texts dealing with European fortifications during the early modern period are vital, not necessarily for what they reveal, but rather the glaring omissions and assumptions that they make, which have adversely affected the debate over the significance of early modern English urban defences. A significant correlation is drawn between fortifications and the context of individual nation-states in establishing claims of authority, even nationhood, within the European-centred early modern historical literature. Pollak (2010a, 26 & 49) argues that within England, Henry VIII's coastal forts represented 'the idea of a nation-as-fortress' and that the French fortifications under Louis XIV in the seventeenth century served to define national identity. Whereas specific nations and individuals could be identified as pursuing fortifications as a measure of national independence, it can be argued that English cities did not operate within such a context. Rather than political independence, such cities and towns are argued to have exercised social independence (Creighton and Higham 2005b, 209). This may account for the wider availability of literature relating to European continental states, where it can be argued that fortification design and considerations were actively pursued within a national political framework, as opposed to considerations of locally incorporated cities and towns within an individual nation. England appears to be unique in its perceived dislocation from continental defensive developments over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which is predicated on a European-centric narrative of new fortification design and nation building, and is a recurrent feature of the historiography pertaining to English and European early modern defences.

Johnson (2002, 131) argues that new early modern designs of artillery fortifications were directly associated with absolute monarchy and state power on the continent. This asserts the dominance and superiority of

studying military designs as a determining factor in their historical and military relevance. The military qualities of the bastion system provided stone-encased earth platforms for mounted artillery around a city, superseding medieval high walls and towers and allowing for both defensive and offensive capabilities (Turnbull 2006, 79 & 128). Artillery developments undoubtedly affected warfare and the theory of warfare during the early modern period. That this new form of defence was theoretically and militarily superior is not in dispute. Contemporary treatises extolling the virtues of city defences as a science, based on mathematics and classically inspired design principles, are testament to this (Mallagh 1981; Pollak 1991b). Described as 'so handsome in their carefully proportioned, massive plasticity', the new bastioned fortifications were 'among the most beautiful functional structures ever built' according to de la Croix (1972, 40). This highlights the duality within the historiography of conflating and focussing on the design and military functionality of defences, removed from their localised and historical contexts. For example, Wallace's attribution of Florence's new bastioned fortifications to Michelangelo during that city's siege of 1529 relies entirely upon defence sketches and plans, rather than documentary proof that his designs were actually constructed (Wallace 1987, 121 & 134). In so doing this dismisses the role of the local administration and officials of the city-state. For Wallace (1987, 121 & 134) it is the affiliation of an artist, Michelangelo, implementing designs within a recognisable state, Florence, which is stressed over the documentary material in order to extol the perceived superior merits of the bastion design. Multiple examples of despotic Italian city-states or rulers could potentially be identified throughout Europe, who arguably utilised fortification building in their quest for nationhood. However, within these examples there would surely be found variations within those differing states at a more localised level of research. A consideration of early modern fortifications below the upper echelons of particular governments, in respect of either their maintenance or construction, is often entirely overlooked within the majority of works on the subject.

For Pollak (2010a) the dual role of aesthetics and nation building are exemplified during the early modern period, particularly during the seventeenth century. This leads to her analysis that the revolution in artillery siege warfare, combined with the perceived passion of authorities for geometrical order, engendered an entirely new form of 'military urbanism' to combine forceful architecture and beauty, allowing contempt and derision to be levelled at those towns and cities that were not fortified with geometrical beauty (Pollak 2010a, 1, 10 & 18). In this regard the majority of England's early modern urban defences would have warranted contempt and derision. Such a statement by Pollak is helpful in determining the bias accorded to European developments, to the detriment of English and un-modernised defences, which is dismissive of non-bastioned defences as a historical resource to be investigated. England is argued by Braddick (2000, 62) to have relied on its position as an island, protected 'by the sea rather than massed ranks of infantry and heavy fortifications', with its military defences and expenditure therefore standing 'at the opposite end of the spectrum' when compared to its continental neighbours from 1550 to 1700.

Historiographical emphasis is particularly focussed on France under Louis XIV and the designs and implementation of new fortification systems by his Engineer-in-Chief and Inspector-General of Fortifications, Sébastien le Prestre de Vauban (1633-1707). Vauban can be directly associated with the defences of more than 180 French towns, cities, fortresses and citadels during the second half of the seventeenth and early eighteenth-centuries (Falkner 2011, 1). The impetus for such a large number of projects is bound to the perceived development of France as a centralized nation-state under a strong-willed monarch, one seeking to define and hold the newly acquired borders and authority of his kingdom (Griffith 2006, 12; Falkner 2011, 11; Pollak 2010a, 49; Perbellini 2000, 16). However, Chatrand (2005, 8) identifies that the French had instituted a nationwide administrative and regulatory system toward fortifications from as early as 1604, which allowed for a professionalization of military engineering that culminated

with Vauban, who was distinct from earlier amateur figures who had accrued their “engineering” skills largely from published materials. Therefore, predating the historiographical eminence of Vauban under Louis XIV, the French state had pursued a formalized national system of training figures in military fortifications. Certainly this formal training structure was not evident within England during the majority of the period under consideration, but arguably was in evidence under Henry VIII and in the later half of the seventeenth century, for example through figures within the Office of the Board of Ordnance based in London. This department of state was answerable directly to the monarch, theoretically providing a similar correlation of defences and the monarch as existed in France, and was responsible for the building and maintenance of garrisons, the erecting of new defences and the supplying of armaments (Howes & Foreman 1999, 56).

Vauban’s reputation centres on his application of the *Trace Italienne* system of bastioned fortifications that give the appearance of ‘beguiling’ intricacy, when in reality they are formed from simple geometric patterns repeated and superimposed upon one another (Falkner 2011, 24). Features bound up with these designs focus on depth, protection, concealment, effective obstacles, such as water-filled moats and trenches, and open fields of fire for artillery through masonry encased bastions and ramparts (Falkner 2011, 18-19). A third of all Vauban’s fortifications were located on France’s northern frontier toward the Low Countries (Griffiths 2006, 13). It was here that the so-called ‘Fence of Iron’ was only ever truly tested during the War of the Spanish Succession from 1701-1713; this war stemmed from the extinction of the Spanish Habsburg male-line with Charles the II of Spain and the proposed accession of Louis XIV’s grandson. Ultimately the accession of a Bourbon prince to the Spanish throne with Philip V prevailed under the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, but between 1706 and 1711 the Allied forces under the Englishman John Churchill, 1st Duke of Marlborough, had led sustained, if ultimately unsuccessful, campaigns to break through France’s defences. The eventual overall French gains are credited largely to

Vauban's system of bastioned fortifications (Falkner 2011, 178, 180-181 & 193).

It is easy to comprehend how grand narratives of European wars, dynastic disputes and politics might garner greater research from scholars. They are imbued with the personalities of figures, such as Louis XIV, combined with the proliferation of bastioned fortifications under the direction of an individual, Vauban, all of which feeds into a defined narrative of nation-building, authoritarianism, absolutism and military-driven considerations (Johnson 2002, 131). Though as Griffiths (2006, 21) highlights, these new works also incorporated earlier pre-existing medieval fortifications and so they should not be considered entirely new systems that swept away obsolete defences, but rather as improvements. An emphasis on researching their construction within a localised context, currently absent from the broader historiography, would surely further an understanding of their wider significance when seeking to discuss pan-European fortification developments. Indeed within France, as Chatrand (2005, 8-10) argues, military engineers were highly skilled and officially recognized by the state and accorded status through royal commissions, being trained in architecture, military and civil engineering and urban planning. They were also integral to the expansion and defence of colonies in North America and elsewhere, thus creating a global legacy for the bastioned *Trace Italienne* system (Griffith 2006, 56-57). Therefore a historical focus on either Louis XIV or Vauban is exaggerated and overlooks previous developments.

Removed from an active military function, Pollak (2010a, 190-195) further argues that the demilitarization and demolition of the city walls of Paris in 1670 led to a reconfiguration of wide militarily inspired boulevards and triumphal arches. 'The stylistic influence of a bastioned fortification on the public spaces and streets of the early modern city' (Pollak 2010a, 195) thus became the principle-regulating element of the city. This generalized emphasis on the stylistic merits of European early modern fortifications, even in the case of Paris where physical defences were no longer extant, too

often dominates the European narrative of early modern fortifications and the bias toward stylistic influences. Removed from architectural and stylistic developments, Mann's (2006, 93) work considers the role of London's city gates during the seventeenth century and highlights that whilst Louis XIV had demilitarized Paris and replaced its defences with military-promenades, the city of London actively sought to reaffirm and repair its own medieval walls. This is argued to have been a tacit rebuttal to the 'feared and hated' French religious and political system of Catholic absolutism.

Therefore, beyond the pan-European emphasis on the design merits of the bastioned system, or the association of them with the definition of one nation, such work highlights that different countries and conurbations could respond differently to military defensive developments. In the case of London's social and political context, the bastioned style was viewed with derision and something to be actively countered. This should indicate for historians that where bastioned systems were constructed in England, such as the state-driven works at Hull in the 1540's and 1680's, the connotations of such architecture may not have been defined in simplistic notions of benign aesthetics, national identity or security. They may instead have been understood and recognised as potentially malignant structures. Saunders (1989, 83) even questions, rather reductively, whether those limited number of fortifications constructed under Charles II were simply an attempt to compete with Louis XIV and other states, the implication being that the expenditure of vast sums of money was engendered by national rivalries. This line of argument reduces the significance of new works within England to mere emulation and of course dismisses the role of pre-existing defences. Clearly during the seventeenth century the angle-bastioned system of fortification became the standard by which new defences would be constructed across the European continent, globally and within England, but their adoption and reception may not have been uniformly or impassively accepted.

The proliferation of the bastion was stimulated by the wars in which France was involved during the later seventeenth and early eighteenth-centuries, which from a French perspective, can be viewed as defensive in nature, or conversely, as evidence of an overtly aggressive and expansionist policy (Falkner 2011, 11). However, the programme of earthen and bastioned fortifications constructed by the Dutch, primarily during the 80-year long war for independence with Spain from 1566 to 1648, are regarded as fundamental to achieving and preserving Dutch independence, as well as furthering the proliferation of the bastioned design (Saunders 1989, 72 & 87; Falkner 2011). Heijden's (2012, 44 & 127) work on the Netherlands during the early modern period highlights that defensive fortification building and maintenance was one of the primary tenets of urban authorities, be they local or supra-local-governments, with them constituting a recognised part of Dutch civic duty and public service. This contrasts with the distinctly authoritarian discussion of Louis XIV having imposed their construction through sheer force of will and personality. Clearly within the context of a protracted war of independence, the term 'public service' may appear to be condescendingly diminutive, but in terms of a military and civic legacy, fortifications were bound up with the survival of the Dutch state in a beneficial and non-authoritarian context. In both the French and Dutch examples, defences are argued to have helped define these two nations. For France it was a projection of power and a means to retain newly acquired land, but for the Dutch it represented their very survival. Yet within England the influence of defences, but particularly the bastion, is argued to have been negligible barring the Civil War of the seventeenth century.

The deployment of bastioned and earthwork defences during the English Civil Wars can be seen as recognition of the new design's military qualities and the translation and spread of military treatises on the subject by the mid-seventeenth century (Harrington 2003a, 25; Wenham 1970; Bull 2008, 81; Creighton & Higham 2005b, 228). The merits of earthen ramparts and bastions during the Civil War, a period lacking in both time and funds,

offered the means of quickly erecting new defences in tandem with existing town and city fortifications, as had been proven in the earlier Dutch experiences (Harrington 2003a, 21 & 24). The influence of the Dutch methods of fortification can be best exemplified by the engagement of the Dutchman Bernard de Gomme (1620-1685). Initially employed by Charles I as Engineer and Quarter-Master-General, effectively the head of the Board of Ordnance, de Gomme was responsible for the design of the Royalist earthworks around Liverpool and the elaborate systems around Oxford, bringing 'a distinctly Dutch flavour' (Howes & Foreman 1999, 56) to English Civil War fortifications (Creighton & Higham 2005b, 228). Knighted by Charles I, de Gomme would go into exile with Charles II and upon the Restoration, was restored to his role at the Office of the Board of Ordnance; he continued for twenty years to work for the state, notably on the fortifications of Plymouth, Portsmouth and Gosport (Saunders 1989, 87; Howes & Foreman 1999, 56). The Board of Ordnance would come to play a key role in the development of Hull in the 1680's, including also plans to redevelop York's Castle, which will be addressed in the following chapters.

Following the Civil War, many of these earthen fortifications were levelled whilst some were retained, including those of Hull. However, between 1650 and 1660 Exeter spent £100 demolishing its Civil War earthen defences, yet from 1660 it set about restoring its medieval *enceinte* (Stoyle 2003, 100). Gloucester's city walls are argued by Friedrichs (1995, 24) to have been demolished during the 1660's following the Restoration, as a tacit form of retribution for having supported Parliament during the Civil War. Other cities, including Coventry, Northampton and Taunton, also had their medieval walls levelled, indicating that while demolished medieval walls marked a city out as having been disloyal, a restored yet non-threatening *enceinte*, such as Exeter's, might act as an expression of loyalty (Stoyle 2003, 102; Creighton & Higham 2005b, 237; Mee & Wilson 2005a, 26). Clearly removing recently erected earthen defences capable of supporting artillery would hinder any potential future use of them for military purposes. However, it should be remembered that these were additions to existing

urban defences, meaning that a medieval *enceinte* still had military capabilities and so was not entirely obsolete, as their utilisation throughout the Civil War during sieges had demonstrated (Bull 2008, 86). But the decision to demolish some cities' walls, retain some earthworks, or simply restore medieval defences, were all matters subject to a multitude of differing local and national contexts. Fundamentally, it is these local considerations that need to be researched to then be able to inform a wider narrative of the function and meaning of both old and new defences before and after the English Civil War.

From a discussion of the European historiography it is possible to observe the inherent limitations in the totalizing narrative of fortification design, predicated primarily upon the adoption of the bastioned *Trace Italienne* system by central governments and sovereign states, as the determining factor for the merit of studying early modern defences. The sheer multiplicity of differing forms of sovereignty on the continent during this period, be that absolute monarchy, dukedoms, imperial fiefdoms or republics, amongst others, undermines the ability to assert generalised assumptions about the presence, or not, of urban fortifications between states let alone within them. The bias against English urban defences is palpable and ultimately deeply flawed, for it largely ignores the continued utilisation of medieval defences during this period by seeking to assert the presence, and historical or military supremacy, of new forms of defensive architecture. A central tenet of this thesis is that a greater understanding of the localised context of urban defences is required, one that is removed from the narrow confines of considering simply central government motivations or bastioned architecture. Within the English context the historiography is constrained by authors seeking to provide such comparisons with early modern Europe to the perceived detriment of English examples, which overlooks localised studies and necessitates a re-evaluation of their significance. In so doing this can encourage us to re-examine the multiplicity of meanings of urban defences for the individual communities who lived within, maintained and used them over time throughout this period. As a

consequence of the European centred historiography of early modern urban defences, this thesis looks to other secondary literature and interdisciplinary methodological approaches, the most appropriate of which is the study of medieval castles and town walls.

Medieval castles and urban defences- war or status?

The historiography of castle studies originated in the nineteenth century and emphasised the perceived militaristic architecture as defining their primary function (Liddiard 2005, 5 & 7). Johnson (2002, 4) states that these early scholars were men from military backgrounds pursuing research, with a definition that 'if it wasn't military, it wasn't 'really' a castle'. Austin (2007, 15-16) argues that medievalists had tended to reduce the subject of castles to a matter of form over substance and as a quintessentially medieval and unproblematic construct, defined within a military context. From the 1970's, Coulson posited that the onus of military considerations and the utilitarian function of castles could be challenged if their symbolic purposes were questioned around issues of status, power, domesticity and architectural stylistic interests (Liddiard 2005, 5 & 7). The military interpretations are argued to have overshadowed the general 'peacetime' utilisation of castles as both centres of administration and elite residences, creating a polarizing debate between military and social or war and status (Creighton 2002a, 5-6). Creighton (2002a, 7) further highlights the reductive nature of this debate by focussing on the multi-faceted nature of castles, which were able to accommodate a myriad of functions, including domestic, social, symbolic, administrative, economic, judicial and military, all of which varied over time, context and regionally. Such considerations are distinctly lacking within the historiography relating to early modern urban defences also. Over twenty years after his 1979 article, Coulson (2003, 1) felt able to comment on the 'crushing imbalance' of a rational examination of castles that reflected both the military and wider interpretative basis of them for analysis. Further undermining the medieval military emphasis is the fact that many castles were never in fact besieged or engaged with defensively throughout their

history until the Civil War of the seventeenth century (Liddiard 2005, 95). This is also true of the majority of urban defences.

This lingering historical dispute was recently exemplified by Platt's counter-argument against the growing emphasis on issues of status, to the perceived detriment of military considerations. The developing non-military considerations proposed, by figures such as Liddiard and Johnson, are described by Platt (2007, 84 & 98) as a proselytising agenda that has 'banished historians and their documents' and led to 'misleading assumptions' that ignore the primacy of military concerns toward the construction of castles. A rebuttal by Creighton and Liddiard (2008, 161 & 164) argues that the division between military and symbolic, or war versus status, is a false dichotomy, an 'interpretive straightjacket' and ultimately, 'an intellectual cul-de-sac'. This thesis uses the basis of its research upon the assumption expressed by Hill and Wileman (2002, 52) that castles, as well as urban defences, derived their form from a military exigency, but also encompassed greater social and cultural meaning. Creighton and Higham (2003a, 33 & 45) recognise that even with extant castle remains, the surviving masonry cannot in itself allow for an understanding of castles as an occupied structure, with many of the architectural features having disappeared, such as residential buildings, kitchens, and chapels. Therefore, there is an inherent need to harness all forms of available evidence and data across disciplines and research interests to form an integrated body of data.

Wheatley (2001, 55) argues that while notions of medieval civic buildings, such as town halls and guildhalls, have considered the spatial, commercial, political and social contexts of such buildings, the same form of analysis had not been applied to urban castles and civic power-politics. She argues that there is a historiographical distinction drawn between ecclesiastical and military architecture, with the former focussing on 'spirituality and aesthetics', while the latter is studied as 'purely practical military engineering' (Wheatley 2001, 5). Wheatley (2001, 55) further suggests that the notion of castles being private, rather than communal, has undermined

their integration within a wider discussion and analysis of their significance for urban or communal interests. To date this has yet to be applied fully to early modern English urban defences. Coulson (2003, 182) notes this paradox, as castles were of course institutional and public spaces, as well as private and domestic. The 'public' walled town or city could also be regarded as a 'private' and collective legal entity through its incorporated status. This leads to the necessity of considering the civic-political context of the early modern period and how incorporated towns and cities utilised their defensive *enceintes* locally, as well as their significance within a national context. Ultimately, both castles and urban defences had their origins within a military context, but as the medieval castle and early modern urban *enceinte* debates illustrate, a strictly military-orientated analysis inhibits a multi-faceted and holistic approach to military structures and their impact upon wider considerations (Creighton and Higham 2005b, 244 & 249).

Two edited volumes, *City Walls: The Urban Enceinte in Global Perspective* and *The Town Walls in the Middle Ages* (Tracy 2000; Perbellini 2000), seek to provide a rationale for the study of urban defences. Whilst both are medieval and European in focus, they are able to demonstrate the possible means to understand such structures beyond their military capabilities, which can in turn be applied to the early modern period. Tracy (2000, 3 & 2) broadly identifies the need to consider the context and rationale in which defences were constructed by rulers or authorities, but most significantly and pertinent to this thesis, what was the political, cultural and symbolic meaning of them once they were built. Tracy (2000, 3 & 2) also highlights that the majority of work on urban *enceintes* are largely researched by Europeans about Europe, which does not reflect the potential for international studies and comparisons, particularly in relation to, for example, the many thousands of mediievally contemporaneous Chinese *enceintes* that outnumbered those within Europe. Reyerson (2000, 88 & 113) also recognizes that walls inherently provided a symbolic form of urban identity, as well as providing a pragmatic means of defence. In turn,

such large expenditure may have diverted funds that were detrimental to other economic and social considerations. This serves to highlight the potential multiple utilisations of such defences and the balancing act of authorities attempting to sustain their urban communities within a localised, as well as national context.

It is encouraging that British medieval walls are accorded recognition, yet still within largely European centred publications, through Higham outlining the methodological rationale behind British studies and recommendations for further progression in their research. Higham (2000, 44-46) identifies the need to record both archaeologically and architecturally surviving materials, the importance of documentary and archival materials to reveal the social aspects of urban defences, their application to the study of urban topographies, planning and expansion, to think beyond the walls themselves and consider the wider urban environs, such as buildings being incorporated into them over time, and finally, to recognise the conservation and preservation of urban defences for their social and historical value in modern times. This clearly informs upon the later collaborative work between Creighton & Higham (2005b) that also recognises the applicable comparisons between castles and urban *enceintes* as a methodological and theoretical basis for research. They argue that walls, like a castle, represented a 'perceived need to express status and identity', as well as a need for protection (Creighton & Higham 2005b, 21). Zeune (2000, 39) directly equates the role of castles and urban defences as providing a clear delineation of jurisdictions within and without the structures, symbolically broadcasting the wealth of an area and of course, providing military protection. The fundamental debate that has underlined much of the literature and analysis of British and English medieval castles centres on the proposition as to whether or not they were primarily for war or status during the medieval period (Creighton & Liddiard 2008, 161). In turn this has influenced the emphasis on the military capabilities of defences during the early modern period, as reflected in the prevailing military focussed-

historiography, which denigrates surviving medieval defensive works as largely superfluous or simply outmoded.

Early modern English urban defences

There are presently no studies devoted entirely to the research of English early modern walls, yet there are for the medieval period. Creighton and Higham's seminal work, *Medieval walls: an archaeology and social history of urban defences* (2005b), not only addresses the study of urban defences in great detail during the medieval period, but also argues that if town walls of the medieval period have been insufficiently researched, 'then traditions of urban defences from the sixteenth century onwards have been even more seriously neglected' (Creighton & Higham 2005b, 221). They identify five causal reasons as to why medieval urban defences have historically and archaeologically been underutilised (Creighton & Higham 2005b, 221). Firstly the nature of urban walls defines them as 'communal' structures, thereby making them devoid of an attachment and association to key historical figures and families, attributes that are conversely commonly associated with another form of medieval defensive structure, the 'private' castle. This is directly linked to issues of communality in that they are viewed as utilitarian structures devoid of adornment, architectural development and investment, features considered integral to the study of secular and ecclesiastical buildings. They note that the structural remains of walls are often discontinuous, piecemeal or entirely absent, thereby creating a challenge to study them architecturally. Emphasis is often placed on the documentary evidence for the defence's initial inception and construction, such as the murage grants or taxes that were made to fund their construction in the twelfth and thirteenth-centuries, undermining the consideration of their physical evidence, which is then compounded by the lack of extant survivals. Lastly, and particularly pertaining to England it would seem, is the bias exhibited toward the European continental urban defensive sites, as discussed previously, which in terms of scale, design, architecture and planning during the early modern period are considered to

dwarf those within Britain. As a whole, therefore, English urban walls and defences uneasily sit between archaeology and architecture and 'carry something of a military stigma', making them 'a relatively neglected and unfashionable branch of scholarship' (Creighton & Higham 2005b, 16).

The challenge for the study of English early modern urban defences is that the majority of them were medieval in origin. Those that were extant underwent no major refortification during the period 1550-1700, with the exception of isolated cases such as Hull, Berwick upon Tweed and Portsmouth. As such, the structures themselves were simply maintained during this period, rather than newly built or substantially altered to reflect changing defensive architecture. Owing to the limited examples of English urban defences being actively engaged with militarily during the early modern period, their study is often entirely confined to historical flashpoints, such as the Civil War. The inherent military connotations of English urban defences, as well as more generally, are inextricably bound up with perceptions of why these structures were conceived of and constructed. For example, the English Heritage Thesaurus defines town and city walls as 'defensive fortifications such as ramparts, ditches and stone walls built to defend a town or city', with no account given for potentially wider uses and meanings (<http://thesaurus.english-heritage.org.uk/>). Combined with this militaristic definition and the de-cluttered restored and crenellated surviving examples, including York and Chester, the lingering impression is one wholly devoted to military defence.

Why then study antiquated defensive works that were militarily outmoded when compared to European defensive architectural developments, were often demolished during the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries, and are contemporarily regarded as historically and anomalously surviving tourist attractions? To omit the study of urban defences is to neglect an essential aspect of what an early modern town or city that possessed them physically, as well as symbolically, represented. Their research is 'not a discrete field of study in its own right, but a component of

the study of the urban phenomenon' (Creighton & Higham 2005b, 18). They can and should be considered in tandem with other recognised forms of institutional and civic buildings of the period.

Reed (2000, 289-290 & 299) identifies the three forms of institutional buildings within the early modern urban landscape as administrative, commercial and cultural, although urban walls are omitted from these categories. Urban defences are described as often ruinous and only prominent during the Civil War of the 1640's, when they were again repaired or subsequently damaged. Yet, of those three urban building categories identified by Reed, urban defences were potentially able to fulfil all of these functions. Administratively, the walls physically acted as a boundary defining the urban administration, excluding the growth of suburbs and jurisdictional authority beyond the walls; they were able to act as a form of commercial control over the import of goods, peoples and economic or commercial activity; and they were culturally and symbolically representative of a form of civic construction and maintenance, whose antecedents predated the early modern period, and were harnessed for contemporaneous and historical forms of ritual, identity and utilisation.

Within a discussion of the early modern urban landscape, Borsay (1989, 41) seeks to establish that an 'urban Renaissance' occurred following the Restoration in 1660, which continued into the eighteenth century. His analysis centres on the perceived 'renewal and transformation' of the urban landscape, wrought through a town's physical buildings and spaces, as an expression of status, prosperity, as well as social and cultural aspirations, exemplified through the transition from vernacular to classical architecture (Borsay 1989, 41-42; Reed 2000, 313). A town or city's cathedrals, abbeys, churches, castles and urban defences defined the legacy of medieval architecture during the early modern period, which by 1660 had suffered 'neglect and depredation', with 'many in a serious state of disrepair or already ruined' (Borsay 1989, 41). The public fabric of towns and cities was neglected on account of sixteenth and seventeenth century religious

change, economic decline and the impact of warfare in the 1640's. Following the Restoration of 1660 this era witnessed an investment in public buildings, 'which projected a sense of corporate identity' and a new notion of the urban landscape as a collective 'whole' (Borsay 1989, 80 & 104). Work by Tittler (1991a) on the English urban fabric, from 1500-1640, recognises Borsay's chronology of a post-1660 era. This period witnessed a 'high urban culture' exerting influence upon the physical landscape through the construction of purpose-built structures, such as promenades, assembly rooms, racecourses and pleasure gardens, as an expression of cultural and political power (Tittler 1991a, 104-105). However, for Tittler such buildings were performing similar functions that earlier medieval parish churches, chantry chapels and religious guilds had in the medieval period, yet the town hall also represented a new 'semiotic' (Tittler 1991a, 93) form for the projection of civic authority, power and identity.

Following the Reformation and the rendering of religious buildings types as obsolete, a vacuum was created for the projection of authority on the urban landscape between the medieval period and 1660 (Tittler 1991a, 104-15). This is understood as having been filled by the creation of a post-Reformation civic culture and built environment, one expression of which was the renewal of pre-existing town halls or the construction of entirely new ones (Tittler 2007b, 105). This building work reflected the expansion of local government following the 'outpouring of social and economic legislation' (Tittler 2007b, 122) from the mid-sixteenth century and the impetus to create 'both seats and symbols of local authority' within the civic community (Tittler 2001d, 60-61). It is also understood as having fulfilled several different practical and symbolic functions. With civic focus centred on the town hall, the 'doorway' itself provided the ability to regulate access to the community and determine the 'flow of goods, services, people, ideas and activities', as well as an 'integrative device' between conflicting groups of people present within the same community (Tittler 1991a, 131). If this regulatory definition of a physical space is extrapolated from the town hall outwards to a town or city's urban defences, then an interpretative

approach toward comprehending urban defences within the early modern urban landscape is evident. This enables both the physical architecture of a structure to be combined with the theoretical notions of civic and corporate identity, and their potential applicability to the urban defences of York and Hull.

Both Borsay and Tittler's analysis relies upon notions of recognisable cultural ruptures, the Reformation and Restoration, which necessitated and engendered responses that wrought change upon the urban landscape and were distinct from earlier building types. Likewise the *Cambridge Urban History of Britain* volume (Clark 2000) adheres to the notion of an urban transformation, stemming from the changing religious and political contexts of the early modern period. Within this discussion the basic medieval institutional structures are argued to have been fundamentally altered from 1540 to 1580 by the Reformation, which necessitated a need to 'find a new collective spirit and new ways of organising their sociability', as well as political reform through the rise of incorporated civic government and the conflict arising between those authorities and the power of the state (Harding 2000, 263; Archer 2000, 235). Therefore, in a discussion of change within the urban, social, religious and political landscape of the early modern period, structural features that are perceived to have undergone no fundamental change of use or alteration, such as urban defences, are overlooked and do not conform to the notion of change. This chronological change leads to a recognisable urban culture of the eighteenth century, as defined by Borsay (1989, 311), in the pursuit of 'the rehabilitation of [a city's] cultural prestige'. Within this analysis urban defences are only referenced as providing a backdrop to the newly created walks and gardens, often sited following the line of city walls, as at Bath, Chester, Dorchester, Exeter, Hertford, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Norwich, Shrewsbury, and York (Borsay 1989, 168). Creighton and Higham (2005b, 241) also recognise this leisure or amenity aspect that urban defences acquired, leading to what they describe as 'an on-going sequence of conservation' through the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries. However, medieval urban defences were not

merely part of a lingering historical and structural legacy restored under the post-1660 'flowering of fashionable culture' (Borsay 1989, 311). Rather they were part of the institutional, civic and public landscape that pre-dated and continued throughout the early modern period. If the initial understanding of early modern defensive walls is that they were ruinous and removed from the wider contexts and developments of urban communities, then it is unsurprising that the existing historiography, including Borsay and Tittler, ignores the potentially continued significance of medieval urban defences throughout the early modern period. Creighton and Higham (2005b, 251) go as far as to 'appeal to both urban archaeologists and historians' to recognise the potential of urban defences within an integrated approach that recognises them as a component of the activities of complex urban societies.

The uniqueness of the early modern English context is reinforced by the fact that, aside from the Civil War, from the end of the fifteenth century onwards, England enjoyed relative peace in which it had not been subject to foreign invasion, marauding armies or sieges. Saunders (1989, 11-12) argues that owing to this infrequency of use and need, the 'relics of previous defences' were therefore merely re-used and then abandoned once the crisis had passed. Saunders explicitly states that it is not his intention to explore the domestic, political and social context of these defences. This accounts for his dismissive attitudes toward English defences and emphasis on European, continentally-inspired military developments and designs. The emphasis on studying new forms of military architecture automatically assumes older examples of military architecture are somehow less worthy of consideration and militarily defunct and has led to the current gap in the historiography.

Larger envisioned works, such as Friedrichs' pan-European *The Early Modern City 1450-1750* (1995, 23 & 25), similarly posits that in England urban defences were neglected with the impetus for their maintenance only rediscovered during the 1640's. Yet, in contradiction, Friedrichs goes on to further argue that the majority of European towns and cities that possessed defences, including the English, maintained them up until at least the end of

the eighteenth century. His assertion that walls were generally obsolete, but yet were maintained, profoundly undermines the hypothesis of disinterest in walls within urban communities. Within *The History of the King's Works*, Colvin (1982, 408) argues that that there was a recognisable shift in the function of town and city walls from the medieval to the early modern period in terms of utilization and the significance of geographical location. Colvin observes that inland urban centres were expanding outside of their walls and owing to the relative peace there was little incentive or imperative to maintain them, aside from those along coastal regions. Yet he also acknowledges that between the medieval and early modern period the function and responsibility of civic authorities to maintain them had not in fact changed (Colvin 1982, 408).

Therefore if civic authorities continued to maintain their defences, in spite of the military threat being negligible, this provides an imperative for locally driven research as to why they were maintained at all. These authors ignore the localised context of urban defences and are seeking to place them within a wider national or European argument, which immediately leads to a distorted viewpoint that national considerations outweighed local conventions, systems of administration and maintenance. This relegates individual case studies as irrelevant to a broader narrative and dissuades the relevance of further research of individual English urban defences. Bull (2008, 84) comments that even when a town's or city's walls were brought into military action, more often than not they were neglected, ruinous, antiquated or subject to urban expansion and encroachment, such as houses abutting the walls or built within town moats. Unwittingly, Bull's dismissive notion of non-military encroachment reveals why such defences may have been maintained throughout the period, highlighting that urban defences were being actively used by their inhabitants in a heretofore understudied non-military capacity. Reed (2000, 289) also argues that town and city walls were subject to encroachments as well as 'piecemeal destruction', which should automatically alert historians to the wider issues of the re-use of

building fabric, the materiality of urban defences and the consideration of domestic or civic usage.

Within the English context of early modern defences, Crossley (1990, 106) identifies three distinct historical phases of construction and utilisation. First from 1538, a decade-long nationwide programme of new fortifications was initiated under Henry VIII, primarily toward coastal defences. Hull is one such example of these fortifications, which are considered to represent the greatest deployment of resources toward defence since the castle programmes of Edward I. Secondly, the Civil War of the 1640's witnessed many new temporary and earthwork fortifications based upon the European bastion design, in what Crossley terms 'up-to-date ideas', as well as the re-use of existing medieval defences. Thirdly, there is the refortification of sites that were modernised under Charles II, of which Hull again is a prime example. This chronology of English defensive historiography succinctly demonstrates the emphasis on key historical flashpoints such as the Civil War, as well as historical figures playing an integral part in this history, primarily Henry VIII and Charles II, who from an authoritarian perspective embodied the power of the state. Crossley likewise adheres to the notion of English defences being outmoded and subsequently modified or subsumed into new defensive modes of architecture. This thread of thought permeates all literature tending to the discussion of English defences. Certainly Henry VIII's, or rather the English, programme of new defensive works represented a clear divergence from the past in terms of architecture. However, for Creighton (2002a, 51) these new forms of defences are seen as a break from the construction and usage of castles and medieval lordships, rather than urban defences. They were used to forge a national defence policy and represented 'instruments of statecraft', which again seeks to personally identify these new defences with the person of Henry VIII himself and the role of the state. The squat, rounded and uniform design of the earlier phase of coastal defences are argued by Coad (1997, 159) to represent the royal and centralising control of the state, with this apparent uniformity suggesting that 'they sprang fully-developed from the royal

drawing office'. For example, Colvin (1982, 379) directly associates Henry VIII with the actual design of the fortifications, seeking to equate them and him with wider architectural projects within the oeuvre of Renaissance ideals of architecture that included palaces, churches and fortifications.

The evident design change of English coastal defences is defined by the development of artillery firepower harnessed within an architectural cylindrical or angled device able to support multiple platforms of cannon, rendering them as both defensive and offensive structures. Harrington (2007b, 37, 4 & 6) identifies the motivation for this programme, which by 1540 had resulted in 24 new fortifications being completed under the state's first phase across England, as reflecting the European context arising from Henry VIII's domestic policies, whose perceived external threats consequentially necessitated a programme of defence; as well as concomitantly in response to the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536 that resulted in maps being produced by military engineers for sites to be fortified. One of these sites was Hull, which had been occupied by the rebels and was held by them until December of 1536. Following their dispersal the corporation professed loyalty and Henry VIII issued a pardon for the town (Forster 1969, 92). As well as plans for new defences, the Council of the North was strengthened and permanently established within the former residence of the Abbott of St Mary's Abbey in York, the King's Manor. York also had a questionable role in the Pilgrimage of Grace as it had provided no resistance to its forces (Gurnham 2011, 33-35; Pogson 1997, 185-186); indeed the leader of those forces, Robert Aske, was hung from Clifford's Tower at York Castle in 1537 (Forster 1969, 93; RCHME 1972, 20). Combined with the implementation of an entirely new system of fortification in Hull from 1542, yet originally conceived of in 1539, and the fact that Hull regularly served as a meeting place for the Council of the North until 1556 (Harrington 2007b, 29; Forster 1969, 93), new forms of defensive architecture were not simply bound up with military considerations and combatting external threats, but part of a wider set of domestically driven measures and contexts. In the case of Hull this resulted in a new system of fortifications being constructed,

while York could be understood to have witnessed a strengthening of political and national surveillance through the permanent establishment of the Council of the North. This raises important questions and demands that further research be conducted about these structures in localised contexts, and in conjunction with wider historical narratives.

The architectural design of Hull's new defences along its eastern edge will be addressed in Chapter 3. Of note, however, is that even within ostensibly archaeological studies of this period of history, such as Crossley and Coad and other more military-centred texts, the overriding emphasis is on the deficiency of pre-existing English medieval defences, the design merits or failures of those new Henrician defences and their comparison with the 'superior' European fortifications. For example, the cylindrical form of architecture that was abandoned on the European continent, owing to the superior merits of the *Trace Italienne* angled bastion that mitigated artillery blind-spots, allows for the argument that the Henrician defences were militarily outmoded as soon as they were constructed (Crossley 1990, 109; Colvin 1982, 381). They are seen to represent a transitional period between the medieval castle and the flat angled-bastion, with the latter coming to dominate fortification design until the nineteenth century (Harrington 2007b, 52). Colvin (1982, 382-383) qualifies this assessment in terms of the transfer and adoption of new styles, tradition versus innovation, and ultimately that even brutalistic defensive architecture is subject to 'whims of taste'. Such lofty Vitruvian notions of idealised architecture and fortification theory, which dominate discussions of European fortifications, centre on the newly founded towns such as Palmanova in northern Italy with its geometric regularity, as well as the star-shaped ramparts of Paris under Louis XIV (Colvin 1982, 381; Pollak 2010a, 87; 1991b), in what O'Keefe and Yamin (2006, 93-94) describe as the unmistakable 'co-intent' of both practical military architecture and its aesthetics. Certainly there is an aesthetic argument for sixteenth and seventeenth century defensive architecture, but in terms of seeking to address wider discourses of the early modern period, aestheticism does not allow for an understanding of the

contexts of individual towns and cities. This is particularly the case in England where medieval defences were actively maintained and, in the case of Hull, existed in tandem with the new Henrician defences. In his discussion of the transition of the European continent from the medieval to the early modern period, Verhaeghe (1997, 26) identifies that often these changes or transitions have been approached archaeologically, as well as architecturally, by identifying certain categories and reductively extrapolating from them a means to explain general historical developments. It is the contention of this thesis that this has occurred detrimentally in relation to a wider understanding and consideration of early modern fortifications through the focussed study of the angled-bastion.

Another particularly English line of enquiry is expressed within Newman's *The Historical Archaeology of Great Britain c. 1540-1900*. Newman (2001, 37) argues that unlike medieval castles that were largely privately owned and multi-functional, all military buildings within the early modern period were state-sponsored and increasingly specialised. These included housing the establishment of standing military forces, the emergence and increased importance of the Royal Navy, and a concentration of specific geographical locations, such as the Highlands and borders. However, in terms of non-modernised defences, such as the medieval walls of York and Hull, which were for the vast majority of the early modern period neither administered by the state nor considered private, urban defences defy and sit uneasily within these archaeologically and historically defined limitations. This would appear to reinforce the prevailing narrative that the primary means to understand military structures is through the prism of the state, according to a totalising pan-European definition. If this approach is followed then local systems of defence, which were patently still in existence within towns and cities throughout early modern England, will be adversely overlooked.

Civic historiography within the early modern period

The preceding sections have made references to the 'state' during the early modern period in relation to France, the Dutch Republic and England, amongst others, which are historiographically recognisable states. Within a discussion of English state formation from 1550-1700, and pertinent to this thesis, Braddick (2000, 6) identifies one definition of a state as a 'coordinated and territorially bounded network of agents exercising political power'. However, he argues that this presupposes a recognisable 'centre' exercising political power, which does not allow for recognition of the importance of local institutions and government within the governing process. As was demonstrated in the European-focussed historiography discussed previously, an emphasis on the central authorities of a state engenders a focus on military considerations that obscure the domestic and internal contexts of that nation (Braddick 2000, 13). Instead, Braddick (2000, 14 & 16) proposes that whilst local government was coordinated from the centre, it was through the conduct of local offices and governments that political power was wielded, which allows for early modern government to be understood not as 'something central', but rather something that [was] extensive'. Hindle (2002, 17 & 23) likewise adopts the argument that state authority was created, negotiated and deployed through the interactions between a recognisable centre and the localities at a highly localised level. One form this localised level of authority and power took was through a civic corporation.

A charter of incorporation was granted by the monarch and established the corporate existence and constitutional foundation for urban governments, five tenets of which included the perpetual succession of that corporate body to govern, the capacity to be sued and sue as a legal entity, the ability to hold land, possess a common seal and to propagate by-laws (Halliday 1998, 33 & 35). In 1500 there were 38 incorporated English cities and boroughs, increasing to 130 by 1600 and 181 by 1640, indicating for Withington (2005c, 18 & 20) that the proliferation and systemisation of

incorporated self-governing authorities characterised this period of early modern urbanity. This proliferation of incorporated authorities can be seen as a response to the changing social and economic contexts that followed the Reformation, which had disrupted the previous institutional make-up and resources of England. In response to these pressures a delegation of urban civic autonomy with additional regulatory powers and enforcement at a local level was instituted (Tittler 2007b, 97-101; Harding 2000, 263). As well as providing greater systems of local autonomy, this also concomitantly served to bind corporations within a national structure of government (Withington 1998d, 29-30; 2005c, 53).

Heijden (2012, 4) argues that the rise of urban governments across Europe during this period informs a notion of state formation through the replacing of feudal lordships and kin relations of the medieval period, toward a rational and bureaucratic system of governance that co-opted citizens and urban communities within a national framework. This engendered a system whereby the private interests of the individual were interwoven with those interests of the community. This would support the narrative of urban authorities increasingly accruing new responsibilities in response to what Clark (2000, 8) termed the 'precarious and unstable' context of the seventeenth century, which included demographic pressures, economic stagnation, failed harvests, trade disruption, social problems, poverty and plague (Sharpe 1999, 142). Heijden's argument of interwoven interests between private individuals and the urban communities they served, is able to help undermine the prevalence of oligarchical discourses, which are so evident within the historiography (Tillott 1961, 139; Clark & Slack 1972, 23; Palliser 1979c, 91; Friedrichs 1995, 50; Tittler 1998c, 146; Hindle & Kümin, 2009, 153). Similar to the European discussion of authoritarianism with its focus on individuals, notions of a self-serving oligarchical civic elite that promoted their own interests for 'their own sort of people' (Tittler 1998c, 146) likewise undermines a holistic consideration of lower levels of civic office and participation that were key to the government of the English state.

An examination of civic office, aside from the recognisable upper echelons of civic government, such as the mayor and aldermen, is helpful in comprehending what it meant to hold civic office in an individual capacity, as well as within the wider political context and structures of the period. Certainly the evidence of 'unpaid amateur' individual officials (Sharpe 1999, 29) carrying out those duties, the instances of people seeking exemptions and refusing to hold office, as well as a corporation's response to these instances, implies a varied understanding of what civic duty, civic office and the loaded term 'citizen' possibly denoted (Halliday 1998, 36; Withington 1998d, 46). Hindle (2002, 24) argues that such local government represented 'the bottom line of early modern government', which depended upon the voluntary assumption of authority by individuals during the Elizabethan and early Stuart period. This is argued to not have represented a process of centralisation, but rather a response to the increased delegation of central authority to the localities. Braddick (2000, 77 & 83) argues that in order for such local officeholders to effectively wield authority they relied on legitimacy conferred upon them by the centre, but that they were also bound by broader cultural and social values that made them 'responsive to local, as well as central, interests'.

Whilst the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth-centuries can be understood as witnessing a proliferation of newly incorporated urban authorities and the extension of authority in pre-existing corporations, then the second half of the seventeenth century can be defined as having undergone a concerted attack on their independence and authority by the centre. Clark and Slack (1972, 24) identify the Restoration period as a 'vicious onslaught on urban political life' that was only surpassed by the attacks under the latter reign of Charles II and James II/VII, through means of *Quo Warranto*, leading to political and administrative upheaval whose effects were still manifest after the Glorious Revolution. Urban wall construction was not a precondition to corporate status, as not all incorporated towns or cities maintained urban defences. However, the correlation between the presence of urban fortifications and the number of

incorporated authorities was high, allowing for those urban walls being physically and symbolically associated with the attainment and preservation of an urban corporation's privileges and status (Creighton & Higham 2005b, 22 & 26; Friedrichs 1995, 21-23). Withington (1998d, 162 & 165) argues that York's walls represented the 'physical embodiment of civic autonomy' within the later seventeenth century, but this could arguably be applicable throughout the medieval and early modern periods. Within the historiography there is agreement that the physical appropriation of both York and Hull's urban defences by military garrisons occurred during the seventeenth century and represented a political utilization of them against the authority of their respective corporations (Tillott 1961, 192; RCHME 1972, 24; Mee & Wilson 2005a, 21; Withington 2008a, 604; Forster 1969, 112-114 & 199; Howes & Foreman 1999, 54; Binns 2007a, 153; Gurnham 2011, 80). This raises important questions about how city walls acted as a conduit not just for local and regional discourse, but also wider national and political disputes that related to incorporated authority.

In this regard there is a historically recognisable separation between the authority and motive of the centre versus the localities, within the broader definition of the English state, which does not necessarily undermine the symbiotic relationship between the two, as defined by Braddick (2000, 14 & 16). Hindle (2002, 21) describes local governments and its officers as having 'stood at the 'interface' of the state and society'. During the seventeenth century there was a diversion between the interests of the centre and the localities and their officers, described by Archer (2000, 238) as the extension of 'the crown's ambitions in local government', enabling a discussion of the tensions between them. Within this thesis the use of the term 'state' refers to the central government as a distinct form of authority, which through the ensuing analysis can justifiably be considered as distinguishable from the local corporations of York and Hull. For Braddick (2000, 281 & 283) the cause of this rupture related to the military functions of the state, following the Civil War of the 1640's, which 'transformed the capacity of government to mobilise for war' and conflated previously

distinct functions, those of defence and policing. Whereas prior to 1640 there were broad structural and administrative limitations for military demands focussed within the localities, post-1640 specialised agencies were created that were funded from national taxation and appropriated away from the localities traditional military functions (Braddick 2000, 283 & 285). Manifest from this development was the increased role of garrisons, a feature of post 1640 that is identified within the historiography as a recognised feature by which the state sought to undermine the authority of individual corporations.

Braddick (2000, 283, 433 & 435) argues that these military and institutional reforms were a conscious development by the state to police potential 'domestic subversion' and impose fiscal and military demands upon localities. Bound up with these developments is the notion of the professionalization and specialisation of offices to meet these new demands. These centred on a newly instituted systemisation of salaries, remuneration, remit and legal delineation of powers, leading to the establishment of 'specialised, bureaucratic, differentiated institutions' that were in marked contrast to the situation pre-1640 and its reliance on non-salaried and voluntary officials (Braddick 2000, 285; Sharpe 1999, 29). The notion of 'professional', within a debate over professionalization, is not an anachronistic definition within the early modern period. For example, The Oxford English Dictionary identifies one definition derived from 1606 as: 'of a person or persons: that engages in a specified occupation or activity for money or as a means of earning a living, rather than as a pastime; contrasted with amateur'; a second definition with its antecedents from 1654 and 1663 states: 'relating to, connected with, or befitting a (particular) profession or calling; preliminary or necessary to the practice of a profession' (<http://www.oed.com>). A key consequence of these reforms and professionalization was that with the adoption of salaried offices, thereby representing a form of income specific to an activity, would counter charges of corruption and confer legitimacy upon the office holders (Braddick 2000, 285). The local civic offices that will be discussed within the thesis,

particularly those within Chapter 4, will seek to address a discernible pattern of professionalization for those offices whose remit related to their respective urban defences. It will be argued that a move away from amateur officials to professional officers is evident from the documentary material, in conjunction with those developments identified by Braddick post-1640, but that it was also a locally instituted process that pre-dated 1640.

York and Hull achieved corporate status in 1396 and 1440 respectively and these charters formed the basis of their governance during the early modern period and beyond (Palliser 1979c, 41; Allison & Tillott 1969, 3). The corporations each constituted thirteen aldermen, of which one would serve as the annually elected mayor, as well as two sheriffs who would govern their urban centres on behalf of the crown as corporate boroughs and counties in their own right, with oversight of all financial, judicial and administrative matters. In the case of York, the title of 'lord' was a prefix that was only accorded to one other corporation, that of the lord mayor of London, and indicated the perceived or symbolic role of York as the second city of England (Gurnham 2011, 20-21; Palliser 1979c, 41 & 65). Each town or city's charter, whilst largely similar, also had variants and localised offices. For example, within Hull from 1452 the town acquired the right to hold the office of deputy to the Admiral of England, which allowed an Admiralty Court to be held and the ability of the town to search foreign ships within its haven (Gurnham 2011, 21). Following the transfer of ownership over the Henrician defences to the town in 1553 and until the mid-seventeenth century, the mayor of Hull would also carry the title of governor of the town and its defences (Howes & Foreman 1999, 16).

In York a separate civic group, known as the Twenty-Four, was a consultative body to the mayor and aldermen drawn from the freemen of the city, which in 1517 was augmented by the creation of a supplementary body known as the Forty-Eight, which drew its members from thirteen of the major and fifteen of the minor crafts. When all bodies met this was known as the Common Council and it convened when summoned and for the

annual election of officials, with real power however ultimately vested in and exercised by the lord mayor and aldermen (Swanson 1980b, 11; Tillott 1961, 138). Within Hull, a body referred to as the Commons or Commonalty was convened on certain occasions, such as the election of Members of Parliament, but not generally for consultation regarding the formal administration of the town (Allison 1969b, 36). Within this thesis the term Council will denote York's mayoral and aldermanic authorities, whilst the term Bench will denote Hull's. Such terminology is predicated on terms used within the archival and documentary materials of the early modern period and as a means to distinguish their primacy from other less notable consultative bodies that existed within their systems of governance. Mee and Wilson (2002b, 51) surmise the responsibilities of corporations as being to preserve the rights and interests of their citizens, to maintain a balance between orders from the State and local considerations, as well as guard against perceived threats to their independence from other forms of authority. Practically, their responsibilities also included: supervising civic and parochial office-holding, finance and taxation, the admittance of freemen, trade and industrial regulation, the provision of public services, such as the poor law, gaols and sewers, and the maintenance of public and civic property including the streets, bridges, roads, housing and urban defences (Tillott 1961, 178).

Described as the 'professional element' of incorporated governance by Forster (1969, 125-126), the office of recorder acted as the legal adviser and consultant over corporate jurisdiction, privileges and interests, assisted by a common clerk or solicitor. Existing alongside these 'professional' elements was a multitude of different and often salaried and non-salaried, voluntary civic offices that are regularly referenced within the archival material. These included the chamberlains with responsibility for an authority's monetary accounts and finances, retainers of the mayoral office known as the sword and mace bearers, officials responsible for rent collection and property maintenance, and lesser offices such as a cook or bell ringer, amongst others. Below these corporate systems were also the structures of the

wards, parishes, guilds and quarter sessions that provided yet more systems of administration and civic offices (Withington 2005c, 97-98). Within York, from the 1520's until the nineteenth century, there were four wards headed by an alderman and one or two constables who were responsible for their administration in conjunction with the parish clerks and churchwardens; the names of the wards corresponded to their proximity to the four gates or bars of the city, namely Micklegate, Bootham, Monk and Walmgate Wards. Within Hull there were six wards assigned to the administration of two aldermen, and which were named Humber, Austin, Trinity, Whitefriar, St Mary and North Wards (Allison & Tillott 1969, 3). Again there would also have then been corresponding parish clerks and churchwardens. The litany of civic duties that are identifiable within the documentary material helps to engender a sense of the wider civic participation in government, removed from the upper strata and offices of the mayor and aldermen.

Samson (1992, 35, 37-38) argues that a medieval town or city's walls, by extension also during the early modern period, were a necessary and reinforcing instrument for the maintenance of social, economic and political relations for power and authority by allowing or denying entry, which in the majority of cases was harnessed to create favourable economic conditions for the individuals who constituted self-serving monopolistic mercantile oligarchies. For Samson, urban centres eventually became 'unwalled' through the development of capitalism, whereby capital wealth superseded the previous emphasis on the monopoly and control of movement, thereby critically portraying the general existence of urban defences as reinforcing oligarchic forms of authority. To study the perceived limited historical examples of attempts to circumvent this civic authority is considered 'unbalanced' and leads to the false proposition that walls can 'be the object of study and thus can have a history of their own' (Samson 1992, 42). Hartshorne's (2004, 221, 215) research on public space within York from 1476 to 1586, also highlights the economic function of the city's walls and the existence of clearly delineated defences as an 'impulse toward common experience and protection'; political control was exerted over them in times

of military defensive crises, as well as political unrest, epidemics and perceived threats to social order. Indeed, for Giles (2003, 334) this period represents a long-term process of political, economic and ideological change, characterised by an overwhelming concern with secular authority, social and moral order and one that fundamentally transformed the relationship between those governing from those that they sought to govern. Hindle (2002, 35) characterises this as 'social control' perpetuated by the state through legislation, but which was dependent upon local co-operation.

This dependency on local governments and populations to adhere to such social control and policies can help to identify the potential utilisation of urban defences. For example, Hartshorne (2004, 224) identifies that within late-medieval York the city's walls can be understood as having helped define and differentiate 'between a 'good' and moral centre, and the otherness of the margin' for defining social and cultural boundaries. For the historiographically recognised incursions by the state upon civic authority to have occurred during the seventeenth century, through the appropriation of urban defences, this relies upon recognising that urban defences were integral to the governance and identity of those civic communities. Tittler (2007b, 101) identifies the potential significance of 'external relations' upon civic bodies during this period and the need for local governments to defend and legitimise their authority. This inculcated a civic culture that sought to project 'an overall image of political authority, civic virtue and institutional identity for the community itself' (Tittler 2007b, 101). Therefore a potentially vast discourse needs to be analysed of the context and utilisation of defences prior to the 1640's and subsequently, and the relationship between three vying groups: the civic authorities, its citizens and the state. It is the contention of this thesis that walls do indeed have a history, one that has heretofore been underutilised for the study of the early modern period and limited to historical flashpoints, such as the Civil War, the political contexts of the Restoration and subsequent Glorious Revolution.

The historical and administrative context of York saw it relegated from the second wealthiest provincial town in 1334, down to fifteenth by the first quarter of the sixteenth century (Tillot 1961, 122). This is argued to have been in response to a shift away from manufacturing and the decline of its textile industry, towards an administrative and 'service-based economy', adhering to Borsay's (1989, 30-31) chronological identification of early modern civic investment catering to social interests, which by the eighteenth century were 'critical to York's livelihood'. Palliser (1978b, 110-115) argues that York had experienced economic contraction during the latter fifteenth and early sixteenth-centuries, but was able to avoid 'total economic collapse' and experienced a recovery, owing to its inherent assets as a centre of economic exchange for local economies and its position within the North as a whole. Combined with its role as a centre of administration and well-established system of local government through its corporation, York was able to maintain an elevated position, but one that was much reduced from its medieval position as the second-city of England (Palliser 1978b, 111-115). Within the North of England only Newcastle with a population of 16,000 was comparable to York's 12,000 by 1700 (Borsay, 1989, 18), and Walton (2000, 122) argues that York was unrivalled as the regional political capital. York's early modern administrative functions consisted of numerous bodies, both national and local in remit: nationally, the Council of the North and its royally appointed president were based in York, as the provincial capital of Yorkshire, from 1539 until its abolition in 1641; the Ecclesiastical Commission for the Northern Province was established by Elizabeth I in 1561; the county sheriffs held biennial courts for the territory known as the Ainsty around York, a monthly county court, and tri-weekly court of common pleas; York Minster was the seat of the archdiocese and administrative centre of the Anglican Church in the north of England; and from 1647 a nationally appointed military governor and garrison were based in York (Colvin 1982, 355 & 363; Hartshorne 2004, 53; Palliser 1978b, 122; Palliser 1979c, 53 & 79; Mee & Wilson 2005a, 20-21). Tillot (1961, 118) argues that owing to its relatively static population during the period, York did not experience any major urban expansion, while

similarly Palliser (1979c, 28) identifies that the corporation undertook no major civic building programmes either, prior to 1700.

Hull's civic origins are credited to the development of the port and town, originally founded by Meaux Abbey as a commercial hub in the twelfth century, from 1293 when it came into the ownership of Edward I during his campaigns in the North of England and Scotland (Allison 1969b, 11 & 21). Allison (1969b, 21) argues that at this time York was recognised as the administrative centre of Edward I, while Hull acted as the principal military supply port. The military significance of Hull was again apparent during the 1320's, as witnessed by its licence from Edward II to construct a town wall, an event that is argued by Howes and Foreman (1999, 4) to have symbolically and physically represented its powers of self-government. During the fourteenth century Hull's position enabled it to be the foremost port on the east coast for the export of wool and cloth, as well as importation of wine, through its overseas trade (Allison 1969a, 1). In 1609 the value of the town's exporting of cloth stood at £109,000, which by 1640 had increased to £166,000 and following the disruption of the Civil War the town was able to re-establish its trade (Gurnham 2011, 58). By 1700 Hull was comparable with other large ports and dockyards, including Yarmouth, Plymouth, Ipswich, Portsmouth and Liverpool, with its extensive internal navigation systems stretching to York, Leeds, Wakefield, Derby and Lincoln (Borsay 1989, 24-25). This increase in trade ran concurrently with an increase in Hull's population, rising from 7,000 in 1700 to 13,000 by the 1760's (Borsay 1989, 24). As a direct consequence of Hull's economic development its fortifications would come to be demolished during the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries and is addressed in Chapter 3. Of note, however, is the renewed military significance of Hull as a strategic site under Henry VIII in the 1540's, during the Civil War of the 1640's and from the 1680's with the construction of the new state-driven fortifications, known as the Citadel.

From the historiography it is possible to observe the chronological trajectory of York and Hull during the early modern period, and particularly the focus that is afforded to their post-Reformation post-1700 development. The former developed as a provincial centre whose economy and prosperity depended upon its role as an administrative and 'fashionable metropolis...devoted to leisure' (Borsay 1989, 30-31), while the latter saw growth in its commercial and industrial interests. These divergent developments would ultimately come to impact upon either the retention or demolition of their respective urban defences during the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries, but the main focus of this thesis is their utilisation prior to 1700. This thesis has chosen to focus on the case studies of York and Hull for a multitude of reasons: geographically they are in close proximity and were subject to similar social, political and economic pressures; each operated within the same legal framework of an incorporated government and therefore shared systems of authority; they each maintained their medieval urban defences throughout the early modern period; both are historiographically recognised to have been subject to encroachments upon their authority by the state during the seventeenth century, through the appropriation of their defences; the presence of new fortifications within Hull and not in York provides a comparison as to the potential ramifications of a town possessing them, or not, during the period; and finally, detailed research will enable the differences and similarities between both sites to be comprehended as each corporation reacted to the social, political and economic contexts of the early modern period. The thesis will build on the interpretive approach of Creighton and Higham (2005b, 139) regarding medieval defences that recognises the 'multifunctional features' of town walls that are evident within their surviving architecture and archaeology, as well as the documentary record.

Within previous research, such as Hartshorne (2004) and Withington (1998d), the interpretation of urban defences was analysed to inform upon the civic context of York from 1476-1586 and 1649-1688 respectively. Tittler (2007b) provides a means of comprehending the role of civic

architecture during the early modern period, and particularly post-Reformation, towards issues of identity and authority up to the 1640's, while Borsay's (1989) research is focussed on the classical influences upon domestic and civic architecture post-Restoration but particularly post-1700 and well in to the eighteenth century. Unlike the work of Creighton and Higham (2005b), there is as yet no research that seeks to study English early modern urban defences within a protracted period of time outside of the periods defined by previous authors. Braddick (2000, 99) utilises 1550-1700 as an appropriate, yet 'arbitrary', starting point in his discussion on early modern English state formation. However, he also qualifies that this period encompasses 'a long trend in the relationship between population and resources, with the consequent effect on social relations', such as the establishment of a protestant identity in the 1560's, the union of the crowns between Scotland and England, and the perceived military changes of the 1640's and 1690's (Braddick 2000, 436-437). Even though social regulation from 1550-1640 is recognised as having had its antecedents in the fourteenth and fifteenth-centuries, this thesis subscribes to Braddick's (2000, 436-437) rationale that the period 1550-1700 is able to comprehend such developments within its 'chronological limits', whilst recognising that analysis of this period can be 'extended both forwards and backwards'. In seeking to build upon such works, the thesis will assert the crucial role that urban defences were able to perform within the post-medieval period and definitively counter the perception that early modern English urban defences were merely military-obsolete and ruinous relics.

Methodology and sources

The methodological approach of this study adheres to the broadly defined term of historical archaeology for the post-medieval period, which is generally dated to c.1450-1750 (Hicks & Beaudry 2006, 3). This approach is underlined by seeking to combine both the material and immaterial aspects of research within broader narratives of 'rich and nuanced local stories', (Hicks & Beaudry 2006, 4) through both documentary and surviving material records (O'Keefe & Yamin 2006, 102). Lucas (2006, 38) recognises that with the availability of documentary and archival evidence, historical archaeology can often lead to an overemphasis on localised studies that are able to only temporally discuss the histories of individuals or households. Within historical archaeology Lucas (2006, 39) argues that there needs to be a balance between recognising wider narratives and avoiding 'totalising' histories, be that national, pan-European or global in outlook, which relegate the significance of local and particular studies. Conversely, the downgrading of grand narratives can lead to highly specific and reductive methodological approaches (Lucas 2006, 39). This thesis seeks to avoid either extreme through the research of the two case studies of York and Hull. Four research questions underline the aims of this thesis: what was the architectural legacy of medieval walls and how was this developed and maintained during the early modern period? How were the walls administered and what can this reveal about the professionalization of office holders and the corporations they served? What were the uses and meanings of urban defences pertaining to defensive, economic, social and political considerations? And how were the walls able to reflect and inform the aspirations and mentality of incorporated governments as an emerging social and political entity?

The most comprehensive assessment of York's surviving urban defences was carried out by the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments of England (RCHME) and presented in the subsequent publication, *An inventory of the historical monuments in the city of York, vol II: the defences in*

1972. The RCHME primarily sought to document the surviving structures' material and architectural qualities and their development over a period of nearly 2,000 years. Having examined the holdings relating to York at English Heritage's National Monument Record Centre (NMRC) located in Swindon, it was determined that there was very little that advanced upon the information that was already within the research of the RCHME. Indeed, many of the records at the NMRC appeared to have been directly related to the work of the RCHME. Analysis by the RCHME is largely confined to the architectural features of the defences, with limited historical analysis of the documentary sources themselves. Considering the survival of York's urban defences and their excellent state of preservation, it is unsurprising that the architectural remains form the basis of archaeological and survey work relating to them. In conjunction with the work of the RCHME (1972), the primary method deployed within the thesis was a photographic survey of the entirety of York's defensive structures', which was then subject to visual analysis. Within Chapter 2 this provides an analytical record of the surviving architecture of York's defences, with reference made to, and informed by, the available sources and documentary evidence for a reanalysis of the surviving data. Combining the architectural, archaeological and documentary evidence will allow for a greater understanding of the defences utilisation that has been obscured by later restoration phases and may have left no physical traces.

In contrast to York, the single attempt to analyse the architectural entirety of Hull's now demolished *enceinte* is within the 1969 *A History of the County of York Volume I: the city of Kingston upon Hull*. In the text an analysis of the *enceinte* only warranted nine pages of discussion (Allison 1969a) within a collaborative compendium of Hull's recorded history up to the twentieth century. Gurnham (2011) likewise seeks to produce a totalising narrative of the town's history into the twenty-first century. Howes and Foreman's (1999) research on the construction of Hull's state-endorsed Citadel during the later seventeenth century underlines the availability and potential of archival material for that period. Their work was informed upon by earlier

archaeological excavation work carried out on the Citadel by Foreman earlier in 1987, which resulted in the publication *Hull Citadel 1988*. Within the archaeological report and prior to the findings, Foreman (1988) notes that 'only a cursory examination of secondary sources was carried out', but that 'a more thorough programme of documentary research would yield more information on the construction and use of the Citadel'.

The excavation of the site was carried out on behalf of Hull City Council that preceded the approval of the Victoria Dock Scheme development (Foreman 1988, 19-20). The main objectives were to identify the position of the defences to facilitate their preservation, determine the extent of their survival, and to detail the construction of those areas within the development site. Archaeological investigations on the Henrician defences had been conducted in 1970 and 1976, leading to its designation as a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Foreman 1988, 2), but it was not until 1987 that the extent of the Citadel's survival was realised. This revealed that rather than being thoroughly demolished, the masonry and ramparts had only been reduced to ground level, leaving over half of the structure and their entire foundations intact (Howes & Foreman 1999, 174). Aside from rediscovering the siting of the Citadel and its degree of survival, one of the main conclusions drawn by Foreman (1988, 71) was the increased understanding of its significance for the development for civil engineering and the techniques and principles of the 'military architect'. Prior to Howes and Forman's later examination of the documentary evidence in 1999, the initial significance of the Citadel and Hull's defences had therefore focussed on its military and architectural qualities. Even within the later publication this focus is still apparent, but the documentary evidence furthers our understanding of the Citadel within its inception and construction during the political context of the later seventeenth century. However, little emphasis is afforded to the significance of Hull's medieval defences that existed in tandem with the Citadel and earlier Henrician defences. Given the extent of Hull's intact corporate records it seems inexplicable that greater

research has not been afforded to comprehending the medieval defences, Henrician works and Citadel, as a whole.

Unlike York, at Hull it is not possible to conduct a visual analysis, as no extant defensive structures surviving above ground. The chronology of the eventual demolition of Hull's urban defences is discussed in Chapter 3, but their demise is regarded as a consequence of 'unyielding pressures of commercial enterprise' (Hull City Council 1987, 5) from the eighteenth century onwards and the development of dockyards that followed the line of the walls. The heavily developed nature of Hull makes it challenging to access archaeological evidence. This was typified by the excavation work carried out in 1986 to locate the remains of one of Hull's principal town gates, Beverley Gate, prior to the development of a new City Centre Pedestrianisation Scheme (Hull City Council 1987, 2). The exact location of the Gate and its state of preservation was unknown and the chosen excavation site 'lay at the heart of one of the busiest pedestrian thoroughfares in the town' (Hull City Council 1987, 2). Access to sections of the surviving remains had occurred in 1964 and 1969, following excavations for drainage and service works, that combined with the 1986 excavations revealed that the walls and gates had been constructed in front of a pre-existing clay rampart (Hull City Council 1987, 7-8). Another conclusion able to be drawn was that Beverley Gate had been constructed as a free-standing structure, separate from the adjoining walls, which allows for a chronology of their construction to be recognised and that the medieval defences were 'built as part of an integrated programme of construction' (Hull City Council 1987, 16-17). In spite of these conclusions drawn from the excavations, the fact remains that when they were demolished they were reduced to below ground level, which necessitates the utilisation of pictorial evidence for visual analysis, such as Wenceslas Hollar's engraving of the town from 1640 (Hull City Council 1987, 6 & 19). In Chapter 3 the thesis relies upon Hollar's engraving to be able to carry out a visual analysis, combined with the documentary evidence and archaeological findings, to recreate their appearance and form during the early modern period. In lieu of the

structures' having survived, excavation work by Foreman (1988) and Hull City Council has highlighted the importance of documentary and pictorial evidence. Therefore, of particular relevance to this research is the necessary utilisation of non-physical evidence.

Within historical archaeology Newman (2001, 4) identifies that a division between the medieval and post-medieval periods is possible owing to the growth of the documentary records from the mid-sixteenth century onwards. Written in the vernacular, rather than Latin, they are seen to record more aspects of the social, economic and everyday contexts of life that stand 'in marked contrast' to those created pre-1550. Yet, they are still 'dominated by the elite' owing to literacy levels and the exigency of such records, originating as they did from those very same elites (Newman 2001, 4). Tittler (1998c, 216-217) also recognises this shift from Latin to the vernacular as being apparent within central government and the localities, as well as the increased bureaucracy and desire to 'perpetuate the record of administrative acts and decisions covering the whole spectrum of local administration' (Tittler 1998c, 214). There is some debate about the merit of documentary evidence within archaeology, leading Newman to argue that the growth of the documentary record for the post-medieval period should provide 'a context, but not a strait-jacket'. Wilkie (2006, 14-15 & 18) recognises the problematic nature of documents, which may lead to either their dismissal or over-dependence, but that ultimately, it is through such records that the social political and economic contexts of sites are able to provide insights for archaeologists. For Hindle (2002, 238) and his work on the English state and social change, the documentary evidence provides individual 'fascinating episodes' to reveal evidence of disputes, but that more broadly such evidence has wider significance for 'us to understand not just *what happened...but what was going on*' during the early modern period.

Held in the York Archives and Local History Library (YALH) and Hull City Archives (HCA) are their respective surviving early modern civic records. The minutes of the corporations' governing bodies, known as the House

Books in York and the Bench Books at Hull, reveal their proceedings throughout the period and were examined in their entirety to form the basis of this body of research. These were systematically transcribed and subsequently thematically organised. The minutes are formulaic in their layout, with each meeting of the Council and Bench respectively recording the date, regnal year, identity of the lord mayor or mayor and the aldermen in attendance. Entries begin with a general statement, such as 'Assembled in the Counsell Chamber upon Owse Bridge the daye and yeare above sayde, When and wher yt ys agreed' (YALH B29, 10r) that is then followed by the proceedings and orders of the corporations. Owing to the variety of responsibilities of the corporations during this period there is no discernable pattern or order of precedence of the matters discussed. Some entries are brief, no more than a single sentence or one folio, whereas others may be dozens of folios in length. The thesis will retain the original dates of the sources according to the pre-Gregorian calendar, in which 25th March represented the start of the New Year, and will also preserve the contemporary spelling of the period. All of the primary archival references that have been referenced are preserved in their entirety within the full body of transcriptions that the author has produced and are arranged within the accompanying material, according to the ordering established in the bibliography (See Item 1 & 3-4).

Once transcribed, these records represented three hundred years of York and Hull's combined civic governmental history and administration. From this it was possible, as well as necessary considering the vast amount of data, to identify and catalogue the evidence into nine broad categories: leases, plague, ritual, repairs and building projects, walls officials, punishments and misdemeanours, war, officialdom and disputes. Within each category there were then several sub-categories. For example, within the category defined as the walls for the Hull documents there are thirteen sub-categories: posterns, towers and houses; moats; bridges; gates; the Garrison Ground; walls; Castle, Blockhouses and Citadel; repairs; safety measures; military officials; ordinance, arms and munitions; national

interference post-Civil War; and individual officials. Under the category of officialdom there is: elections; disenfranchisements and dismissals; the mayor; aldermen; sheriff; chamberlain; burgesses; documents and proclamations; debts; fines for exemption from office; recorder; high steward; miscellaneous offices; charters; common officer; miscellaneous; Civil War and Interregnum; and Restoration. From such examples it is possible to appreciate the amount of detail that the records of the House and Bench Books were able to provide, as well as the recognised importance within the thesis of the wider context of the defences toward the broader civic, local and national administration of the respective sites.

Owing to the length of time under consideration, combined with the large body of data acquired from a single source type, emphasis was placed on these records to the detriment of other available sources. This was more apparent for York, whose archival materials are better catalogued when compared to Hull's repositories. For example, there are chamberlain accounts covering the citywide expenses of York's corporation during this period that could have revealed the financial costs of the defences. However, the ability to carry out such research and produce relevant calculations was inhibited by time constraints and the sheer enormity of the data. Financial records were transcribed for York, but only those that related to the leasing accounts (Item 5-8). Owing to the variability in the surviving documents, it would not have been possible to transcribe them in their entirety from 1550-1700. Instead, where a complete record survived for every decade it was transcribed, allowing for a record of York's leasing accounts from the 1550's to the 1680's. Once transcribed it was again necessary to categorise the material and identifiable typology of the civic leases, which comprised: mural leases, meaning the actual defences or their environs, such as the moats; mural leases combined with a tenement; a single tenement; tenements and land; a commercial property or shop; a shop and tenement; land leases; and a miscellaneous category, which included long standing guild or craft payments to the civic authorities. This allowed the defences to be quantified in terms of their monetary value, as well as their comparison

to the city's wider stock of property. The detail of the records also provided the names of individual tenants, which theoretically would allow future research to plot the leasing of the defences and place them within a wider context, removed from purely military considerations. The conclusions that can be drawn from analysing the leasing accounts are addressed specifically within Chapter 5.

Emerging from the documentary evidence during the course of this research was the ability to trace individuals and officeholders in a biographical manner, often over several years or even decades. This enabled our understanding of historiographically recognised offices, as well as heretofore-unrecognised ones, to be revealed further, as well as their perceived professionalization during the period to be charted within wider notions of early modern civic office (Braddick 2000, 285). This is particularly evident within Chapter 4, but it is not the intention or within the bounds of this thesis, owing to the length of time under discussion, to apply the same level of forensic bibliographical and prosopographical research of individuals at Hull, as Withington (1998d) was able to achieve at York. He was able to reconstruct the local and national political culture, machinations and grievances within the context of later seventeenth-century York, but within a far smaller time period. This represents a weakness of the methodology within the thesis as it relies largely on a single source of evidence, the House and Bench Books, over a protracted 150-year period. Yet, it is able to demonstrate the value of the documentary evidence for future research, that like Withington (1998d) could take into account other sources and follow specific individuals within a shorter time frame.

However, within this thesis and archaeology more broadly, the role of biographical studies is recognised by figures such as Lucas (2006) and Mytum (2010). For Lucas (2006, 41) the availability of documentary sources means that 'quite detailed connections can be drawn between specific people and their material remains', which creates 'very personal and human accounts' within broader themes, in spite of the problematic nature of

directly connecting archaeological remains with documented persons and households. Mytum (2010, 242) discusses the applicability of biographical studies to 'anything from a small find to a landscape' that could combine the biographies of a site with the biographies of inhabitants over centuries. He argues that archaeological reports generally regard sites or landscapes as 'neutral, unproblematic and situated equally in past and present', which then fail to take account of the potential contemporary meanings of a site that would have affected and 'created actions and performances in and around them' (Mytum 2010, 244). This approach lies at the heart of this research methodology and accords with Mytum's (2010, 244) argument that the combination of archaeological and documentary sources allows for a greater understanding of individual or group agency, within the 'physical and socio-cultural structures within which people operate[d] in any particular historical context'. This is particularly relevant within Chapter 5 for highlighting the interactions of individuals and groups with the physical structures of their urban defences, which is more than mere historical anecdotal evidence or as Mytum (2010, 244) would term, 'stereotypical pastiche'. The 'biographical' work within the thesis relies upon the emergence of individuals within the documentary evidence, and whilst unable to trace individuals prosopographically, it helps to illuminate the physical utilisations and meanings of them that an analysis of their physical structure alone would be unable to reveal.

The evidence also comprises late seventeenth through to nineteenth century prints, paintings, sketches and maps. These sources provide pictorial evidence of the now vanished or demolished sections of the urban defences and complement the archival evidence, countering the impression that is presented following periods of either restoration or demolition. This is particularly key to the reconstruction of Hull's now demolished urban defences. The prints and sketches of Francis Place and William Lodge, dating to the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-centuries, are particularly significant as visual renderings of the physical fabric and topography of the city and its walls. Heretofore such works have emphasised the pictorial

evidence as providing support for the supposition, as argued by Borsay (1989) and others, that post-1660 York 'entered into an age of elegance, entertainment and culture' and the beginnings of eighteenth century antiquarianism (Green, R et al. 1990, 10 & 1), rather than as evidence of their architectural form and historical contexts in which they were rendered.

Through the architectural, archival, archaeological and pictorial evidence, this thesis will seek to demonstrate the relevance of researching and comparing the early modern urban centres of York and Hull, through the conduit of their respective urban defences.

Structure of the study

In Chapter 1 the historiographical background and rationale of the thesis has been outlined, particularly in respect of the dearth of historical works that fully recognise and comprehend the significance of English urban defences during the early modern period. Chapters 2 and 3 systematically chronicle the architecture of York and Hull's *enceintes*, interweaving the archival and architectural evidence and their historical developments. Within Chapter 4 a detailed analysis and reconstruction of the officials and systems of maintenance responsible for the defences is discussed. The reform, development and perceived professionalization of these officials are able to inform on the wider context of York and Hull's administration and their priorities, which counter the prevailing historiography, including the maintenance of their urban defences throughout the period under discussion. Chapter 5 seeks to elucidate and extrapolate from the archival evidence the commonplace utilisation and meaning of the defences within the context of their urban governments and populations. The thesis concludes by arguing that an understanding of the local, historically-specific and particular uses and meanings of urban defences lies at the heart of developing a fuller understanding of the materiality of early modern forms of civic governance. The approach piloted in this thesis has the potential to

be extended not only within England, but also in Europe. Only then can the complex political, social and symbolic significance of this important aspect of European urban heritage be fully understood and appropriately preserved and interpreted in the future.

Chapter 2- Architectural analysis and the building phases
of York's city defences

Introduction

York's city walls primarily consist of white magnesium limestone blocks quarried from Tadcaster, enclosing an area of 263 acres and a perimeter of 2.5 miles (RCHME 1972, 3). In terms of size, the area within York's walls was over three times as large as Hull. A map of York's defences (Figure 1) highlights that they are not a continuous circuit but rather four distinct areas that also harnessed natural features of the landscape. These include the River Ouse, Foss and the large but now silted body of water known as the King's Fishpool to the north-east of the city, which all affected the siting of the defences. As seen in Figure 1, the north-western section of the defences lay on the foundation of the Roman fortress, with subsequent developments including the enclosing of the city with an earthen rampart and outer moats in the ninth century and two castles in the eleventh century (RCHME 1972, 57). From 1250 to 1270 the defences south of the Ouse and west of the Foss were begun and completed, with the circuit around Walmgate not constructed until after 1345 (RCHME 1972, 57-58). The period under discussion, 1550-1700, witnessed no substantial additions to the circuit, apart from rebuilding, conservation and alterations, unlike the two refortification phases witnessed at Hull (See Item 10, pp. 1-2, Tabulation of building, demolition and restoration programmes).

Building on the work of the RCHME in 1972, what follows is a detailed assessment and analysis of the defences' surviving architecture, combined with an integration of the documentary evidence where appropriate. The defences are referenced according to the conventions established by the RCHME (1972) and followed by others, including Mee and Wilson (2005a), with each tower identified numerically along the circuit. An understanding of the physical structure and material properties of the defences are an essential foundation for comprehending the significance of a largely

medieval structure that was utilised throughout the early modern period. This is aided by the archival material as well as historical artistic renderings of the defences. Key themes to be considered are the degree of material continuity of the defences over the centuries, the role of nineteenth century restoration for their appearance and interpretation, and the degree to which the material record and primary sources are able to complement and contribute to our understanding of York's defences from 1550-1700 and beyond. Many of the architectural features are likely to have been shared by both York and Hull, though it is only with the former that the structure of the defences has survived, even if altered and restored.

Analysis begins with Skeldergate postern on the eastern edge of the defences within Micklegate and continues clockwise around the circuit, culminating in Davy Tower (Figure 1). The defences of York Castle and the precinct walls of St Mary's Abbey will be given individual consideration, for they were administratively distinct from those defences administered by York's corporation.

York's enceinte

Skeldergate Postern and Tower

Skeldergate Postern consisted of a circular tower and adjoining postern next to the south bank of the River Ouse. First referenced in 1403, the tower was 23 feet in diameter with a battered base, a large equal-armed cruciform arrow slit and a conical tiled roof. From 1380 a chain is referenced as being able to be stretch across the river north to the corresponding Davy Tower to stop the passage of vessels (RCHME 1972, 90), a feature also once evident at the mouth of the River Hull. The postern was first referenced in 1315 and consisted of a single pointed arch and a single gate flanked on either side by a small round turret. From 1550-1700 there is no distinction made within the records between the tower and postern and it is simply referred to as Skeldergate Postern. In 1807 the postern was demolished following a partial collapse of the structure and to facilitate the construction of Skeldergate Bridge, the remaining tower and city wall up to Baile Hill were demolished in 1878 (RCHME 1972, 90-91).

In March 1638/39 aldermen were appointed to survey Skeldergate Postern and certify if it was suitable to lease to Elizabeth Stockdale to build upon (YALH B36, 6r). In January 1641/42 Stockdale is recorded within the House Books as 'being the keeper of Skeldergate postern and there hath built a house at her owne charge' and was to receive vi s. a year for life (YALH B36, 64v). As this was a structure privately funded and executed independently from the Council, there are no surviving accounts recording the cost, materials or workmen used by Stockdale. However, oversight by civic officials would have at least occurred in the intervening three years, from initial consideration to completion of the building work. The building work on the postern would have warranted the approval of the authorities, with their granting an annuity a sign of approval.

Whilst there are no accounts of the construction, a detail of Stockdale's house is depicted in Edmond Barker's 1718 etching, *The South-East Prospect of the Ancient City of York* (Figure 2). The etching shows that (between the tower and postern) a tiled gable-roofed structure with three chimneys had been constructed. The structure appears to have been at least two-storeys high and had utilized the existing crenellations of the city wall for the insertion of three windows on the first floor. Of note is that the tower has a flat roof, rather than a conical roof as suggested by the RCHME (1972, 90). Given the proximity of the building to the tower and postern it can be assumed that Stockdale may also have occupied and incorporated it into the new structure. By the time the etching was created, Stockdale's original structure would have been 77 years old, with alterations and repairs likely to have been carried out following the Civil War and simply over time, such as the insertion of more chimneys or replacement of the roof. However, the Council's use of the term 'build on' rather than against Skeldergate Postern in 1638/39 (YALH B36, 6r) suggests that this was a reasonably substantial building. The 1718 etching provides the best source of seventeenth century construction that incorporated this section of the city's defences, with similar buildings constructed around Beverley Gate in Hull built directly in to the existing defences (Figure 83).

Wall from Tower 1 to Tower 5

The original wall was built under the direction of Archbishop William Melton from 1317 to 1340, with masons' marks visible intermittently on the first, second, third and fourth courses (RCHME 1972, 91). This section surrounds the motte and bailey of the former Old Baile Castle and within the records the demolished castle and land is referred to as Old Baile. The land of the Old Baile was leased regularly throughout the period 1550-1700, within one lease from January 1585/86 stipulating that any future leases of the ground would not to be sublet 'to a stranger' (YALH B29, 69v). The use of the term stranger applied to non-citizens of the city, indicating that renting parts of the defence was only to be accorded to the city's citizens.

Characteristic of this section of wall is the distinction between the irregular coursing of the lower sections, compared to the regular sized stone of the parapet with its regularly spaced crenellations above (Figure 3). This level of coursing correlates with the height of the internal wall-walk that was largely constructed during restoration in 1831-32 (RCHME 1972, 90). The uniformity of the crenellations is a marked feature of the entire wall from Tower 1 to Micklegate Bar, implying that the restoration and construction of the wall-walk and parapet created a uniformity of design that may not have existed previously.

Tower 1

Tower 1 is a wholly nineteenth century semi-octagonal structure with a crenellated parapet constructed in 1878 as a terminal for the wall-walk steps descending from Baile Hill (RCHME 1972, 91). The heavily stylised design of the tower, regular coursing of limestone blocks and uniformity of their size is in immediate contrast to the section of wall that it abuts. This suggests that if stone was reused from the demolished section of wall in 1878, the stone itself was heavily reworked to achieve the uniform design, or was entirely new limestone.

Tower 2

Tower 2 (Figure 4) is semi-circular, 16 feet wide and projects 7 feet from the wall with a double chamfered plinth at the base (RCHME 1972, 91). As with the connecting wall, the coursing of the top section corresponds to the wall-walk with the implication that the foundation of the tower is original, but the upper section is also a nineteenth century modification.

Tower 3

Tower 3, referred to as the 'Bitchdaughter' Tower from 1566, is an irregular circle with the arcs of the internal curves struck from different centres

inside and outside the walls. It is situated on the southernmost corner of the Micklegate city walls. The tower is largely solid but does contain a roughly rectangular brick vaulted room entered through a passageway on the inner side of the wall and contains a reused sixteenth century fireplace and brick chimney, now blocked by the wall-walk platform. Externally it has a double chamfered plinth below a stone waterspout (RCHME 1972, 92). The RCHME identifies this tower as having been repaired in 1645 under the city husband, whose office was responsible for the corporation's civic property and defences (1972, 91). Repairs of the Old Baile section of wall were ordered and overseen by the Council in 1645 but they simply refer to the 'ould baile' and do not specify individual sections or towers (YALH B36, 126v & 129r). The presence of a chimney suggests domestic occupation that, if dated to 1645, would infer some military usage for soldiers. Yet the presence of a sixteenth century fireplace may in fact identify the occupation of the tower, either militarily or domestically, as far earlier and contemporaneous with the fireplace itself. The RCHME states that it was described as a cow house in 1834 (1972, 92). The presence of the identifiably domestic chimney merged with a defensive tower would have presented a different perspective to the early modern viewer than is visible today. The chimney itself was removed and blocked off to make way for the public wall-walk, yet the nineteenth century restoration not only served to create a cleared public pathway, but also served to de-domesticize and re-militarize the appearance of the city walls.

Tower 4

Tower 4 is semi-circular, 17 feet wide and projects 8 feet 9 inches from the wall and is now solid, though the visible cruciform arrow slit and evidence of a former one suggest that it was hollow. The form of the plinth dates the origin of the tower to 1330-40 (RCHME 1972, 92). Again the nineteenth century creation of the wall-walk and restoration of the parapet has destroyed the original upper section of the tower.

Tower 5

Tower 5 is demi-hexagonal, 23 feet wide and projects 11 feet from the wall. There is one cruciform arrow slit on the south side and two on the front wall, all of which are blocked (RCHME 1972, 92). This coursing of the tower and size of the stone blocks appear uniform until the upper 3 courses, which can be attributed to the nineteenth century restoration (Figure 5). Also of note is the central course of the tower that contains a band of thin stone to create a narrow plinth. This plinth continues uniformly around the outer face of the tower until halfway along the south side below the cruciform arrow slit. Here it drops a course and discontinues with the joint of the wall, confirming an earlier dating below the plinth and also the retention of this feature in later building phases.

Tower 6

Tower 6 is rectangular, 17 feet wide and projects 7 feet from the wall. There is a narrow plinth beneath two cruciform arrow slits. The RCHME posits that the uniformity of the stone and coursing represent a single building phase (1972, 92-93). The parapet is set back from the lower part and is consistent with the nineteenth century restoration evident on the preceding wall and towers. The tower was an addition to the wall and not contemporary with its initial construction.

Victoria Bar

Victoria Bar is not an example of either a medieval or early modern gateway, but a nineteenth century addition for traffic and pedestrians (Figure 6). The round-headed central arch, 12 feet wide and 10 ft. 3 inches high, was created in 1838 following a petition from the population in 1831 and the two smaller side arches were opened in 1864 and 1877 respectively (RCHME 1972, 93). The red plaque above the central arch records:
'VICTORIA BAR ERECTED BY PUBLIC SUBSCRIPTION UNDER THE

DIRECTION OF THE CITY COMMISSIONERS AD. 1838 GEORGE HUDSON ESQRE LORD MAYOR'. There are three distinct coursing phases: the parapet is consistent with the preceding restoration work of 1831-32; the central section follows the coursing of the rest of the city wall with larger stones; and smaller stone coursing is in keeping with the projecting walls that were built to support the ramparts once this section of rampart had been excavated. The height of the central arch roughly corresponds with the present height of the rampart on either side. Internally either side are two flights of stairs for entry and egress from the city wall walk.

Victoria Bar and this section of the wall are therefore primarily examples of nineteenth century restoration and alteration, excluding the central seven bands of coursing. However, during the removal of the rampart and construction of the central archway, evidence of a previous gateway 8 feet wide and 6 feet 6 inches high was found. The opening had been blocked with stones and wooden piles then with large quantities of earth on the inner side of the walls. The RCHME posits that this was the 'Lounelith' gate referenced in the twelfth^{century} that had been blocked up at some unspecified date (1972, 93). There are no references to this gate or its existence from 1550-1700.

Tower 7

Tower 7, Sadler Tower, is D-shaped and features three cruciform arrow slits. The inner room is entered via a doorway on the inner façade and has a segmental stone vault ceiling (Figure 7). As with Tower 3 there is a fireplace, converted from the recess of one of the cruciform arrow slits, with the corresponding chimney having been removed during the restoration work of 1831-32. The RCHME dates the tower to the mid-thirteenth century and it is therefore one of the earliest surviving towers of the circuit (1972, 93). The central section of the coursing is relatively consistent, yet to the left of Tower 7, excluding the nineteenth century restoration of the upper section, the stone size and coursing for roughly 5 metres is irregular with evidence

of impact damage. The varying stone sizes, combined with the evidence of cannon fire, indicating that this area has been repaired following the Civil War, accounting for the discontinuity of the wall's coursing. Similar small sections of discontinuity and presumed repair are evident along this stretch of wall up to Micklegate Bar.

Tower 8

Tower 8 is rectangular, 19 feet wide, projects 3 to 4 feet from the wall and was an addition to the city wall. Due to subsidence and a subsequent collapse the tower has largely been rebuilt, only retaining its original structure in the lower four courses that includes two plinths and two former arrow slits (RCHME 1972, 93). The plinths do not continue on the side of the tower, suggesting that the size of the original tower was altered during rebuilding. This rebuilding is clearly visible in contrast to the earlier structure and the later restoration of the parapet, primarily owing to the stones' lighter colouring. The wall between Tower 8 and 9 has regular coursing but differing sized stones for the lower half in contrast to the regular stones of the nineteenth century restoration and parapet. Before the third buttress there is a vertical joint in the wall for its entire height. Around this joint the stonework appears to be contemporary with the lower half of the wall, suggesting that this particular parapet may be original or predate the restoration of 1831-32.

Tower 9

Tower 9 is D-shaped, 17 feet wide, projects 6 feet from the wall and has three cruciform arrow slits. One is largely blocked off and the one that is damaged is attributed to Civil War artillery fire (RCHME 1972, 94). The lower half of the tower is faced with yellow limestone, contrasting with the surrounding white stone. Internally the tower is entered through a rear door and has two recesses corresponding with the unblocked arrow slits. The surviving first two courses of vaulted ribs would have originally

supported a roof 6 feet higher than the present height of the wall walk (RCHME 1972, 94). Whilst the dimensions of the interior room have not been altered, the height of the roof has been reduced, altering the original appearance of the tower to the uniform design of the nineteenth century restoration.

Tower 10

Tower 10 is rectangular, 12 feet 10 inches wide, projects 2 feet 5 inches from the wall, has a narrow plinth at its base, an arrow slit and is now solid (RCHME 1972, 94).

Tower 11

Tower 11 is semi-circular, 13 feet wide, projects 6 feet 3 from the wall, has a battered base, two arrow slits and is now solid (RCHME 1972, 94). As with the majority of the towers and wall in this area there is a clear distinction visible between the upper sections of nineteenth century restoration compared to earlier surviving masonry. The succeeding section of wall, up to the first of seven buttresses leading to Micklegate Bar, is extremely rough, fragmentary and displays numerous sections of repair, infill and discontinuity of stone size and colour (Figure 8). A section corresponds with the earlier building period of Tower 11 and it appears that the amount of restoration to the upper sections and parapet is less evident than in other sections.

Micklegate Bar

Micklegate Bar (Figure 9) is the southern gateway of York whose name designates this area and ward of the city south of the Ouse from 1550-1700 and beyond. First referenced in the twelfth century, the outer archway includes reused Roman gritstone voussoirs and was originally set within the earthen rampart; the sidewalls project as pilaster buttresses chamfered to a

height of 5 feet, above which is smaller stonework, also dated to the twelfth century (RCHME 1972, 95-96). On the first floor in both buttresses are doorways that originally led out on to the platform of the barbican. Centrally there is one rectangular aperture above the coat of arms of Lister-Kaye, commemorating restoration work of 1737, and above this on the second floor are two cruciform arrow slits with another rectangular aperture in the centre (Mee and Wilson 2005, 38; RCHME 1972, 96). Directly above these are two coats of arms of the city, a third depicting the royal coat of arms with France ancient, and above this the crest of a demi-lion rampant on a cap of maintenance, either side of which are two rectangular apertures opening onto the third floor (RCHME 1972, 96). Above the two buttresses, level with the second and third floor, are two bartizans with cruciform arrow slits resting on three corbel courses. The central merlon of the Bar's parapet has a cruciform arrow slit, as do the central merlons of both bartizans and above each of the three slits stands a statue of a knight dating from 1950, but which replaced earlier unidentifiable figures (RCHME 1972, 96).

The barbican, demolished in 1826, had a pointed arch, a chamfered plinth, two crenellated bartizans and a crenellated parapet displaying 2 lion heads and York's coat of arms. The structure originally projected 50 feet from the Bar being 30 feet wide, 20 feet high and its walls were 5 to 6 feet. thick (RCHME 172, 100). No trace of the barbican survives apart from the surviving doorways on the first floor that indicate the height of the platform. The central archway, which once housed a portcullis, is today used for vehicles at the crossroads of Queen Street, Blossom Street, Nunnery Lane and Micklegate.

The inner face of Micklegate Bar (Figure 10) dates to restoration work of 1827 that removed the previous sixteenth century wooden structure, similar to that surviving at Walmgate Bar, and the creation of the present rear façade (RCHME 1972, 96 & 100). Each of the three floors has two-light square-headed windows in the Perpendicular style and between the first

floor windows is the royal coat of arms with France modern. The non-crenellated parapet is supported by corbels that continue on either side, indicating the extent of the 1827 addition that is further highlighted by the fine ashlar limestone blocks contrasting with earlier building phases. The side archways date to 1863 and replaced earlier pedestrian passages.

One early modern account of James I being received at Micklegate Bar in 1617 describes it as having been painted, with 'Trumpeters and waites sounding and playinge' atop the Bar, the lord mayor surrendering to the King the sword, mace and keys of the city gates and delivering a speech from a platform erected on the street within the city (YALH B34 116v, 117r, 118v & 119r). The prominence afforded to Micklegate Bar for the receiving of monarchs tended to its location on the road that led northwards from London, the route by which most dignitaries would have travelled and arrived within the city. The survival of such documents allows the history and function of static structures to be understood within a wider context of civic ritual, rather than simply their construction phases and material qualities.

Tower 12

Tower 12 is rectangular, 10 feet 5 inches wide and projects 5 feet from the wall. There is a plinth near the base with uniform lower courses and above the stone is irregular in size suggesting different building phases and a small section of brick infill (RCHME 1972, 101). Unlike the section of wall and towers prior to Micklegate Bar, evidence for restoration of the parapet and crenellations is less pronounced until buttress 5 on this section. It would appear that the central area onwards to buttress seven is largely of one building phase with a small lower section, including buttress 6, predating this. The majority of this wall up to Tower 13 displays irregular stone sizes, colouring and dating. Between buttress 9 and 10 the wall diverts inwards from what was originally the footings of a former tower identified in eighteenth century maps (RCHME 1972, 101). This former tower has three

plinths at its base and is perhaps 20 feet wide. The amalgamation of this tower into the wall suggests significant alteration and rebuilding. Based upon the evidence discussed above it would seem to be contemporaneous with the preceding wall and Tower 13.

Tower 13

Tower 13 (Figure 11) is rectangular with the majority of its face built of large gritstone blocks with smaller limestone infill. In contrast, the upper half and side elevation are consistent with the coursing and stone of the preceding wall. The RCHME posits that the gritstones are reused from a Roman building (1972, 102). The reuse of Roman material may be indicative of numerous factors, including simply a pragmatic reuse of available material or the perceived symbolic patina qualities of the stone. A platform or artillery was constructed following the Civil War siege in 1645 and the walls were also repaired (RCHME 1972, 101) (YALH B36, 131r). This tower is on the corner of this section of wall but the archival records do not record how much of the circuit was repaired. Based upon the amalgamation of the former tower, corresponding material and coursing, this section can be speculatively attributed to the repairs from 1645. The tower does also contain a rectangular windowless room with a segmental brick vault ceiling 8 feet 2 inches high (RCHME 1972, 101-102).

Wall to Tower 14

300 feet of the city wall after Tower 13 was demolished and rebuilt in 1839-41 when the Toft Green Railway Station and headquarters of the North Midland and Great North of England Railway Company were built within the walls. This required the excavation and removal of the ramparts and insertion of two large pointed arches, the second an 1845 addition for additional tracks (RCHME 1972, 102). The removal of the ramparts, deep excavation and levelling of the surrounding area dramatically and irrevocably changed the profile of this section of wall. The height of the wall

and four large buttresses are almost monumental for a modern viewer when compared to the sections of wall that retain the rampart (Figure 12). There is a clear disjuncture between the rebuilt original limestone, with the edges and faces roughed with age and varying in size, when compared to the lower courses of finely cut and uniform limestone blocks. Within the rampart the remains of a Roman graveyard and an eighth to eleventh century wall were uncovered during its excavation (RCHME 1972, 102). The retention of the city wall amidst the construction of the railway is testament to the concerted efforts undertaken during the nineteenth century to maintain and restore York's urban defences.

Tower 14

Having been demolished for the insertion of the pointed arches, Tower 14 was rebuilt in 1845, is demi-hexagonal, 12 feet wide and projects 5 feet from the wall with a plinth near the base (RCHME 1972, 102). Between Tower 14 and 15 the coursing of the wall is relatively uniform bar a central section that consists of more irregular sized blocks of stone, yet the parapet and crenellations are consistent with the surrounding wall.

Tower 15

Tower 15 is rectangular, 15 feet wide, projects 5 feet 8 inches from the wall, has a double plinth below the parapet and one at the base, two cruciform arrow slits and a blocked internal room. The RCHME states that the arrow slits are modern creations as the cross arms are impractical (1972, 102). Certainly the face of the tower and sides display evidence of alteration or repair consistent with this analysis, yet this and the preceding lower coursing of wall predate the presumed nineteenth century parapet and crenellations. The rest of the wall to Tower 16 contains both regular and irregular coursing, stone sizes and maintains the uniform spacing and size of the crenellations. Certainly some sections are nineteenth century, but many

appear to also predate this, allowing for the inference that the later phase of building reflected the pre-existing appearance of the walls.

Tower 16

Tower 16 is demi-hexagonal, at least 15 feet wide, projects 6 feet from the wall, and has a double chamfered plinth of grey limestone at the base that contrasts with the remaining yellow coursed ashlar stone. The front face of the tower has a cruciform arrow slit, as does its side elevations that differ in only having one cross arm. The tower dates to the fourteenth century and is argued to be the least altered of its type within the entire *enceinte* (RCHME 1972, 102). The internal room is roughly rectangular with a brick vaulted ceiling. Surviving stone corbels would once have supported a stone or wooden roof here and the recesses of the arrow slits have apparently been adapted for use with firearms, inferring a Civil War dating (RCHME 1972, 102). To Tower 17 the wall appears irregular, with variations of sections of ashlar stone and then irregular coursing and stone sizes until halfway between Tower 16 and 17. From here there is a clear disjuncture and the walls coursing is then almost entirely uniform and of the same material, stone ashlar.

Tower 17

Tower 17 is demi-hexagonal, 10 feet 3 inches wide, projects 5 feet from the wall, has a double chamfered plinth and the parapet has been dated to 1831-32 (RCHME 1972, 103).

Tower 18 and Wall to North Street Postern

The wall from Tower 17 to North Street Postern contains numerous building phases and alterations, primarily the two arched piercings inserted for traffic, the first in 1874 in which 60 feet of wall was demolished, and the second in 1876 that involved the removal of Tower 18 and the demolition of

40 feet of wall. The tower was rectangular and roughly 12 feet wide and projected 6 feet (RCHME 1972, 103 & 106). The coursing of the section covering the first traffic arch and two pedestrian arches is of regular ashlar and contains some evidence of reuse. The rampart has been removed with walls built to support the surviving sections, as at Victoria Bar. The wall then continues and does not appear to have been altered in 1874 as this section only displays evidence of the nineteenth century restoration of the parapet from 1831-32. The RCHME identifies three building phases along the proceeding section of wall (Figure 13): firstly rough and bulging facing at the base supported by four buttresses; centrally there is regular yellow stone facing with the 1831-32 merlons and embrasures blocked; finally, the upper section of ashlar increases the height of the wall by four courses and follows the previous spacing of the merlons and embrasures, built for the parapet of the second arch of 1876 (1972, 106). For the majority of the wall from Tower 18 the parapet includes original musket loops that are not present on any other section of the Micklegate wall (Figure 14). These musket loops were continued in the restored sections in conjunction with the spacing of crenellations, which the RCHME suggests are a reflection of a pre-existing arrangement (1972, 106). The presence of both original musket loops demonstrate that defensive adaptations, however small, had occurred on the city walls, and the nineteenth century examples highlight the desire to maintain explicit reference to the military capabilities and architecture of the wall at this section. Such military features may have been present elsewhere on York's city wall but were removed following restoration work. While York may not have engaged in wholesale refortification with angled-bastions, artillery developments had impacted on the civic urban defences architecturally during the early modern period.

North Street Postern and Barker Tower

The Great North of England Railway Company constructed the present North Street Postern archway in 1840 for access to a coal yard. The central arch is 20 feet wide and 17 feet high and the two side arches are 4 feet wide

and 12 feet high, with the two central piers being 4 feet square (RCHME 1972, 106). The path through this opening leads to the walkway along the riverbank and to the side is a flight of steps leading from the stretch of the wall walk that terminates at Lendal Bridge. The joint between the arch and preceding city wall is unambiguously articulated in the use of contrasting large ashlar limestone blocks. However, it would appear to follow the original footprint of the now demolished wall and archway. Following alteration in 1577, the postern was only 4 feet wide and 9 feet high, externally square-headed and internally a lintel was supported by two corbel courses (RCHME 1972, 106). The relative narrowness of the original postern would suggest that the flow of traffic of people and transportation was relatively limited.

First referenced in 1376, the adjoining Barker Tower is circular with a conical tiled roof and has ashlar limestone walls 3 feet 6 inches to 4 feet 9 inches thick (RCHME 1972, 106-107). Prior to 1840 there existed a two-storey brick addition with a gabled roof and chimney abutting the tower and city wall. George Nicholson's sketch from 1825 (Figure 15) illustrates that this building was amalgamated into the tower and provided the only entrance into it. A flight of steps now leads to the entrance on the first floor and it seems that the section of gabled roofing that remains above it survived the demolition, though possibly rebuilt with reused stone. As at Skeldergate Postern, a chain could be stretched across the river to Lendal Tower to stop the passage of vessels. The tower was often leased to the ferrymen operating between it and St Leonard's Landing across the river until the opening of Lendal Bridge in 1863. It was subsequently a mortuary from 1879, restored in 1930, used for storage by the Parks Department (RCHME 1972, 106) and is currently leased as a coffee shop, 'The Perky Peacock'. Lendal Bridge dwarfs Barker Tower, as the bridge pavement has been built level with the city wall walk, radically altering the historic character of this area and literally overshadowing both North Street Postern and Barker Tower.

In September 1593 Brian Wharton, a tanner, is recorded as the ferryman and his lease was renewed again in March 1608/09 for 21 years (YALH B31, 26v & B33, 98v). By 1630 the possession of the tower and ferry was held by Henry Wharton, likely a relative of Brian Wharton, and alludes to the potential longevity of one family's multi-generational tenancy of a single site. Accounts of rental leases for 1564 to 1565 reveal that another Wharton, William, also rented the tower and ferry (YALH C91:1) Yet in February 1630/31 the civic authorities were seeking to evict Henry Wharton for unspecified reasons, while also making some allowance towards his wife and children 'provided for out of the poore folks stock' (YALH B35, 98v). Nearly two years later Henry had still not been evicted. In June 1632, an order was made to dispossess and imprison him for his misbehaviour; the record also orders the appointment of 'som honest man...accountable for the profits thearof to the Chamber', indicating that financial irregularities for the ferry had occurred under Wharton, though the scale of these deceptions is unrecorded (YALH B35, 170r). In incarcerating Henry the city was deprived of a ferryboat for the area and the authorities attempted to negotiate the purchase of Henry's boat whilst he was in gaol, which he refused, stating that 'before he partwith the boat he would part wth his life'. Over several months the search for another boat was made and in that time Wharton had been allowed to 'goe abroade' by the sheriffs before being confined again, for which they were fined 10 li. (YALH B35, 172v, 174r, 176v, 181r & 181v). In April 1633 another lease for the ferry and Postern was provisionally made for John Watson, though in June and August the house Book notes that Henry Wharton and his wife had trespassed and were still operating their ferryboat in competition with the civically appointed ferryman (YALH B35, 197v, 211v & 215r). The situation was only resolved when another member of the family, William Wharton, leased the ferryboat for 11 years upon the covenant that he would 'save the Citty harmlesse of henry Wharton his wife and children that they be noe wise chargable to this citty...and that they shall not meddle with the fferrying or carying over any psons whatsoever in that boate or any other' (YALH B35, 217v). William Wharton is last recorded as leasing North Street Tower and ferry from 1644 to 1645 (YALH C68.3),

indicating that members of the Wharton family had in total held the lease for over eight years. The case of Henry Wharton is only one example of one tenant operating a single section of the *enceinte*, but the amount of detail that can be gleaned from the archival material is testament to the active use of these structures and environs in a non-military context by citizens and civic government alike. Issues of ownership, tenancy disputes and commerce will no doubt have been evident and experienced elsewhere on the *enceinte*, which is succinctly encapsulated in the protracted dispute with one family over the possession of North Street Postern and the ferry.

Lendal Tower

Opposite Barker Tower across the Ouse is the corresponding Lendal Tower (Figure 16). The tower dates to post-1300 and was originally circular, 28 feet in diameter with a spiral staircase in a rounded turret. In the seventeenth century a rectangular addition was added, virtually doubling the footprint of the structure. The lower third of the tower and stair turret contain original slits, whilst the rest of the windows above are post 1784 (RCHME 1972, 108-109). The fine ashlar coursing of the lower sections contrasts with the irregularly sized stonework, brick infill and coursing of the upper half. The crenellated parapet is also ashlar there is no brick infill, indicating that this is the latest phase of building. The parapet can be dated to 1846 and the removal of a water tank on top of the tower, reducing it in height by 10 feet, during the relocation of the waterworks from the site to Acomb Landing for the New York Waterworks Company. The tower was refurbished internally for the company's headquarters in 1932 (RCHME 1972, 109). The conversion of the roof into a glass balustrade terrace in 2011, as well as interior renovations, is the latest modification to the structure. The Tower and adjoining eighteenth and nineteenth century three-storey brick built structure, Lendal Hill House and Whistler House, are now three private dwellings, where once they were one structure (Figure 17). The ground floors of the rear of the two houses incorporate this area of city wall and the coursing correlates with the lower half of Lendal Tower,

although it comprises less ashlar and three windows and two doors have been inserted into it. The upper halves of the houses are entirely eighteenth- and nineteenth century brickwork. The frontages of the houses display no evidence of limestone blocks or reuse of city wall material. Therefore the rear of the building was built abutting the city wall in a similar arrangement as Elizabeth Stockdale's house at Skeldergate Postern. The internal and external rampart is not in evidence around the tower and houses, which when considered with the dating of Lendal Tower's lower coursing and ground level, would suggest there was never a significant rampart within this section.

Henry Lynn's twenty-one year lease of Lendal Tower for 4 s. per annum from 1598 stipulated:

'wthout any fine in regard that he is agreed to [cover] the same with a rofe and to theake the same [over] wth good tile and to make a chamber floor plastred [over]...and to kepe the same well reped and theaked...and so to leave the same at the end of his tenure...upon condicons not to erecte make kepe or use any plaister kilne or lyme kilne in the same nether to impare nor hurt the Cittie walles' (YALH B31, 367v).

Aside from the itemizing of the building work within the lease, the reference to lime and plaster kilns highlights the materiality of the city defences as a potential source of stone for lime production. In making Lynn personally and financially invested within the structure of the tower and its adjoining section of wall, the Council was ensuring the maintenance of its defences and greater protection of the stone from would-be thieves, and once the lease had expired they would be in possession of a privately funded and habitable dwelling to lease again for revenue.

Wall to Bootham Bar, Tower 19, 20 and 21

The RCHME suggests that this section of wall has been rebuilt with the addition of a nineteenth century archway and small gate through the wall and reduced in height by 5 feet in 1874 (1972, 110). This was also the year

that the lodge at the entrance to the Museum Gardens was constructed, suggesting one building phase for the area. Visible within John Storey's lithograph copy of Nathaniel Whittock's lost original, *Bird's Eye view of the City of York* from 1858 (Figure 18), are at least three separate buildings of two and three storeys built against the *enceinte*. With Lendal Bridge now dominating the area and the removal of these buildings, Lendal Tower and the adjoining Lendal Hill House and Whistler House appear in relative isolation. Yet clearly this area was populated and built upon and were only cleared in the nineteenth century. The origin of these now-demolished buildings cannot be determined but it is possible that they were adapted from earlier buildings or footings prior to the nineteenth century. The standing city wall is roughly faced with reused stone and contrasts with the newer ashlar limestone of the nineteenth century lodge. 110 feet of wall was demolished from the lodge to St Leonard's Hospital at an unknown date and today serves as the gateway to the Museum Gardens (RCHME 1972, 110).

Within this vicinity the cottage of John Browne in May 1614 was described as adjoining the walls of St Leonard's Hospital and being 'verie unfitting'. He was instructed to demolish his home prior to Pentecost with the stipulation that 'in regard of his povertie' he was to be allowed the bricks and timber. In September and October of that year the material of the demolished house was sold, with Browne allotted the timber and 20 s. from the sale of stone. In August 1615, some ten months later, the House Book records that in 'full recompence for that he had the tente pulled down', Browne was awarded a further 26 s. 8 d. (YALH B34, 34v, 41r, 43v, 71r). The process of ordering the demolition, undertaking it and settling compensation upon Browne demonstrates the protracted nature of the process, as well as the materiality of such dwellings. The House Books refer to stone, timber and bricks in the make-up of the cottage that even once demolished held a monetary value. It also alludes to the possibility of the city's walls being understood within a context removed from defence, income generation and maintenance, and instead simply as domestic.

From the remains of St Leonard's Hospital to the Multangular Tower, the city wall represents the western corner of the Roman fortress wall which is 16 feet in height, with brick, rubble and later limestone blocks (RCHME 1972, 110). Built upon the Multangular Tower are late thirteenth century walls of larger ashlar limestone blocks contrasting with the smaller Roman stones. On each of the nine sides of the medieval work there are cruciform arrow slits that were inserted for gun loops; a waterspout 29 feet high, now at the top of the tower, indicates the level of the thirteenth century platform. The tower was filled with earth to the base of the medieval stonework until it was cleared in 1831 by the Yorkshire Philosophical Society (RCHME 1972, 111). The sheer height of the medieval stonework in conjunction with the Roman wall, suggests that there was a rampart at the base of the wall and tower. Evidence of a repaired breach of the wall by cannon to the right of the tower, as referenced from 1683 (RCHME 1972, 110), indicates that the rampart did not exceed the height that corresponds to the discoloured stone coursing at the base of the Multangular Tower. From the tower the thirteenth century city wall was built 2 to 5 feet in front of the line of the Roman wall, which is buried within the rampart itself (RCHME 1972, 111).

Tower 19 was originally constructed in the seventh century then covered with earth, only to be opened again in the thirteenth century, yet again covered with earth and only rediscovered in 1839 during the construction of a tunnel. It is rectangular, stands to a height of 14 feet, is roofed and now fully exposed (RCHME 1972, 111 & 113).

200 feet of wall survives and the proceeding 350 feet was demolished and the rampart levelled up to Bootham Bar for the construction of St Leonard's Place (RCHME 1972, 111). This area now forms part of the city's road network providing a crossroads with Gillygate and Bootham and a car park with a small section of Roman walling exposed. Unlike other sections of the city walls that were modified during the nineteenth century, this is the only section to have been completely demolished. As well as the wall, two towers were also demolished. Tower 20 was rectangular and Tower 21 was semi-

circular, 17 feet wide, projected 9 feet 6 from the wall, had at least 4 cruciform arrow slits and a battered plinth (RCHME 1972, 115). Joseph Halfpenny's etching *Multangular Tower* from 1807 (Figure 19) depicts the stretch of wall leading to Bootham Bar with King's Manor, the early modern headquarters of the Council of the North, shown on the left. Tower 21 appears to be well maintained at this date and a small chimney projecting from the parapet suggests a form of occupation. The wall recommences to the right of Bootham Bar, housing a public lavatory and stairs leading into the side of Bootham Bar that leads to the continuation of the wall walk. This period of development can be dated to post 1834-35 (RCHME 1972, 115).

An example of this section of wall being utilized for domestic purposes dates from February 1648/49 through to September 1651. Richard Dossie is recorded as a Common Councilman for Bootham Ward in 1649 (YALH B36, 228r), and upon his appointment he was engaged in a dispute with the Council concerning building work against the city wall near Bootham Bar. Concerns were raised on 8th February 1648/49 to 'what [prejudice] it may bee to the saiftye of the Cittie or the manor wall'. 'Manor' refers to King's Manor, by this point the former headquarters of the Council of the North, identifying the location as the now demolished section of the *enceinte* (YALH B36, 222v). On the 22nd February three aldermen and other officials were ordered to view the work and consult with Dossie to 'put some end to the matter...that the saiftye of the cittye may not be [prejudiced]...nor mr dossey loose all his paynes and charged in the sayd building' (YALH B36, 223v). Clearly attempts at negotiation and mediation had failed as the issue was still being discussed in August 1651. Whereas John Browne's cottage had only been built against the city wall, Dossie had in fact inserted a door and window directly into them. The Council issued a fourteen day notice in which to 'wall upp' the said door and window 'as firmly as the same was at the making of his lease' or forfeit the same lease; a little over two weeks later, the forfeiture was enacted and action brought against him in Chancery (YALH B37, 21v, 22r; Withington 1998d, 173). The reluctance of Dossie to cease, and then correct his building work, highlights the dichotomy of

sections of the defences being leased to citizens for personal or commercial uses, whilst the city simultaneously desired to maintain them as functioning defences. A typical lease of twenty-one years at this time was, as it would be considered contemporaneously, a significant investment on the part of the tenant. The desires of the tenant, through a sense of ownership, had superseded the concerns of civic defence in the case of Dossie. The degree to which this may have been experienced by others during this period is difficult to determine and ultimately unquantifiable, beyond individual case studies. However, it does raise questions that will be considered throughout the thesis relating to urban defences and their significance within a localised early modern context by those interacting with them.

Bootham Bar

Bootham Bar (Figure 20) is the city's western gateway and is first referenced in 1200, although the Bar lies on the site of a Roman gate. The round-headed archway is supported by possibly Roman gritstones and its construction is dated to 1100, with the external order of limestone considered to be a twelfth century addition (RCHME 1972, 116 & 49). As at Micklegate Bar the side walls are projecting buttresses with chamfered 'setbacks' and it has a string level correlating to the first floor level (RCHME 1972, 117). Within the central setback are two pointed windows, in the third setback are two carved and painted coats of arms of the city, and in the upper setback are two blocked windows or gun ports and a shield painted with the Stuart coat of arms surmounted by a crown dating from 1970 (RCHME 1972, 117; Mee and Wilson 2005, 49). Above the two buttresses are bartizans supported by corbels, each with a cruciform arrow slit and a plain parapet. These and the central plain parapet each support a statue erected in 1894 to replace earlier ones, representing respectively a knight, a mason and the fourteenth century lord mayor Nicholas Langton (Mee and Wilson 2005, 49). The RCHME dates the upper half of the façade and the bartizans to restoration work following damage during the Civil War siege of 1644 (1972, 116). Demolished between 1831-35, the barbican projected

47 feet in front of the Bar, was 26 feet wide, 16 feet high and its walls were 3 feet 6 inches thick. It had a plain parapet above its wide-pointed archway that was flanked by two bartizans supported by cone-shaped corbels with cruciform arrow slits and crenellated parapets (RCHME 1972, 121).

The inner façade of Bootham Bar (Figure 21), excluding the twelfth century archway, dates to 1832 restoration work (RCHME 1972, 117 & 121). This work removed the 1719 face of two round-headed windows and a central round-headed niche containing a statue of the figure King Ebrauk, the mythical founder of York and described as the 'fowerth kinge after Brute' in 1617 (YALH B34, 119v). The eighteenth century façade had most likely replaced an earlier timber-framed structure, similar to that surviving at Walmgate Bar. The 1832 restoration created a façade that strongly resembled the outer front, including bartizans with cruciform arrow slits and set backs, but with the addition of two cruciform arrow slits in the centre and above them two rectangular apertures. This serves to create a uniformed inner and outer design for the Bar. The two flanking pedestrian archways were inserted during the restoration of 1834 and further restoration and conservation of the Bar was carried out in 1951 and 1970 (RCHME 1972, 117).

Evidence of Bootham Bar having been rented domestically occurs in May 1563 when the tenant Lady White was 'dischardged of any longer occupieng the said Bothome barre' owing to not having fulfilled the covenants of lease made by her husband to repair and maintain the Bar, which by that time was described as decayed (YALH B23, 94r). This is an early example of the civic authorities' well-established lease caveat placing the onus upon the lessees to maintain rented property, but in this case Bootham Bar and others formed part of the city's defences. In November 1570 the tenant Richard Aynclay found his tenancy of Bootham Bar and its chambers terminated 'for the watche and other defence for the citie to be had in the same', highlighting a clearly defensive function of the bar taking precedence over domestic considerations (YALH B24, 216r). By 1591 a watch house had

been constructed internally abutting the Bar, as an order is recorded for a chimney to be constructed for the benefit of the watchmen on cold evenings (YALH B30, 282v).

Wall to Tower 26

From Bootham Bar to Tower 26 the buildings on Gillygate obscure the city wall and interval towers. This section of wall was restored in 1888-89, with the crenellated parapet, upper section of external facing, wall walk and series of internal arches supporting it (RCHME 1972, 121-122). Tower 22 is demi-hexagonal, 16 feet wide, projects 7 feet from the wall, has a battered base, nineteenth century parapet and arrow slits (RCHME 1972, 122). Tower 23 is demi-hexagonal, has a chamfered plinth, a circular gunport, modern arrow slits and is hollow with an open-backed recess (RCHME 1972, 122). Tower 24 is demi-hexagonal, has a chamfered plinth, a modern cruciform arrow slit with an open-backed semi-circular recess (RCHME 1972, 123). Tower 25 is semi-circular, has a battered plinth with evidence of older and restored cruciform arrow slits, as well as a now brick wall and door at the rear that was added in 1888-89 (RCHME 1972, 123).

Tower 26

Tower 26 collapsed in 1957 and was rebuilt using the old stone, presumably on the same footing, and is semi-circular, 14 feet wide and projects 5 feet from the wall (RCHME 1972, 123-124). The cruciform arrow slit above the plinth appears to have used newly cut stone owing to the colour variation. The crenellated parapet follows the form of the previous towers and unlike the walls in Micklegate the tower parapet rises above that of the city wall. The wall between Tower 26 and 27 appears uniform in its coursing with some evidence of repairs consistent with the restoration work of 1888-89.

Tower 27

Tower 27 (Figure 22), referred to in the seventeenth century as Robin Hood Tower, was reconstructed in its present form during the restoration of 1888-89. It forms a three quarter circle, with a base, a chamfered setback below neat coursing, contains ten cruciform arrow slits on two staggered rows and a crenellated parapet above a string course supported by merlons with cruciform arrow slits in each merlon. The internal chamber is entered by a door at the internal rear of the tower and is roofed in concrete (RCHME 1972, 124). Tower 27 is the largest of the interval towers and owing to its size and embellishment best represents the extent of the late nineteenth century restoration work. The role of this as a vantage point for tourists and wall walkers can be understood in the large platform that was constructed on top of the tower to provide an iconic vantage point of York's landscape.

Tower 28

Tower 28 is also characterised by the restoration work of 1888-89 (Figure 23). It is semi-circular, has a battered plinth and three original cruciform arrow slits. Above the 12 feet of medieval stonework the tower has an equal armed relief shield, corbels supporting the crenellated parapet, a cruciform arrow slit in the central merlon and is supported either side by two 'pepper-pot' turrets with corbelled bases, arrow slits and crenellated parapets (RCHME 1972, 124). This section of the rampart is the best-preserved outer ditch or moat of the urban defences and is 40 feet wide and 4 feet deep (Figure 24). The RCHME identifies two sunken sections of earth as possible sites of either the demolished Tower 29 or the site of a Roman gateway, as the wall follows the footprint of the original Roman circuit, yet there is no evidence in the wall itself for a tower (1972, 125). Between Tower 27 and Monk Bar the wall is relatively uniform with numerous buttresses and some evidence of earlier repairs distinct from the nineteenth century crenellated parapet and wall walk.

Monk Bar

Monk Bar (Figure 25) is the city's northern gateway and it replaced an earlier gate, as evidenced by the preceding sunken section of rampart, with reference to its name first appearing in 1370 (RCHME 1972, 125). The round-headed archway of the central passage is made of limestone and gritstone voussoirs, has a ribbed vault that contains a blocked doorway to the now-demolished watch house, and the portcullis also survives. Flanking the archway are two buttresses with moulded plinths that at first-floor level contain shoulder-headed doorways, similar to Micklegate Bar, which would have originally opened onto the platform of the barbican (RCHME 1972, 130). Above the ground floor archway passage is a pointed arch of two chamfered orders supporting a gallery, below which are two pairs of cruciform arrow slits corresponding to the first and second floors. It is suggested by the RCHME that the pointed archway that projects 3 feet 3 from the main wall originally had defensive machicolations or 'murder-holes' that have subsequently been blocked (1972, 130). Above here are three shields, two depicting the city's coat of arms and the third the royal arms of England surmounted by a crowned demi-lion rampant. On the third floor façade are two cruciform arrow slits and beneath them are two square gun ports with the central face capped by a plain parapet. The two side bartizans rest on a rounded corbel base and have corresponding cruciform arrow slits on each floor and the roof level. These are capped by crenellated parapets supporting three seventeenth century figures of men wielding rocks on alternate merlons (RCHME 1972, 130). The passageway and central section below the second-floor external pointed archway are clearly older than the surrounding buttresses, bartizans and upper courses. This area consists of smaller stones that are contrasted with the ashlar and more uniformly sized stones surrounding it.

Monk Bar's barbican was demolished in 1825 and projected 44 feet from the Bar. It was 27 feet wide, 17 feet high, the walls were 5 to 6 feet thick and it had a round-headed archway with a plain parapet with low polygonal

bartizans on three corbel courses (RCHME 1972, 132). The entrance to the city at Monk Bar now stands at the crossroads between Lord Mayor's Walk, Monkgate and St Maurice's Road. The two side passages were inserted in 1825 and 1845 and necessitated the removal of the rampart (RCHME 1972, 129).

The inner face of the Bar was the only one to have originally been built in masonry, unlike the other three Bars which had timber-framed structures (Figure 26) (RCHME 1972, 130). The central passage has a segmental arch supporting a corbelled platform within another segmental arch containing a central three-light window, single rectangular window and a 4 feet high doorway on the first floor of the Bar (RCHME 1972, 130). To the left of the passageway is a doorway that internally leads down from the wall walk steps. On the second floor is a central three-light window with empty niches on either side and on the third floor is a central niche with two shoulder-headed lights capped either side by a plain parapet (RCHME 1972, 130-131). Aside from the plain parapet, the entire face of the inner Bar appears to be of the same date, with irregular sized and ashlar stones alternating uniformly and irregular coursing throughout. The Bar is argued to be the most fortified of all the Bars, for the internal staircase is not continuous, thereby forcing any attackers to cross the room to reach the succeeding flight of stairs (Mee & Wilson 2005, 53).

The Bar was rented as a domestic dwelling from the fifteenth century and converted into a prison during the sixteenth century for numerous misdemeanours (RCHME 1972, 126-126). For example, Richard Hall was incarcerated within the Bar for failing to declare to the authorities that his cat was sick during an outbreak of plague in 1631/32 and in September 1623 it was used to house an apprentice described as a 'lunitique' (YALH B35, 150v, B34, 275r). The lease of the two rooms of the Bar to James Clerke in November 1650 demonstrates the changing use from prison back to the domestic, with covenants in the lease to 'keep the rooms in reparaire and clense the barr stead' and also to have possession of the keys of the Bar,

which presumably involved the opening and locking of the gates during the day (YALH B37, 14v). Today the bar houses the Richard III Museum.

Wall to Tower 30

The first section of this wall has ashlar stone, regular coursing, and unlike the preceding and proceeding wall, is not crenellated but instead displays 13 musket loops of a similar design to those found near North Street Postern. Near here is a 12 feet in diameter nineteenth century brick icehouse built into the rampart (RCHME 1972, 133). The proceeding section of city wall appears to be of one building phase whose stonework features less ashlar than that preceding it, but is uniform in its coursing. There are areas of repair with different coloured and sized limestone and variations in the lime pointing throughout. This section of wall was restored in 1871 and 1877-78 (RCHME 1972, 132). However, some of the smaller spaced crenellations do appear originally medieval and possibly informed the basis for restoration work of the nineteenth century.

Tower 30

The RCHME (1972, 133) identifies the location of the now demolished semi-circular Tower 30 as being halfway between Monk Bar and Tower 31, yet there is no visual evidence for this.

Tower 31

Tower 31 is similar in form and style to Tower 28, though it is less embellished. It is semi-circular, with three arrow slits and the lower half is of medieval date (RCHME 1972, 134). The upper half is clearly a nineteenth century restoration of ashlar stonework, has a plain parapet with only one embrasure and at the joints with the wall two 'pepper pot' turrets with corbel bases, a single cruciform arrow slit and a plain parapet. Prior to the restoration work of 1877-78 a brick summerhouse had been built onto the

top of the tower, and now there is a brick vaulted roof to the internal room of the tower supported by 1950's concrete beams (RCHME 1972, 134). To the left of Tower 31 there is an arrow slit at the base of the wall, yet internally it is in fact a gun port 2 feet 9 inches wide and 2 feet 6 inches high with the splayed sides narrowing to 1 foot (RCHME 1972, 134). The positioning of this gun port at the base of the wall above the parapet is probably contemporaneous with the medieval wall, although could be a later addition. It is significant in reiterating the military function of the wall and the insertion of elements that kept pace with artillery developments.

Tower 32

The wall diverts at an inward angle toward Tower 32 and appears to be of two distinct building phases. Prior to 1851 the tower was open at the back with the remains of a half-timbered building atop it (RCHME 1972, 135).

Tower 33

Tower 33 is rectangular with a four course chamfered plinth, a single central chamfer from which the top half of the tower is set back, three musket loops on the front face, one on its side and one embrasure in its parapet. The RCHME identifies it as a late-medieval addition to the *enceinte* (1972, 137). The corresponding top three levels of the parapets coursing correlates to the surrounding non-crenellated nineteenth century restoration either side of the tower. This serves to maintain the parallel height of the wall to Tower 34 on what is otherwise a sloping rampart, highlighting that the height of the parapet has been designed to reduce the incline for users of the wall walk and maintain the uniformity of the walls appearance.

Tower 34

Tower 34 has no solid base and is instead supported on two buttresses, 6 corbels and a pointed arch, indicating hasty repairs of reused material,

possibly post-Civil War (RCHME 1972, 137). The upper courses of the parapet can be dated to the nineteenth century restoration, although two cruciform arrow slits appear to be contemporaneous with the circular and central aspect of the tower. In 1822 a gabled brick building was built on the top of the tower, perhaps similar to the summerhouse that was built on Tower 31 (RCHME 1972, 137). To the left of the tower is an opening leading from the descending steps of this section of the wall walk.

Layerthorpe Postern

A modern red brick and limestone office block for a firm of solicitors today occupies the site of Layerthorpe Postern. The original postern, first referenced in 1280, was a rectangular tower 26 feet by 20 feet externally with pointed arches 9 feet wide and supported by two side buttresses (RCHME 1972, 137). Joseph Halfpenny's etching *Laythorp Postern* from 1807 depicts the postern, the bridge over the river Foss and the preceding circuit of wall including Towers 34 and 33 (Figure 27). The original form of the tower with its crenellated parapet and flat roof is visible, with the addition of a gabled tiled roof and windows inserted within the embrasures of the original parapet and a chimney. The only reference to the tower being made habitable dates from 1604/05 by John Criplinge: 'who craveth a lease of Lathrop postern to thend he maie build over the same...and make it fit for habitacon...he will build over the same in good sorte to the bewtefyinge therof that he shall have a lease...for xxi tie years paying vi d. rent yearlie' (YALH B32, 320r). It is likely that the structures shown in 1807 are largely those of John Criplinge's building from 200 years previously. A reference to him having 'builded a howse' over the postern, for which the council extended the length of his lease, implies that the trappings of habitation were still visible in the early nineteenth century (YALH B32, 359v). The construction of a house, or other buildings on towers, again reiterates the duality of the defences as both military and domestic.

The restoration of the walls and clearance of these buildings leaves an impression upon the modern viewer only of their military and defensive qualities, to the detriment of understanding their use within a wider context. In this instance the early modern Council had transferred the structural integrity of the postern and tower to a private individual, whilst the presumed benefits to Criplinge in building a house here are unknown, but they may have been related to construction costs or location, amongst others. By 1820 the gates, floors and roof of the postern were removed and from 1829-30 it was demolished for the construction of the new bridge and approach into the city (RCHME 1972, 137). The area today stands at the crossroads of the city's ring road and Peaseholme Green road.

The King's Fishpool

For one third of a mile there are no extant urban defences between Layerthorpe Postern and the Red Tower. From the eleventh century the river Foss had been dammed to create the water filled moat around York Castle and in doing so flooded approximately 100 acres of land upstream that became known as the King's Fishpool (Mee and Wilson 2005, 58). This body of water therefore negated the need for the construction of urban defences. The area was silting up by the sixteenth century, and when the Foss Navigation Company was formed in 1792 this led to the canalisation of the Foss and subsequent drainage of the area (Mee and Wilson 2005, 59-60).

The Red Tower

The Red Tower (Figure 28) designates the recommencement of the city walls and wall walk within the Walmgate area of the city. The tower is rectangular, and excluding the hipped tiled roof it is 16 ft. 6 ins. high. Uniquely it is made of brick rather than stone, and possesses numerous slits, 2 cruciform arrow slits and a projecting garderobe; the ground around it has been raised by 6 feet so the original height of the tower and parapet would

have been 30 feet, but the limestone footings are now concealed (RCHME 1972, 140). This use of brick is able to give some small indication of the materiality of Hull's now-destroyed brick *enceinte*. First referenced in 1511 the Red Tower was leased to individuals and by 1800 was in use as a cowshed before it and the surrounding walls were restored in 1857-58 (RCHME 1972, 140). No remains of the ditch or rampart are evident between it and Tower 35. The Red Tower is undoubtedly a unique survival of York's urban defences, providing evidence for variation in construction materials other than the prevalence of limestone. The city's decision to engage the tillers for the Red Tower, rather than the masons, is argued to have resulted in the well-publicised dispute between the two crafts that resulted in the murder of the tiler John Patrik in the 1490's (Swanson 1980b, 247).

The proceeding wall up to Walmgate Bar is the least uniform of all sections. For 45 yards from the tower the parapet alternates between crenellations with musket loops, to non-crenellated with musket loops, to finally just crenellated as the wall gradually rises to the surviving rampart. The musket loops are of the form found at the walls adjoining Monk Bar and North Street Postern. Internally medieval segmental arches that are 10 feet wide and 5 to 8 feet in height support the wall walk. The RCHME assigns much of this section to the restoration of 1857-58 (1972, 140). Along this wall a chamfered plinth is visible and continues along the majority of the walls above the rampart in Walmgate. For sections below this plinth supporting foundation arches are visible and are dated to the fourteenth century (RCHME 1972, 140) (Figure 29). This reveals at least three clearly visible building phases and methods of construction. The level below the plinth is generally made of roughly faced and irregularly sized stone, whilst the central section has ashlar regularly sized stone, capped with the nineteenth century restored parapet. An unusual feature along this stretch of wall is the nineteenth century insertion of cruciform arrow slits within the merlons of the parapet that are not found on any other section of the *enceinte* (Figure 29). Similar to the musket loops near North Street Postern, these cruciform

arrow slit loops may reflect a pre-existing arrangement that was restored. The implication is therefore that the restorers of this section actively sought to maintain their early modern appearance through the retention of distinguishing architectural features.

Tower 35

Tower 35 is rectangular, 18 feet wide and projects 4 feet from the wall with three blocked arrow slits (RCHME 1972, 140). The plinth of the wall and 3 levels of coursing of the surrounding wall correlate to that of the tower.

Tower 36

Tower 36 is rectangular, 16 feet 7 inches wide, projects 3 feet from the wall, has one cruciform arrow slit on its face, two within the merlons of the crenellated parapet and can be dated to its rebuilding in 1864 (RCHME 1972, 142). Up to Walmgate Bar the wall has a cruciform arrow slit in the parapet, then four musket loops, followed by several cruciform slits within alternating merlons. The large archway for traffic was constructed in 1862 and replaced an earlier pathway from 1804. It is 14 feet wide and 21 feet high with large gritstone voussoirs, next to which are steps down from the wall walk (RCHME 1972, 143 & 149).

Walmgate Bar

The construction of Walmgate Bar is dated to the thirteenth century, with the addition of the barbican in the fourteenth century (RCHME 1972, 142). The Bar contains a round-headed archway with the stone of the inner passage dating to the twelfth century, with the portcullis and inner fifteenth century wooden doors surviving (RCHME 1972, 142, 143 & 148) (Figure 30). At the side of the archway are three chamfered buttresses, obscured by the barbican wall but clearly visible at the joint on the exterior, and centrally there is coursing of small limestone blocks up to a chamfered corbel course

at the height of the second-floor. The central plaque commemorates restoration work carried out by the city in 1840 (RCHME 1972, 143). Above the walls of the barbican are the two corresponding square-headed doorways that lead to its platform. Above the central chamfered corbel plinth the façade of the Bar is made of larger ashlar stone blocks containing two rectangular windows. The shield depicts the royal arms of England, above which is a single string course capped by a plain parapet. The flanking bartizans are each supported by five corbels, contain one rectangular window and have crenellated parapets with five merlons. These upper levels of larger stone blocks are dated to the restoration work in 1644 following the Civil War siege (RCHME 1972, 143 & 148).

The barbican (Figure 31) has lateral buttresses with chamfered offsets either side of the pointed archway, which is surmounted by a crenellated parapet with a carved shield of the city's coat of arms and two crenellated bartizans supported by threefold corbelling (RCHME 1972, 149). The sidewalls of the barbican are made of small stone blocks with a single central coursing of larger stone blocks and the crenellated parapets are supported by a continuous chamfered corbel course. Internally the barbican platforms are 4 feet wide and the coursing corresponds to the exterior (RCHME 1972, 149). The barbican itself dominates the profile and approach to the Bar, unlike the other three Bars whose barbicans were demolished. It is possible to appreciate the practical role of a barbican in filtering the passage of people through a series of archways, as well as the potentially intimidating nature of entering it.

On the sides of the internal façade's round-headed archway are two extensions on chamfered plinths at the side walls that rise to a height halfway between the roof and second floor, where they continue on double corbels to the roof. The rest of the façade is dominated by the timber-framed extension that is supported by two stone Roman-Doric columns on square pedestal bases (RCHME 1972, 148) (Figure 32). Above the base columns is an entablature supporting two Doric columns at first-floor height, which in

turn supports another entablature supporting Ionic columns with the structure capped by a third entablature. On the first floor there is a six-lighted window, and on the second floor a five-lighted window. The entire structure is dated to 1584-86, but may have replaced an earlier medieval timber-framed extension (RCHME 1972, 148).

The RCHME ascribes much of the surviving masonry to rebuilding work carried out by the Council following the Civil War siege of 1644, as well as restoration in 1840 that removed cottages abutting the barbican and the demolition of the inner watch house (Mee & Wilson 2005, 63). This was somewhat ironically paid for by the Great North of England Railway Company for the access granted them at North Street Postern, which had resulted in the demolition of the original postern and brick extension of Barker Tower (RCHME 1972, 143). Thomas White's watercolour of 1800 (Figure 33) depicts Walmgate and its barbican prior to its restoration. The dwellings abutting the barbican were two storeys high, including the occupied half-pitched roof with windows, as well as having an enclosed garden encompassing the rampart or moat. Comparing this image with the structure and surrounding area today, what had been a domesticated environment was expunged to present a wholly militaristic structure. This is a marked feature of the restoration work of the nineteenth century, reiterating the interpretation of it as seeking to de-domesticize and re-militarize the appearance of the city's defences. The Bar is currently leased as a coffee shop, 'Gatehouse Coffee'.

Wall to Tower 37

The pedestrian round-headed archway to the side of Walmgate Bar was created in 1840-41 and is 8 feet wide, 10 feet high and above the parapet has two musket loops (RCHME 1972, 149). Like the preceding section of wall this stretch has a plinth at its base and the central coursing is made of larger stones that contrast with the smaller stones of the crenellated

parapet. The outer rampart up to Fishergate Bar was cut back to house cattle pens for the cattle market (RCHME 1972, 149).

Tower 37

Tower 37 is rectangular, 22 feet wide, projects 2 feet 9 inches from the wall, has a chamfered plinth at its base on its front face and it is not bonded to the curtain wall (RCHME 1972, 149 & 151). From this tower to Fishergate Bar roughly two-thirds of the parapet is crenellated and uniform, while the other one-third contains musket loops and is not crenellated. The lower levels of coursing are generally of large ashlar stone with evidence of minor repairs and areas of irregularly sized stone and coursing. The parapet consists of smaller ashlar stone that is consistent with a nineteenth century date.

Fishergate Bar

Fishergate Bar (Figure 34) in its present form consists of 2 side passages with chamfered corbels and a large round-headed fifteenth century archway with a portcullis slot, above which, both internally and externally, are two carvings of the city's coat of arms (RCHME 1972, 152). The height of the Bar correlates to the height of the preceding and succeeding wall parapet and it is unembellished when compared to Micklegate, Bootham, Monk, and Walmgate Bars. It is referenced in 1315, at a time when the Walmgate section of city wall had not been constructed. It was seriously damaged following tax riots of 1489, and so blocked with bricks until it was reopened in 1827 and finally restored in 1961 (RCHME 1972, 152). Its present form more closely resembles a tower rather than a major gateway and thoroughfare of the city. Towers rising above the Bar were present during the seventeenth century and referenced as a dwelling, prison and house of correction in 1584 and 1594 (RCHME 1972, 152; YALH B28, 153v). Internal steps either side of the Bar lead to and from the wall walk. The upper coursing of the wall and parapet above the chamfered plinth to Tower 39

appears to be of one building phase and consistent with the front façade of Fishergate Bar.

Tower 38

Tower 38 is rectangular, 7 feet 6 inches wide, projects 5 feet 6 inches from the wall and has a hollow interior but no entrance. Whilst an addition to the wall, its coursing and stone are consistent to the building of the wall itself (RCHME 1972, 153). At the angle of the wall towards Tower 39 the chamfered plinth steps up a course, the majority of which is dated to the fourteenth century.

Tower 39

Tower 39 (Figure 35) is contemporary with the surrounding fourteenth century wall but has been subject to modification. It is rectangular with a stepped chamfered plinth that correlates to the preceding wall, has two cruciform arrow slits and one non-cruciform vertical slit. Internally there are three recesses, one housing a fireplace and two blocked, and it has a brick vaulted roof that is argued to have features dateable to after the Civil War (RCHME 1972, 153). The chimney has now been removed for the wall walk, as evidenced at other interval towers, suggesting a use of occupation or habitation that is now indiscernible. From here to Fishergate Postern the wall appears to have a combination of ashlar stones and regular coursing, as well as irregularly sized stones. The parapet is defined by a single course of large square stones and ashlar blocks two courses below this, and the crenellations and embrasures above are clearly of different phases to the central and lower coursing below the chamfered plinth. In 1829, 60 yards of wall in this area was rebuilt from the ruinous upper sections, accounting for the height of the wall having been reduced and restored to its present form (RCHME 1972, 153 & 156).

Fishergate Postern and Fishergate Tower

Although first referenced in 1440, the surviving postern is a sixteenth century pointed archway of four orders with chamfered jambs and a portcullis slot between the second and third orders (Figure 36) (RCHME 1972, 156). There is a clear straight joint between the preceding wall and the wall above the postern. The wall of the postern archway has ashlar stone with some yellow limestone near its base in what is otherwise a uniform colour, indicating two building phases, with the lower third being the earliest. If the crenellation above the arch is contemporary with the Postern Tower, as the coursing would suggest, then it is likely that the restoration of the preceding city wall was built to correspond with the height of this wall.

Fishergate Tower (Figure 37) is rectangular with moulded plinths, two tall rectangular buttresses, 14 openings and windows, four storeys high, has a garderobe, a late sixteenth century roof and one entrance at the rear of the tower (RCHME 1972, 156). The third floor would originally have had a flat roof and crenellated parapet with the embrasures used to form windows, similar to those at Layerthorpe Postern and Barker Tower. An etching of Fishergate Postern by William Lodge from 1678 (Figure 38) shows that the form of the tower has not altered externally from its present form, besides the absence of two chimneys and the removal of a third buttress. Fishergate Tower's largely unaltered appearance makes this one of the best surviving and least restored sections of the entire circuit. The city walls recommenced at the moat around Clifford's Tower at the modern position of the traffic lights on Tower Street. Any semblance of the previously water filled moat no longer survive and it is not evident within the modern landscape. A pen and ink drawing by Francis Place from 1699 (Figure 39) depicts this area from the Castle Mills Bridge showing the southern gateway of the Castle and two of its towers. This image gives an impression of the scale of the castle complex and the positioning of it in relation to the rest of the city's defences. Of note is the timber-framed structure with a chimney atop the tower on the

right, highlighting the potential form of structures that may have been common on the interval towers across York's *enceinte*.

Castlegate Postern

Castlegate Postern Tower was D-shaped, 25 feet wide, projected 15 feet, had a high battered base on its curved face, was three storeys and possessed a hipped tiled roof (RCHME 1972, 158). Henry Cave's etching of the Tower from 1813 (Figure 40) shows that the upper floor windows had been inserted within the embrasures of the crenellated parapet, a common feature found elsewhere on domestic buildings along the *enceinte*, as well as the tower possessing a chimney. The postern archway, which was 16 feet high and 11 feet wide, is also depicted (RCHME 1972, 158). In 1698/99 the postern was to be enlarged for the passage of coaches and carriages and it must be this date at which it reached its full extent, as depicted by Cave in 1807 (YALH B39, 117v). Castlegate was regularly leased to citizens. In 1554-55 Mr Shadlock rented the postern and adjoining garden for 3 s., whilst in 1634-35 John Harland rented the postern for 2 s. and the garden for 1 s. (YALH C90:2, C67:1). Not only do these two references highlight the lack of rental variation, but also a consistent use of the tower as a place of habitation. The Council contemplated a change of use for the tower in May 1634 when aldermen were to speak with John Harland about the terms of his lease, and by June formally considered establishing a house of correction on the site (YALH B35, 240v). Within the Receivers' Rolls for 1634-35 no remittance is given to John Harland for the termination of his lease; therefore it was not terminated and plans for a house of correction never came to fruition. In 1826 Castlegate Postern was sold to the County Justices and demolished with the development and expansion of the castle site, and no trace of it survives today (RCHME 1972, 157).

Wall to Davy Tower

The smallest stretch of city wall lies between the site of Castlegate Postern and Davy Tower, situated on what was the bank of the Ouse and parallel to Skeldergate Postern. It is not built on a rampart although the level of the surrounding ground has since 1800 been heightened by several feet, thus reducing the profile of the wall (RCHME 1972, 158). The wall is relatively original with some restoration to the crenellated parapet and blocking of some embrasures. The internal pathway now provides access to the private dwellings known as Tower Place.

Davy Tower

Davy Tower (Figure 41) is an irregular polygon but was formerly rectangular, with a plinth and surviving masonry 10 feet high, above which is brickwork of a summerhouse erected post-1732 and altered in the mid-nineteenth century (RCHME 1972, 159). The stone of the original fourteenth century tower is ashlar and the coursing is uniform, although it does not correlate to the preceding wall and there is a distinct colour variation. This may be accounted for by modern restoration or cleaning. In 1732 a new postern was created at the side of the tower. Known as 'Friargate Postern' it had a stone arch and iron gate and was demolished in 1840 (RCHME 1972, 159). From Davy Tower along the Ouse are the remains of the Franciscan Friary precinct wall that originally had a crenellated parapet and dated to 1290 (RCHME 1972, 159). References to Davy Tower within the documentary evidence are scarce and from 1550-1700 there are no accounts of it being leased. Currently the house above the remains of the tower, combined with the alteration to the riverbank and creation of a pathway, has altered the appearance of the tower and surrounding environment that belies the defensive role of this area and its relationship to the circuit as a whole. It is only through viewing it in conjunction with the adjoining wall and location within the entire *enceinte* that the significance of this isolated site can be understood.

York Castle

York Castle began as a motte and bailey under William the Conqueror, yet it was not until the mid-thirteenth century that the site was reconstructed with stone and included the bailey walls, towers, gates, bridges, kitchen, two halls, a prison and Clifford's Tower atop the motte (RCHME 1972, 59-60). The site was under Royal ownership and therefore jurisdictionally distinct from the city of York with status as a separate liberty, housing a court of justice and acting as an administrative centre for the county; the legal status of the Castle as outside of local jurisdiction continued until as late as 1966 (Mee & Wilson 2005, 72). Throughout its history York Castle had never been under the administration of York's corporation and therefore there were no disputes arising over legal control of the site. The Castle site is located to the south-east of the city between The River Ouse and its tributary the River Foss and a dam constructed across the Foss had historically provided water for the moat to the north of the Castle and around Clifford's Tower; this same dam directly contributed to the creation of the King's Fishpool referenced earlier (Mee & Wilson 2005, 71-72). From 1550-1700 there were no major works carried out on the Castle or programmes of refortification.

Francis Place's 1699 pen and ink drawing of the Castle from the south (Figure 39) and William Lodge's etching of Clifford's Tower from 1678-90 (Figure 42) best depict the site as it stood at the end of the seventeenth century. Place depicts the south gatehouse with a pointed archway that had once housed a drawbridge, a 12 foot pit of which some foundations survive, and either side of it were two drum towers (RCHME 1972, 64 & 76). Another gateway existed to the north of the site giving access to and entry from the city, with a curtain wall encircling the entire area surrounded by the water filled moat. The stretch of wall along this southern section that survives ranges from 4 to 8 feet in thickness and is roughly 25 feet high. Within Place's drawing the gateway and towers at either end of the wall were fully crenellated whilst the parapet was not (RCHME 1972, 77). From a contemporary view of the area (Figure 43) it can be seen that the towers

have been reduced in height to be parallel with the height of the wall, while the drum towers and gateway, largely removed in 1735, are only evidenced by the slight tonal variation of the stonework above where the drawbridge pit is still visible (RCHME 1972, 74). Aside from the section of regular cut and uniform stone coursing of five levels in the top right corner of the wall and the top coursing level, the wall is predominantly made up of irregularly sized stones. With the removal of the gateway and the reduction in height of the towers, the viewpoint of the Castle from this angle gives it a much-reduced profile and is very much devoid of its previous architectural features. As well as the core structure of the towers and walls being much altered, there is no surviving evidence of the buildings that were constructed abutting and on top of the walls internally. From Place's drawing a whole range of buildings with pitched tiled roofs and chimneys are shown to have existed along this section of the Castle wall, as well as the timber framed structure somewhat precariously built atop the tower on the right. The presence of these buildings allude to the site as a working and functioning complex at the end of the seventeenth century that harnessed the architecture of the original defensive structure with multiple additions. Such an example of a timber-framed building built on top of the tower of the Castle are representative of similar structures that may have been found around the *enceintes*' of both York and Hull.

From 1701 to 1705 the new County Gaol, also known as the Debtor's Prison, was built on the site of the Castle, to be followed from 1773 to 1777 by the new Assize Courts and in 1780 the Female Prison. The prison was expanded from 1825 necessitating the demolition of Castlegate Postern and a new crenellated wall encircling the site, which no doubt seeking to reflect the history of the site with reference to historical defensive architecture. The prison was operational until 1929 and afterwards was sold to the city of York in 1934, when all the buildings dating to post-1824 were demolished, thus creating the layout of the site as it is seen today (RCHME 1972, 65-66). The Assize Courts are today the York Crown Court, whilst the other two wings of the site house the York Castle Museum. With the use of neo-

classical architecture adopted for these buildings in the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries (Figure 44), aside from the presence of Clifford's Tower and the reduced southern wall, there is little visual evidence that this was the site of York Castle and there is no indication that it had been surrounded by a water-filled moat.

Clifford's Tower (Figure 45) is the best-preserved building of the original Castle and its core structure has remained largely unaltered since Lodge depicted it at the end of the seventeenth century (Figure 42). It is a quadrilobate stone tower that is two storeys high with a chapel housed above the entrance on the first floor (RCHME 1972, 66). It is constructed from magnesium limestone, the same material as the city walls, and the walls are between 9 and 10 feet thick; above the entrance are the Royal Arms of Charles I and the 5th Earl of Cumberland, Henry Clifford, who garrisoned the Castle in 1642 for the King (RCHME 1972, 73 & 67). Internally the tower was subdivided into multiple rooms, with several spiral staircases and fireplaces as well as numerous apertures on both storeys, and until an explosion in 1684 it was roofed (RCHME 1972, 73-74). Lodge's view of Clifford's Tower (Figure 42) takes its vantage point from the south, showing Castlegate Postern in the foreground on the left and Clifford's Tower atop the motte with a wooden bridge traversing the moat that led to the Castle proper on the right. The motte has a diameter of over 220 feet and is 48 feet high (RCHME 1972, 74).

Owing to the status of the Castle and Clifford's Tower as a separate liberty it is seldom referred to in York's House Books. One incident where it is recorded concerned the partial demolition of Clifford's Tower by the gaoler of York Castle, Robert Redhead, from June 1596 to December 1597 (YALH B31, 190r-192r, 314v-315v & 319r). In a petition to the Lord Chancellor and Privy Council, York's Council sought to halt Redhead's demolition of sections of walls and the tower and his burning of lime for mortar from the stone. Clifford's Tower is referred to as 'one of the heist and farest buildinge for showe & bewtyfyng of this Cyttye', with its demolition representing 'a

great defacing of the buetye & showe of this Cyttye'. In a later petition from December 1597 it is described as being a 'principall ornamente for beautifynge and showe' of the city (YALH B31, 192r & 315r). An emphasis by the Council on the architectural beauty of Clifford's Tower and the determined view that it should not be pulled down is somewhat undermined, however, by them also stating that if the crown were to pull it down they would request use of the stone to repair the city walls. Redhead's activities do appear to have been stopped by the national authorities and Clifford's Tower was not demolished. However, the issue dragged on and was brought before the Council of the North, whose headquarters were located in the King's Manor, another liberty within the city. A tiler, Miles Norton, was brought before York corporation for having slanderously told the Council of the North that he had been given permission by the lord mayor to work the stone from Clifford's Tower. The record states that it was 'knowne to this court to be false for that nether such leave was given nor this court could' as 'the tower being her [majesty's] house or tower and not of the cittie nor franchise of this citty' (YALH B31, 319r). This clear demarcation of ownership and jurisdiction succinctly establishes the context of York Castle within the city of York throughout this period. The crown or national government had jurisdictional and material ownership over the entire castle area, with potential repercussions for perceived incursions by the civic authorities readily investigated at a national level, and awareness by both authorities of the legal situation. Conversely, the civic authorities also felt a degree of affinity over York Castle and an interest in seeing the defences maintained. Therefore there was no jurisdictional confusion or historical conflict over the Castle and Clifford's Tower, or the presence of a liberty administered by the national government within the confines of the site for much of the early modern period.

The fundamental shift in the context of York altered with the onset of the Civil War and the subsequent potential for conflicts of authority that were instituted as a result. The institution of a royally appointed military governor began in 1642 with the 5th Earl of Cumberland, with the position of

governor maintained by the Parliamentary forces during and after the Civil War and continued following the Restoration until 1688. In itself, a military governor based within the historical liberty of York Castle did not necessarily herald a threat to the authority of York's corporation. Tensions within York were possible over the custody of the magazine, soldiers being billeted, their conduct within the city and the watch over the defences. However, from January 1660/61 the governor took control over the keys to all of the city gates and posterns (Tillott 1961, 192; Withington 1998d, 166), representing what Withington refers to as a military appropriation of York's civic and urban defences (1998d, 162). Traditionally, the authority over the ownership, control of the keys and opening of the gates has resided with the lord mayor and corporation. Excluding the immediacy and rupture of the Civil War, this was largely maintained during the 1640's and 1650's (Withington 1998d, 165). This authority was, however, usurped from the 1660's by the governor, outside of the confines of the historical jurisdiction of York Castle. What had been a recognised legal distinction between the local and national authorities' remit of the city's *enceinte* and York Castle, as demonstrated by the 1596 petition regarding Clifford's Tower, came to be appropriated to the detriment of York's traditional and historical civic authority. Lodge's decision to depict the soldiers of Clifford's Tower within his etching is testament to these possible tensions of the nationally maintained military presence within York during this period.

The governor of the garrison from 1682 until 1688 was Sir John Reresby (Mee & Wilson 2005, 20-21). From his memoirs of his time as governor, issues regarding the ownership of the city's keys and control of the gates, and thereby the city walls as a whole, is repeatedly referred to. Reresby recorded in 1682 that he 'was empoured by [his] commission to take the keys of the guarison and to keep them upon the guard in the night, and had all thos of the citty' (Browning 1991, 274). In March 1685/86 he notes that 'the only thing that gave it the face of a guarrison', besides the soldiers themselves, was his possession of the keys and authority over the opening and closing of them; if authority over the keys were returned to the civic

authorities they 'would seem to gain their point extremely in this matter' and it would 'seem an absolute disquarrising of the place' (Browning 1991, 418). For the governor at this time it was the possession of the city's keys and control of the gates that underpinned the very presence of the garrison and its authority.

Although no refortification of the defences occurred during the seventeenth century, there were plans devised for the addition of bastions to York Castle that were contemporaneous with the construction of a bastioned Citadel at Hull. Sir Christopher Musgrave, Lieutenant of Ordinance, conducted a report for the Office of the Board of Ordinance in 1682 on York's defences and within his retinue was Sir Martin Beckman, a figure who was intimately involved with the assessment of Hull's defences and plans for the town's refortification of the eastern Henrician fortifications (RCHME 1972, 176; Howes & Foreman 1999, 59). A map by Jacob Richards from 1685, which may be a copy of an earlier map, depicts the proposed bastioned scheme at York (Figure 46). The plan shows six angled bastions projecting from the existing walls of the castle and the retention of Clifford's Tower, reiterating that by the seventeenth century the angled bastion was the preferred and recognised form for new defences. The cost for this scheme was estimated to be £35,907, yet within the report Musgrave recommended that once the works at Hull were completed it would suffice as the magazine for the county and that Clifford's Tower should be demolished, the garrison disbanded and the city walls and gates demolished (RCHME 1972, 177). Considering the costs involved, it is unsurprising that the bastioned scheme was not implemented given the recognition of Hull's superior military siting for the county's magazine. Reresby notes that Charles II had resolved to disband the garrison and demolish the defences in early 1682/83, although the garrison was continued and he had told the King that a cheaper option of fortifying Clifford's Tower alone would serve to 'prevent any sudden insurrection within the town' (Browning 1991, 290). The RCHME argues that with the death of Charles II, the accession of James II and the ensuing political context, the decision to retain and reinforce the garrison was

undertaken outside of a purely military context (1972, 178). Clearly the role of York as a strategic military site was negligible; the city walls' continued appropriation and the presence of the garrison and governor owed more to the political machinations of the central government and legacy of the Civil War. Fortunately the refortification of York Castle and demolition of Clifford's Tower and the city walls was not undertaken and the defences are today still extant.

St Mary's Abbey precinct walls

The wall surrounding the precinct of the dissolved St Mary's Abbey (Figure 1) and the King's Manor runs for 375 metres north from the Water Tower on the banks of the River Ouse to St Mary's Tower, located at the road juncture of Marygate and Bootham, then east for 155 metres towards Bootham Bar; it would originally have joined up with the 350 feet of wall that was demolished up to Bootham Bar for the construction of St Leonard's Place between 1832 and 1835 (RCHME 1972, 160 & 111). As with the rest of York's *enceinte* it is constructed from magnesium limestone. A boundary wall around the site is first referenced in 1260 with construction starting in 1266, followed in 1318 with a licence to crenellate that entailed the heightening of the existing wall to roughly 16 feet, as well as building several towers with first-floor rooms and thus creating a formal defensive structure (RCHME 1972, 160-161). St Mary's Abbey had been one of the principal houses of the Benedictine order in the north of England. Following the Pilgrimage of Grace, Henry VIII had strengthened the powers of the Council of the North and from the dissolution of the abbey in 1539 until 1641, the Council was housed permanently in the former palace of the abbot, known as the King's Manor. This relocation is argued to have allowed for increased scrutiny of the city from central government within a liberty outside the jurisdiction of York corporation (Gee, 1979, 65; RCHME 1972, 20; Pogson 1997, 185-186; Gurnham 2011, 33-35).

A sketch by Francis Place depicts a panorama of the city and the site of the Abbey grounds (Figure 47) that from right to left includes: a faint outline of Lendal Tower leading to the Multangular Tower, shown just to the right of the Minster in the background, followed by the Hospitium, the roof of the King's Manor, the ruins of St Mary's Abbey, the Water Tower in the foreground and then the wall leading up towards Bootham past St Olave's church. The vast majority of these features still survive within York's modern landscape. The Yorkshire Philosophical Society gradually acquired the site in the early nineteenth century and implemented the creation of the ornamental gardens. From 1896 the City Council acquired responsibility for the preservation and maintenance of the precinct walls, which from 1950 to 1957 underwent a programme of restoration (RCHME 1972, 163). A wall originally ran along the banks of the Ouse as part of the circuit and the depiction of a pointed arch within a ruined wall in the centre of Place's sketch testifies to its location. Clearly by the time this sketch was made, during the latter half of the seventeenth century into the early eighteenth century, very little of this wall survived, although the walls leading to Bootham are clearly visible on the left and were intact. Analysis of the surviving structures of the defences will begin with the Water Tower, shown so prominently on the left of Place's sketch, culminating in the Postern Gateway located near to Bootham Bar.

The Water Tower is externally circular and internally hexagonal with 6 openings in the tower, 4 cruciform arrow slits, a doorway and a rectangular aperture, each corresponding to a side of the interior (RCHME 1979, 164). A detail from Place's sketch (Figure 48) shows the tower's battered base, that a section of wall extended from that base toward the river and it was two storeys high with a crenellated parapet. As it stands today (Figure 49) the bank has concealed the battered base and the tower has been reduced to below the parapet, which then levels off to the height of the nineteenth century pointed archway on the left. The ground floor entrance of the tower survives as well as evidence of a first floor doorway, which would have provided access to the internal wall walk platform (RCHME 1979, 164). The

depiction by Place of a low and easily penetrable wooden fence to the side of the Water Tower suggests that at the time of his sketch issues over access and the defensive capability of the area were not a priority.

The wall leading from the Water Tower has been reduced to a height of 7 feet and leads to an original postern doorway, 2 feet 8 inches wide and 5 feet 10 inches high, now blocked and next to the first tower (Figure 50). The majority of this wall is made of large blocks in contrast to the smaller stones on the upper three courses, suggesting that the lower sections are fourteenth century and the upper sections are later work contemporary with the reduction in height (RCHME 1972, 165). The first tower next to the postern doorway is semi-circular, 10 feet in diameter and projects 5 feet from the wall (RCHME 1972, 165). The coursing of the tower and wall do not correlate, suggesting that the tower was a later addition that was bonded to the wall and it has been reduced in height to that of the surrounding wall. The wall continues at the reduced height with two gateways or openings inserted into it either side of a brick building within the grounds that abuts the wall. From here the wall increases in height to 13 feet and has embrasures along the parapet (RCHME 1972, 165). There is a clear demarcation of stone size and coursing between the majority of the wall and the upper sections of the embrasures and parapet (Figure 51), indicating significant restoration to create a uniformity of the wall with the surviving original embrasures found further along the circuit. Features of the embrasures along the circuit are the L-shaped slots within the reveals that would have housed wooden shutters and are only evident along the St Mary's precinct walls (RCHME 1972, 165). The second tower along the wall is entirely a nineteenth century construction and is the same form and dimension of the first tower, though it is full-height with embrasures in the parapet. A wall walk is present along this circuit that is 2 feet 10 inches wide and is contemporaneous with the fourteenth century heightening and additions of the circuit (RCHME 1972, 165).

The wall continues to St Mary's Lodge and Gatehouse (Figures 52-53). The Gatehouse is architecturally contemporaneous with work undertaken on the nearby St Olave's church from 1470 and the area and gatehouse were associated with the courthouse and prison of the Liberty of St Mary, as well as a chapel of Our Lady by the Gate from 1314 (RCHME 1972, 162). Brick infill and variation in the coursing on the exterior of the Lodge are evident with significant nineteenth century restoration and internal modernisation in 1840 (RCHME 1972, 167).

Abutting the Gatehouse is the church of St Olave's, whose north aisle incorporates the precinct wall constructed in 1266. From here a wall with chamfered offsets extends outwards (Figure 54) with a doorway once defended by a portcullis and four tall narrow openings, all of which are now blocked. The interior of this room was filled with earth to create the raised garden of the adjacent house, 29 Marygate (Figure 55) (RCHME 1972, 167). This house was constructed abutting the external face of the precinct wall. Where the wall is revealed again a section shows the original wall, a central plinth and upper brick walls built atop it (Figure 56) that are remnants from other dwellings before they were demolished. There is then a sharp contrast between the previously built upon wall of irregular sized stones and coursing with the heavily restored facing stone of the succeeding section. However, the parapet was not restored and exposes the internal make-up of the wall of roughly cut stones as well as further evidence of brick additions atop the wall. Also evident are several buttresses and numerous first-floor joist holes (Figure 57). The now demolished structures may have been of the same proportion as 29 Marygate or similar to those found abutting Walmgate barbican and the wall near Lendal Tower, as depicted by White in 1800 (Figure 33) and Whittock in 1858 (Figure 18). As with the clearing of the dwellings at the barbican and near Lendal Tower, this expunged what had been a clearly domesticated environment, whose antecedents may have begun during the early modern period or earlier.

Prior to the third tower an opening has been inserted to provide vehicular access to the ground within the walls. Preceding this are three double chamfered buttresses, two of which are entirely new and greater in height than the original central buttress and at this point the parapet with embrasures restarts. Again the upper section and the embrasures contrast with the older coursing that is identifiable with a period of restoration, but which predated the more recent buttresses. The third tower (Figure 58) is rectangular, over 18 feet high, is open at the back, was originally two storeys high and it has four cruciform arrow slits that the RCHME identifies as belonging to the work of 1318 (1972, 168). The coursing of the lower halves of the tower and proceeding wall appear to correlate, indicating that the base of the tower is contemporaneous with the original thirteenth century wall. Along the wall are further first floor and second floor joist holes as well as vertical patches where the stone facing appears to have been removed (Figure 59). These are in fact where buttresses once stood but which were removed at some stage, possibly through piecemeal theft (RCHME 1972, 169). The height of the original buttresses corresponds to those of the first floor joist holes, intimating that during the construction of the now-demolished structures, stone from the wall was appropriated for building and also served to remove the buttress from intruding into the internal spaces of such buildings. Prior to St Mary's Tower the wall drops to 11 feet, the original height of the thirteenth century wall (RCHME 1972, 169), with two large sections of facing stone having been removed to expose the inner core of the wall.

St Mary's Tower (Figure 60) is situated at the present day junction of Bootham and Marygate. Built in 1324 it is circular, 34 feet in diameter, 30 feet tall, has an octagonal interior, is two storeys high and is capped by a nineteenth century conical roof (RCHME 1972, 169-170). There are two different building phases evident with St Mary's Tower as it stands today owing to rebuilding following an assault on this section of the defences during the siege of York in 1644. On the 23rd April 1644 a Scottish army and Parliamentary forces under Lord Fairfax and the Earl of Manchester took up

respective positions around the city to the south of Micklegate, on the east facing Walmgate and on the west opposite Bootham (Cooke 2011, 29, 32 & 39). Artillery fire had damaged this section of the wall resulting in repairs by the Royalist defenders and on the 16th June a mine that had been placed under St Mary's Tower by the Parliamentary forces was also detonated (RCHME 1972, 163). This is said to have resulted in many civilian casualties, the partial collapse of St Mary's Tower and allowed for the only breach of the defences during the siege. A force of 600 besiegers were able to enter through the breach, although they were repelled by 2,000 Royalist defenders under the Earl of Newcastle, William Cavendish, that resulted in 300 Parliamentary forces being either captured or killed (RCHME 1972, 163; Cooke 2011, 46). York eventually surrendered to the Parliamentary forces on 16th July 1644 through negotiation rather than as a result of a military assault (Cooke 2011, 55-56). Aside from the single breach at St Mary's Tower and adjoining wall, the city defences withstood the siege. The original fourteenth century Tower survives facing the precinct grounds at the back, while the exterior, visible from the road and where it had collapsed in 1644, shows an exposed full height joint mark several feet wide and a setback where it was rebuilt with reused stone (Figure 60). Internally the rebuild is also evident, as the walls' original stonework contrasts with the rebuilt seventeenth century brickwork (RCHME 1972, 169-171). The three first floor windows with ovolo mouldings are identified by the RCHME as having originally belonged to a range of the King's Manor, built by the Lord President of the Council of the North from 1610 to 1620, which were reused during the rebuilding of St Mary's. On the ground floor is a reused fifteenth century window of two lights with trefoiled pointed heads (1972, 169-170). The original fourteenth century doorway at the back of the Tower provides access from the precinct grounds and on the first floor are two doorways that would have led on to the adjoining wall-walks and parapet (RCHME 1972, 169-170).

Henry Cave's engraving *Marygate Tower* (Figure 61) depicts St Mary's Tower as it stood in 1813, and when compared to the appearance of it today

(Figure 60), there is a stark contrast. Although features of St Mary's are familiar, such as the four windows, conical roof and circular form, clearly by the early nineteenth century there had been considerable construction around the site, effectively enveloping the majority of the tower and entirely obscuring the walls of the precinct on either side. The evidence of these and other buildings with exposed joist holes was observed with the wall preceding St Mary's Tower. From Cave's depiction these buildings were at least two storeys high with slanted roofs and chimneys. On the left of Cave's depiction a two-storey extension is shown bonded to the tower, with double doors on the ground floor that would have opened onto the street. The door that is visible today to the left of the ground floor window would have opened up into this extension, suggesting that this and the tower formed one building, with multiple individual buildings elsewhere along the precinct wall. As was found at Walmgate Bar with the clearing of domestic buildings abutting the barbican, along Marygate and Bootham these structures were cleared to reveal the core defensive walls and features in 1896 (RCHME 1972, 171), entirely distorting the non-military and historical use of the defences. Post-1644 buildings had been constructed abutting the Bootham stretch of precinct wall and the RCHME identifies that by the end of the eighteenth century the wall along Marygate had similarly been developed. However, the RCHME also posits that no significant development had occurred in the sixteenth century and majority of the seventeenth century, aside from a couple of buildings (1972, 163).

Certainly any buildings within the vicinity of St Mary's Tower noted in 1682 would have been constructed following the breach and mine explosion of 1644. Yet, records from the Ouse and Foss Bridge Accounts, one of the rental documents of York's Council from 1550-1700, demonstrate that commercial activity and domestic habitation were occurring along the precinct walls. For the year 1573 to 1574 Brian Whether, a smith, is recorded as holding the lease 'for a shop laytly Buylded nygh the Rownd Tower at Saynt Marygaite end' for the annual rent of 4 d. (YALH C93:1). Unfortunately as an account of rents there are no details over the size or layout of the building.

From 1584 to 1585 and 1592 to 1593 Smith's widow is recorded as renting 'a little tente' at the round tower for 12 d. annually (C94:4 & C94:8). Reference to the shop from 1573 had been replaced to just a tenement and even a decade after the first lease the premises were still referred to as 'lately buylded' (YALH C94:4), highlighting that such a phrase cannot suggest a reliable inference of when the building was actually constructed. Within this time the rent of widow Whether had trebled. This suggests that the initial commercial building had been enlarged and developed over time to include domestic quarters, thereby accounting for the increase in rent. As noted within previous leases, the Whethers are likely to have paid for the building of the shop and subsequent house, with the corporation maintaining the freehold over them and likely to have inserted clauses regarding the relinquishing of them for defence. That the lease was maintained from husband to wife for a period of at least 19 years is testament to the potential for investment by individual families toward such structures. In respect of widow Whether, the Ouse and Foss Bridge Accounts also record that for 1592 to 1593, under the heading 'Certen Rents allowed for [diverse] consideracons and others wch refuse to pay', the Council relinquished the rent on the property 'in the tenure of uxor Whether for that mr Beasley hath the same of [her majesty]' (YALH C94:8). Therefore a small tenement, housing a smith shop and domestic quarters attached to St Mary's Tower, had come to the attention of a central government figure leading to the eviction, for unspecified reasons, of the longstanding tenant widow Whether. As St Mary's Tower formed part of the precinct wall for the liberty of St Mary's under the jurisdiction of the Council of the North, it was therefore legitimate for the state to affirm their rights over it. However, the appropriation of the tenement from the tenant and ultimately York's corporation, highlights the potential for jurisdictional conflict over even seemingly insignificant buildings abutting the defences of the city.

From St Mary's Tower further sections of the wall reveal evidence of former buildings with exposed joist holes and areas of removed stone facing (Figure 62). The distinction between the original wall of 1266 and heightening of

the wall in 1318 is also evident, the lower half consisting of smaller stone sizes when compared to the larger stones of the upper section and parapet. There does not appear to have been any restoration of these sections and the fourth and fifth tower since they were exposed in 1914, such as the embrasures and parapet, as the coursing is entirely consistent with the two thirteenth and fourteenth century building phases. Of note are examples of cruciform arrow slits within the merlons of the parapet, a feature only found along the section of city wall near the Red Tower (Figure 28). There are multiple eighteenth and nineteenth century buildings along Bootham abutting the wall. Viewing these buildings and the wall from within St Mary's precinct reveals not only how tightly they are bonded to the wall, but also how they dwarf the height of the defences (Figure 63). The building of what is now the White Horse pub simply bricked up the crenellations when it was raised above the height of the wall (Figure 64). Both the fourth and fifth towers date to 1318, are half-round, have two projecting stub walls at the rear, are internally semi-octagonal, have three cruciform arrow slits, were originally two storeys, roofed and had crenellated parapet platforms (RCHME 1972, 171). The fourth tower is fully exposed, whereas the fifth is half obscured today, the building presently occupied by the 'Janette Ray' bookshop (Figure 65). The siting of this building abutting the curve of the fifth tower, also evident at St Mary's Tower, highlights that the angle of the defences or other obstructions did not represent an impediment to construction; in fact the use of an existing wall would have reduced building costs.

At the end of the extant circuit of St Mary's precinct walls are the Postern Tower and Postern Gateway (Figures 66-67) that were both constructed in 1497 (RCHME 1972, 172-173). The Postern Tower is rectangular, with the third storey added in the seventeenth century, projects outward from the precinct wall, is 27 feet tall and constructed from brick with ashlar facing (RCHME 1972, 172). Within the tower are several windows as well as blocked cruciform arrow slits. There were originally two doorways, one without the precinct and one within, the latter having been partly filled in to

form a window and there is evidence of a chimney having been inserted on the second floor, since removed (RCHME 1972, 173). The stone size and coursing of the tower appears to be all of one building phase and distinct from the surrounding fourteenth century precinct wall, parts of which must have been demolished and perhaps reused in the building of the tower. Today the City Sightseeing bus tour company operates from within it.

The adjoining Postern Gateway consists of a segmental stone headed archway 10 feet 7 inches high and would have originally housed inwardly opening doors, with the smaller 7 feet high opening to the left inserted in 1836 for pedestrians (RCHME 1972, 173). Either side of the original gateway are two double chamfered buttresses and along the surviving parapet one of the merlons is pierced, below which are exposed joist holes, indicating that some form of building once abutted the wall internally. A plaque erected in 1899 by the Yorkshire Philosophical Society commemorates the gateway as Queen Margaret's Arch following the then Princess Margaret's stay in the city on her progress north to marry James IV of Scotland in 1503. This is a posthumous cause for the building of the gateway as it is first referenced in 1500 and most likely was built to afford better access to the palace of the abbot of St Mary's Abbey (RCHME 1972, 162), later the King's Manor from 1539 (Figure 68), whose entrance directly correlates to that of the gateway and postern. The following section of wall from the gateway would have led to Bootham Bar, yet as stated was demolished between 1832 and 1835 and today forms part of the city's inner ring road. A boundary wall originally ran parallel and southwards with that of the city wall past the King's Manor toward the Multangular Tower (RCHME 1972, 173). With only small fragments surviving, it is generally indiscernible today that such a wall existed.

The precinct walls of St Mary's Abbey were removed from the larger periods of restoration carried out elsewhere along the city's *enceinte* during the nineteenth century under the civic authorities, only coming under their jurisdiction in 1896, therefore they were not subject to the same degree of

alteration. Those alterations elsewhere on the circuit included the creation of the pedestrian wall walk platform and homogenisation of defensive architectural features, allowing for three discernible and dominant building phases of the walls to be understood from the extant walls: medieval, early modern and nineteenth century. The continued development and occupation of structures abutting St Mary's walls during the nineteenth century restoration periods, evident from exposed joist holes and surviving occupied buildings, precluded restoration and these features being expunged. Combined with the demolition between the city wall at Bootham and precinct walls in the 1830's, this material separation isolated the urban defences, a situation that had jurisdictionally existed, if not physically, then legally, throughout their history. The material evidence of the sustained occupation and development of buildings abutting the walls of St Mary's are features likely to have also been evident along the rest of the *enceinte* prior to its phases of restoration.

Conclusion

An architectural analysis of the urban defences reveals that the integrity of the original foundations of the medieval circuit is largely intact, with substantial alterations or demolitions occurring largely in the nineteenth century. It also highlights the sheer scale of the defences as a physical structure to be maintained by York's corporation over the centuries. Exactly how these defences were maintained within the corporation's governing structures has yet to be fully appreciated within the existing literature. The surviving material alludes to the constant rebuilding and conservation of the walls, which continues to the present day. This thesis will for the first time reconstruct and detail the systems of administration for the walls during this period and what this highlights about the increasing professionalization of civic-office holding and employment of professional building crafts. The irregular design of the towers, walls and gateways suggests that there was no uniform plan for the defences. For example, the interval towers consist of numerous footprints, including rectangular, demi-hexagonal, semi-circular and polygonal, often varying within a single stretch of a wall. A generalised pattern for the phasing of the defences is discernible: medieval, post-medieval and nineteenth century. The restoration work carried out in phases during the nineteenth century has undoubtedly served to unify sections of the walls with features, particularly the levelling of the walls height and the insertion of the wall walk platform. As seen starkly with Walmgate Bar and sections of St Mary's Abbey precinct walls, the restoration also served to de-domesticize and re-militarize the appearance of the walls, whilst also creating contemporary passages for traffic, pedestrians, tourists and infrastructure. That so much survives is testament to the success of these restoration phases and maintenance throughout the centuries. In conjuncture with the relatively unrestored sections of St Mary's Abbey precinct walls, an idea of the material nature of non-defensive structures operating in tandem with the defensive walls can be gleaned.

However, fundamentally, and inevitably, the function of the walls has altered both materially and spatially. Analysis of the surviving material alone, however, cannot reveal who maintained them, lived in them, or their function within the administration of a city at all levels of society. Surviving documentary sources are fundamental and allude to the scope for further research, which allows for an understanding as to why a medieval structure was pertinent to the administration of early modern York. They reveal how the static defences were used, traversed and negotiated and what they meant for those living within the urban area enclosed by them.

Chapter 3- Architectural analysis and the building phases of
Kingston-upon-Hull's town defences

Introduction

During the period 1550-1700, Hull's fortifications encompassed the medieval brick walls that enclosed the town, with the east and south of the town abutting the Rivers Hull and Humber respectively. On the east of the River Hull a series of three blockhouses with an interlinking curtain wall had been constructed in the 1540's, with subsequent redevelopment of the site and structures in the 1680's and 1690's to create the bastioned Citadel. The medieval walls, gates and towers enclosed an area of 80 acres and were initially built in the 1320's to 1350's using an estimated four and a half million bricks, argued to represent medieval England's most extensive use of brick construction (Allison 1969a, 412; Gurnham 2011, 10-11). The walls were 14 feet high and encircled all but the section of the town that faced the River Hull, whilst outside the walls ran the town moat or ditch that was filled with fresh water via sluices (Allison 1969a, 414 & 416). Combined with the geographical location of the town, the natural confluence of the two rivers, the construction of the brick walls, water filled moat and the addition of defences on the eastern side of the River Hull in the mid-sixteenth century, Hull's defences represented a fully unified and extensive system of fortification. The defences were also further able to harness the Rivers Hull and Humber by cutting their banks to flood the surrounding area for some 2 miles around the town, as occurred in both 1642 and 1643 when the town was besieged (Cooke 2011, 14 & 22).

However, this system of defence is no longer extant above ground and came to be completely levelled post-1700 (See Item 10, p. 2, Tabulation of building, demolition and restoration programmes), which limits any architectural analysis of these historical structures to the confines of artistic and cartographical images, as well as limited archaeology. As a site, Hull's defences represented an example of medieval and early modern defensive

architecture working in tandem with one another. Had they survived it would represent a unique architectural and historical record with which to analyse and combine with the documentary material to better understand their function and the history of the town from 1550-1700. The surviving architectural details of York's defences offer a potential insight into what may have been in evidence at Hull. In lieu of their physical survival, this thesis will holistically recreate and analyse Hull's defences based upon the available historical pictorial images and the supporting archival material. This period witnessed the retention of the medieval walls, as well as the construction of two state-endorsed development of new fortifications to the east of the town in the 1540's and 1680's, with the ensuing repercussions from both instances being influenced by the corporations' historical legal ownership and utilisation of them.

The best surviving depiction of early modern Hull is Wenceslaus Hollar's aerial engraving dating from 1640 (Figure 69). It is depicted from a western perspective, with the southern section of the walls next to the Humber being shown on the right of the engraving. It clearly shows the layout of the town itself with the main streets recorded, along with details such as the names of the individual staiths for the loading and unloading of ships along the River Hull, as well as the Henrician cylindrical and bastioned blockhouse fortifications that encircled the eastern half of the town. Analysis of the medieval walls will start with the section of wall at the convergence of the River Hulls and Humber that then ran along the shore of the Humber leading to the first of Hull's four gates, Hesse Gate. The panoramic view at the top of Hollar's engraving shows the southern section of wall with Hesse Gate being located on the left. The walls then followed the line of the moat northwards around the town and culminated in North Gate, which is depicted nearest to the North Bridge on the left of Hollar's engraving. The core medieval *enceinte* was not subjected to major alteration, beyond rebuilding and conservation, so it can be understood as being distinct from the two phases of fortification construction by the state on the eastern side of the River Hull. These new defences were physically, as well as periodically

under the authority of non-local authorities, distinct from the existing medieval *enceinte*. The demolition of Hull's defences has to date impeded the recognition of the merits of its defences for historical research, something this thesis will definitively counteract.

Kingston-upon-Hull's enceinteHumber Shore, also known as the South End

The detail taken from Hollar's print (Figure 70) depicts the shoreline of the Humber and the southern section of Hull's defences. The presence of shipping alludes to the maritime nature of Hull's role as a port, with the ships both leaving or entering the River Hull between the South Blockhouse on the right (a large flag of St George flies above it) and the beginning of the town's walls. The rows of multi-storeyed buildings and houses with their pitched roofs that lined the western bank of the River Hull can also be seen. Half of this section of wall was built up against the foreshore of the Humber, whilst that on the right had what appears to be a pier or jetty like structure, with palisades shoring up the earth providing access to a postern gate. This area of the town within the walls was known as The Roperie, recorded as 'Roperie' on Hollar's map, or often as The South End. In June 1592 Hull's Bench Book records that the jetty at the 'south ende' was decayed with 'danger likely to ensue' if it were not repaired, so an order was made to construct 'a new jettie in the same place and somewhat more in length than the former was' (HCA BRB.2, 272r). Orders of Hull's Bench occur frequently in relation to the repair of the jetties and staiths around the city and clearly their maintenance represented a continuous commitment on the part of the town.

Although not clearly visible, there was a tower at the South End to house a chain that would be drawn across the haven to the jetty located next to the South Blockhouse to prevent ships sailing up it (HCA BRB.5, 435). Indeed it may be the square tower with a crenellated parapet that is depicted abutting a two-storey building nearest the haven opening. An order from February 1646/1647 states that a chain was to be provided 'as hath bene formerly accustomed' (HCA BRB.3, 752), indicating that this was a long-standing defensive measure. This same measure was deployed in York from the towers located at either end of the city along the River Ouse. Hull's chain

was repaired in 1654 for 20 li. (HCA BRB.4, 154), yet by March 1673/74 an inspection by two aldermen found the chain had been removed and the town's shipwrights and carpenters were requesting to lease the tower for storage; this request was denied and use of the tower was retained by the Bench for their own storage of sand and other materials for 'the Towns service' (HCA BRB.5, 360-361). The design of the Chain House must therefore have been a relatively substantial building, able to store quantities of material as well as an iron chain to stretch across the haven. By 1673/74 the defensive function of the tower had given way to storage, as there is no mention of the missing chain being replaced and in August 1675 only enquiries were ordered to be made as to its whereabouts and replacing it (HCA BRB.5, 435). In 1691 the Chain House tenant was evicted during her lease, with the garrison forces having taken custody of it, though as recompense she was abated a proportion of her rent (HCA BRB.6, 267).

Of the possible nine discernible towers depicted by Hollar in this section of the wall, only the central tower is shown as round whilst all the others are square and there is a uniform crenellation running along this section. The smaller squat square towers projected outward from the wall and provided platforms above that corresponded with the inner wall-walk platform running along the top of the wall. Details by Hollar of arrow-slits on the exterior of the walls suggest that there were rooms within the towers, whilst an internal view (Figure 71) shows the semi-circular tower to have been four storeys high with multiple apertures. Figure 71 shows there to have been internally an arcade of arched openings running the entire length of the wall with the Ropery street running parallel, punctuated only by the postern gateway, one semi-circular and one square tower. From the archival material there is clear evidence that this section of wall was built upon and sections used for non-defensive purposes. For example, there is reference to a cobbler's shop being built into the walls at the Southend in 1604 (HCA BRB.2, 239r), three rooms were let at the Ropery with 'all other previlidges' in 1656 to some rope makers (HCA BRB.4, 186), as well as in 1610 the walls and crenellations being used by rope makers to hang their ropes 'on top of

the towne walls and through the loopholes of the same to the dainger of the breakinge the same'; for this offence the persons guilty were to be fined everyday 10 s. (HCA BRB.3, 13). However, the practice of leasing access to the loopholes for rope makers, as well as the towers and other structures, clearly continued and in 1683 the town's aldermen were surveying how many loopholes were being rented and agreeing new leases (HCA BRB.6, 79 & 82).

Explicit reference to a named tower at the Southend occurs in 1662 and 1663, when it is recorded as the Mally and Mallow Tower respectively. One definition of 'Mallow' refers to the widespread plant with rose-purple coloured flowers found on 'waysides and waste places' (<http://www.oed.com/>); this would suggest the possibility that such a plant was prevalent around the tower's environs, thus accounting for its documented name. In 1662 the tower had 'beene lately broken by a prisoner' and the Bench ordered the 'breach' to be repaired (HCA BRB.4, 523). Though not stated, it can be assumed that it was some form of internal damage rather than structural, despite the use of the word breach. A year later, 'the low roome' of the tower is recorded as being leased to Martin Cooper, a rope maker, and was used by rope makers for weighing (HCA BRB.4, 523). In June 1691 the tower appears to have been leased in its entirety to one Mercy Ogle who 'upon her peticon is to have the [liberty] of living in Mally Tower' (HCA BRB.6, 185). It is only when Hollar's image is combined with the archival and documentary evidence that an idea of the multi-faceted nature of the walls function can be gleaned, which included commercial, domestic and defence. A lease from September 1574 between the Hull Bench and Thomas Eampson for a tower summarises this aspect:

'the said maior and burgesses did seale with their comon seale and delyver as the dede...unto Thomas Eampson...hull mariner for...a lease of a tower over ye Brogers howse for thirteen years for ye yearly rent of v s. ...Thomas eampson ys charged wth all manner of repacons of ye tower and ye lead of ye tower. The maior and Burgesses for defence of ye tower and for every other necessary cawse may enter

upon the said tower and use the saime at their will and [pleasure] the said lease notwithstandinge' (HCA BRB.2, 113v)'.

The location of this tower is not identified, but clearly they could be and were leased to citizens by the Bench, whereby the lessee was designated with their structural maintenance and the uncertainty that their lease could be overridden by the authorities for defensive purposes. As well as the defences having multiple uses, there is also evidence that buildings were constructed against them. In 1585, a lease for a widow Kimpson stipulated that she was to have a lease of a house for 23 s. a year and to pay for all manner of repairs, 'the maine walle towards the haven onelie excepted' (HCA BRB.2, 239r). The 'maine walle' could only have meant the town wall itself, which the Bench had responsibility to maintain. As with Thomas Eampson's lease, widow Kimpson was to maintain her leased property and also to relinquish the building so that 'in tyme of anie troble the towne to use yt at pleasure' (HCA BRB.2, 239r). One example of a lessee damaging the integrity of the wall at the South End comes in September 1693, when Towers Wallis inserted a 'doorstead into the Southend...wthout leave of this Court' (HCA BRB.6, 320) and it was then ordered to be blocked up. To have punctured the town wall with a doorway would have created a new access point for Wallis, but undermines any notion that the walls were entirely defensive, at least for those citizens operating or renting areas in and around them.

The large square, unroofed and hollow tower that projected inward from the town walls was only crenellated on three sides and can be identified as being a postern gateway. From Hollar's print it can be seen that having entered through the exterior gateway there was then another internal doorway, before it then opened out on to The Ropery street. If this postern had come under attack or the first doorway breached, there was then a second doorway to overcome with the defenders able to attack any assailants from the walkway above. The square tower nearest to Hesse Gate appears slightly shorter than the semi-circular tower, though again arrow slits and apertures are shown, and in keeping with the rest of the circuit it

had a crenellated parapet. From this tower the wall led to the imposing Hesse Gate. Besides the postern, semi-circular and square towers, this southern section of wall would appear to have been uniform in design and height and was fully crenellated, suggesting a single construction phase. Hollar's engraving is one artistic recording of these structures, but the accuracy of his work would appear to be highlighted in the detailed depictions of the variations in the shape of individual towers and number of apertures or openings. This suggests that a high degree of reliability can be afforded to the engraving for the architectural analysis of a structure that no longer survives.

In June 1694 a loop hole and rights to unload timber from the haven were granted to the same Towers Wallis 'with Condition that he will not doe or cause to be done any damage to the brestworke of the said Southend' (HCA BRB.6, 347). Considering his insertion of a doorway through the walls in 1693, such conditions were no doubt warranted. It was also not detrimental to his election as mayor for the year 1710/11, as recorded on the compiled list of the town's mayors by the Hull History Centre (anon, 2010). The reference to the 'brestworke' refers to the earthen fortifications that were erected during the Civil War around the *enceinte*, and which represent the only significant additions to them during the period 1550-1700. However, the breastwork may in fact be a much earlier sixteenth rather than seventeenth century construction phase. Hollar depicts a structure abutting the walls from his view of the Humber shoreline that is not evident from his aerial perspective (Figure 72). The squat form of the building, with several jutting platforms, ground floor apertures and first-floor slanted parapet, indicates this was a form of fort designed to house artillery and had been constructed as a permanent structure. The design of the fort is too complex to simply have been an earthwork for mounting artillery and appears more architecturally contemporaneous with the Henrician blockhouses. The permanence of the structure may be inferred by the position of a flag atop it, a feature found elsewhere atop the principal gates and upon the Henrician additions. In 1646 the Bench Book records that soldiers under the command

of the governor were to be stationed 'within the walls of the ffort and have use of the 'great Guard howse' at the South End (HCA BRB.3, 741). The use of the term 'ffort' differentiates the structure at the South End from simply an earthen ravelin or rampart. This is evidence that Henrician or bastioned additions were not limited to the state-endorsed works of the 1540's or those erected during the Civil War of the seventeenth century.

Hessle Gate

The road from the gate led to the village of Hessle westwards along the Humber, thus accounting for the gate's name, and was located next to the Humber shoreline and spanned the town moat; the contemporary Hessle Road still follows this route today. Hollar's depiction of Hessle Gate from the Humber (Figure 73) differs from his aerial perspective (Figure 74). Figure 73 shows the gate to have been formed by two symmetrical, crenellated, rectangular and three-storey towers, linked by a central two-storey structure that would have concealed the bridge spanning the moat, beneath which was an arched water channel to the moat from the Humber and another smaller opening to the right. Figure 74 shows the gate to have been far narrower and without such a marked difference in height between the two towers and central section. This may have been done for artistic reasons in terms of depicting the proportion and scale of the gate in relation to the rest of the composition of the town. When comparing these two depictions by Hollar with William Bromley's 1800 engraving *A view of Hessle Gate* (Figure 75), it would appear to correlate best with Hollar's perspective from the Humber, which showed there to have been a marked difference in height between the two towers and the central section (Figure 73). Bromley depicts the remains of the Civil War earthworks in the foreground, which by 1800 were used as a vantage point for well-dressed sightseers; one figure is shown using a handheld periscope to survey the landscape. Construction of substantial earthworks or batteries are recorded in 1642 outside of Hessle Gate, as well as the other three principal gates and a postern as part of the siege preparations (Allison 1969a, 415). Estimates for the repair of the jetty

and stonework around Hessle Gate in 1642 amounted to 50 li. and 200 li. respectively, with reference to the 'weight of the horneworke laily raised upon it for fortificacon of the towne' (HCA BRB.3, 746). Flooding of the surrounding land in 1642 and 1643 by the defenders of the town meant that fighting was mostly concentrated around Hessle Gate as one of the only means of approaching the town by land (Cooke 2011, 22). This was presumably along the raised road and bank that ran parallel to the Humber and accounted for the addition of earthen defences that were still visible by 1800.

Hessle Gate consisted of two towers housing gateways and a series of upper level rooms either side of the moat that were then linked by a central structure that spanned the water-filled moat. This design is similar to a barbican, such as those that were constructed at York, yet differs in that at York each gate only had one tower with a correlating projecting barbican, rather than the two towers either end, as shown at Hessle Gate. Walmgate Bar in York is the best surviving example of an extant barbican gateway and the similarities with Hessle Gate, in general fortification design and appearance, are noteworthy from the pictorial evidence (Figures 76-77). Walmgate Bar and Hessle Gate would have been used to filter the passage of people through the gateways and then at times of defence attacks could have been made from above atop the central section toward any besiegers. Hollar (Figure 74) would appear to show that the central section of Hessle Gate was covered by a platform, unlike Walmgate Bar that was open and relied on walkways either side of the barbican walls. From the pictorial images it is unclear how much stone, if any, was used or if Hessle Gate was entirely constructed from brick, though it is likely capping stones on the crenellations or any reliefs, such as coats of arms, would have used stone. Without the surviving structure it is impossible to deduce what materials or quantities of materials were used or differing construction phases.

Hollar's depiction (Figure 74) of the first tower of Hessle Gate, furthest from the town wall, depicts a square-headed archway, above which was a

chamfered round-headed arch half the height of the exterior, leading to the crenellated front elevation parapet and the position of a large flag; the other two sides appear to have been uncrenellated and seemingly the only part of the gate's parapet not to have been crenellated. On either side of the first gateway structure were two full-height lateral buttresses with two chamfered offsets. The town wall to the north of Hesse Gate had been demolished by 1800 and around this time the remaining wall on the Humber shore was also demolished (Allison 1969a, 417). Bromley's engraving may well depict Hesse Gate in a stage of demolition, or certainly at least partial demolition. By 1800 the front tower had been removed up to the second row of full-height lateral buttresses, thereby exposing the inner face of the tower and ground floor pointed archway that led to the central section spanning the moat (Figure 77). A doorway above what was the inner archway attests to a room within the tower that was entered from the platform of the central section.

Behind this first tower two half-height lateral and double chamfered buttresses would have risen from the moat itself, supporting the walls and crenellated parapet of the central section; Hollar also depicts these buttresses but they are not shown on the Humber shore side. The channel that led out to the Humber for the water filled moat is visible in Bromley's engraving between the two lateral buttresses. Given the proximity of a building shown on the left of the engraving and a pathway leading from the channel, the moat was no longer supplied with water and had been built upon. Bromley's engraving also shows that the town wall had been demolished, as it contrasts with Hollar's depiction of the bonding between it and Hesse Gate at the joint of the central section and the second tower. This second tower was likely to have been of the same proportions as the first, containing the same number of archways through to the city proper, rooms above the ground floor and a crenellated parapet and platform; Hollar depicts three storeys within it, judging from the number of apertures illustrated in 1640 (Figure 73). Therefore, by 1800 (Figure 77) the tower had been reduced by one storey along with the crenellated parapet. Hesse

Gate was clearly a substantial structure with two towers that were three storeys high and connected by a central section that traversed the water-filled moat. Defensively there were at least 4 doorways, perhaps a mechanism for making the moat impassable, portcullises and a crenellated platform from which to engage with any besiegers. Archival evidence for the usage or materiality of Hessle Gate is very limited beyond references for repairs from 1642, as noted above. However, through the pictorial evidence it is at least possible to comprehend to a degree the form and function of Hessle Gate architecturally, and to analyse it separately and also as part of a much larger *enceinte*.

Wall and towers to Myton Gate

Hollar depicts the section of wall between Hessle Gate and Myton Gate as having been entirely uniform, fully crenellated and containing three identical towers built into the wall that projected outwards into the land between the wall and the moat (Figure 78). All three towers were crenellated on three sides while the backs were open to the town, and judging from the depiction of apertures, all had rooms on their first floor. There was presumably a wall walk that ran along this circuit, similar to that found along the South End. The tower nearest Hessle Gate has been identified as another postern gate and the outline of a semi-circular archway is visible, along with a series of correlating wooden piles in the moat for a bridge (Allison 1969a, 413). Such a postern would have provided access to the outer face of the walls and the land at their base for repairs or other uses perhaps. The depiction of wooden piles but no bridge implies that this was an infrequently used point of access, particularly with Hessle Gate so near, but that at times a bridge could have been temporarily erected for large scale works and movement of building materials or access. In February 1586/87 reference is made for 'the planks of the posternes [to] be taken upp' (HCA BRB.2, 245v), which must refer to the temporary bridge or bridges of the postern gates. This stretch of the *enceinte* would appear to be one construction phase owing to the uniformity of the design and identical

towers. However, where the wall is bonded to Hesse Gate a small section of wall is shown to have been much higher than then abruptly dropped to the height of the crenellated parapet. This suggests that at some point the wall was in fact lowered in height to achieve this section of *enceinte* as depicted by Hollar.

From the documentary evidence it is possible to identify that sewers ran along the internal face of the town walls. For example, from Myton Gate to Blanket Row, the street where the postern of an unknown name would have opened out on to, repairs for the vaulting of a sewer were ordered in April 1669 (HCA BRB.5, 172) and in May of the same year the new vaulting was continued along to Hesse Gate (HCA BRB.5, 174). This demonstrates the sophisticated water supply systems that were potentially operational at Hull, with sluices being operated for the moat as well as sewerage within the town. Indeed, references to the maintenance of water supplies and channels are frequently recorded in Hull's Bench Books. In September 1578 water coming from 'Julian dike by wch the freshe water is [wholly] and only conveyed to this towne for yt by the same lane...the freshe water is very often and many tymes is corrupted as it will not well serve for any use' (HCA BRB.2, 198v). In 1634 the mayor and some aldermen made an order to view 'the Townes ditches, sluices and sewers as well wthin the walls and without, that the same may be clenched and opened...for that much Complaint is made for not repairing of the same and much annoyance is thought to have growne thereby' (HCA BRB.3, 341). With water a 'scarce and valuable resource in all pre-industrial cities' (Jenner 2000, 250), as well as polluted watercourses potentially representing a 'source of collective shame' for urban communities (Rawcliffe 118, 2013), an emphasis on water supply and quality is discernible. Within London the lord mayor and aldermen would process to inspect the conduit heads of the city's water pipes, thereby affirming the significance of the water supplies, as well as dining in a specially constructed banqueting house for the occasion from the 1560's (Jenner 2000, 254). Within Hull, as well as other coastal towns and cities, their geographical location meant that water supplies could become

contaminated with salt, impacting not only on drinking water but also industrial processes and food preparation; attempts in Hull from 1376 to supply the town with water from Anlaby had failed (Rawcliffe 2013, 353). Therefore within the Bench Books there is evidence for the multiple systems of water controls and civic concerns over supplies of water. By 1699 the moat was said to 'stinketh' and a means was ordered to be devised for the water to be 'made sweet...and prevent the stinking for the future' (HCA BRB.6, 446). Therefore amidst the defensive structures themselves, including the moat, there were concerns over the supply of water and means of sewerage for the town that navigated and were entwined with the defences themselves.

Myton Gate

Myton Gate was called such because the road from it led to what had been the liberty of Myton, which included a manor, once held by the Pole family, that in 1552 was granted to the corporation of Hull by the crown (Allison & Tillott 1969, 3). The gateway (Figure 79) was a round-headed archway and above that was a round-headed half-height chamfered arch. To either side of the front elevation was a single full-height lateral buttress with two chamfered offsets, not dissimilar to those found at Hessle Gate. Unlike Hessle Gate that consisted of two towers, Myton Gate was a single rectangular tower projecting out from the town walls. Hollar depicts two apertures above the chamfered arch, indicating a room within the tower. Above this is a platform surrounded by a half crenellated and half non-crenellated parapet, at the front of which was flown a large flag. Myton Gate was approached via a piled bridge over the moat, similar to the piling found for the bridge before the postern, though seemingly a permanent structure. Repairs for the bridge itself are recorded in 1565, 1692 and 1697 (HCA BRB.2, 55; BRB.6, 286, 424). The use of 35 trees at Myton Gate in October 1638, at a cost of 38 li. 1 s., may represent work done on it or alternatively for the seventeenth century earthen defensive additions (HCA BRB.4, 85). A guardhouse is referenced with a drawbridge being attached to the 'ravelline'

earthwork in 1681 (HCA DX 130/5, 103v & 104r). A map by an unknown artist from 1774 (Figure 80) depicts the form of the earthen defences of the eighteenth century, which would have been based upon those constructed in the seventeenth century and clearly conformed to bastioned defensive designs along the European and Dutch models. The ravelin at Hesse Gate was a four-sided angular earthen platform able to support artillery and was traversed by the road and drawbridge referenced in 1681. The 1774 map shows that these earthen works were also surrounded by a water-filled moat or ditch. They acted as part of a larger defensive scheme (Figure 81), which from the map shows that the same earthen ravelin design deployed the angled bastion, or *Trace Italienne*, at each of the gates and the postern between Beverley and North Gate. Hollar does not depict these earthworks, meaning either that their construction post-dated 1640, or that they had been intentionally not depicted so as not to highlight that Hull had erected new defensive earthworks.

A fair granted by Elizabeth I to Hull in 1599 stipulated that the sheep market was to be kept around Myton Gate and the surrounding streets, with the gate likely to have been utilised for the regulation of that market (HCA BRB.2, 322v). In 1639 companies of trained bands or soldiers were provided with a banquet and provisions on the site (HCA BRB.3, 502). Evidence of dwellings, if not a suburb, are noted in 1685 when the 'houses out of Miton gates' were surveyed for defects and the roof tiles replaced (HCA BRB.6, 126 & 128). These instances within Hull's Bench Books do not in themselves provide any evidence for the materiality of Myton Gate or the use of the rooms above the gateway. However, they are able to highlight at least some of the frequent and infrequent uses of the area and peoples that would have passed through the gates environs, including livestock. These activities demonstrate the duality of Hull's town walls for both defensive and non-defensive purposes.

Wall and towers to Beverley Gate

As was observed at Hessle Gate, the wall that is bonded to the side of Myton Gate is depicted to have dropped in height to the level of the crenellated parapet and wall walk platform (Figure 82). If this is indicative of the wall having been reduced in height at some point, then these western sections of the wall are likely to have been altered at the same time and according to a single design. However, such work is not recorded within the documentary evidence, and without the structures surviving the date and certainty of this alteration cannot be ascertained. Between Myton and Beverley Gate Hollar shows five towers built within the wall; the second, fourth and fifth towers were identical in form and crenellated on three sides, while the backs were open to the town and projected out into the land between the wall and the moat. Identical to the preceding towers of the *enceinte*, internal rooms would therefore also have been present within them. The first tower nearest Myton Gate is shown by Hollar to be fully crenellated, slightly taller and larger in form, though contemporaneous with towers two, four and five, judging from their general appearance. The central tower was circular with a crenellated parapet and before it was a series of piles in the moat for a bridge. The street leading to the tower within the town was called Postern Gate Street, clearly indicating the existence of a well-established postern gate. Owing to the disjuncture of the circular tower amidst the surrounding square towers, as well as the street name correlating with it, it can be deduced that this was the oldest surviving tower, one whose form was unaltered during alterations to the *enceinte* because it was an actively used postern gate. Hollar's engraving is only a single artist's depiction, but the recording of these differences and details again supports the reliability of the engraving as an accurate representation of the walls in 1640.

From May 1645 orders were made by Hull's corporation for the 'necessary defence of this Towne that all ye Towne walls from ye Hessle gaites to the North Gaites shalbe enlarged and made of an equall breadth and height

according to patterne and worke already begun...betwixt Hesse gates and myton gates' (HCA BRB.3, 666). By September 1646 the walls between Myton Gate and Beverley Gate had been completed and further orders were made that the same 'patterne already done wth earth and sodds' was to be continued from Beverley Gate to North Gate (HCA BRB.3, 711). The purpose of this 'patterne' was for the mounting of artillery atop the earth to fire from the town walls, as well as to strengthen the walls against the impact of artillery fire from any besiegers. The impact of artillery fire was demonstrated in November 1646 when 50 yards of wall, from Myton Gate to the circular postern tower, collapsed. This was attributed to 'the great weight of earth on the Inside thereof...and the weight and shakeing of the ordinance thereon in times of service' that was compounded by 'excessive raine...and the mortar of the wall being thereby loosed' (HCA BRB.3, 744). The wall was not immediately rebuilt with brick but rather wooden palisades, at a cost of 30 li., which was borrowed from the Committee of Sequestrations and Hull's Bench guaranteeing to repay the money should it 'not be allowed in their accompts to the Comon Wealth' (HCA BRB.3, 748). A report on the defences from 1681, conducted by Sir Martin Beckman for the Office of the Board of Ordnance in London, records that this breach was in fact 63 yards in length and that the final costs incurred by Hull's corporation amounted to 292 li. 15 s. 3 d. (HCA DX 130/5, 102r). Therefore the initial 30 li. for immediate repairs was dwarfed by the eventual costs. It is also clear that the central government had not met these expenses, and this emphasises the financial burden faced by the town in maintaining the entire town wall and fortifications. No reference to any of the towers collapsing is made and it can be assumed that the rebuilding of the wall followed the previous design with a crenellated parapet.

Beverley Gate

Beverley Gate was located at the juncture of the western and northern circuit of the *enceinte* and its name corresponded to the road that led to the walled town of Beverley, some 9 miles to the northwest. Hollar's 1640

depiction of Beverley Gate (Figure 83) shows a substantial building, but one whose basic structure had become obscured by structural additions. J. Taylor's 1776 engraving, *Beverley Gate Hull* (Figure 84), shows far more clearly the dimensions and form of the original gate, ironically owing to the state of decay. On both corners from the front elevation, either side of the segmentally-curved gateway, there were two double-chamfered lateral supporting buttresses at right angles to one another. Similar buttresses are shown where the gate was bonded to the town wall. Above the gateway there was a stringcourse that continued around all sides of the gate, which possibly correlated to the first floor room above. The dimension and proportions of the gate are depicted as similar to others in the circuit, particularly Myton Gate. Both were essentially a single tower with a gateway projecting from the town wall and were accessed via bridges over the moat. Beverley Gate had been reduced to the first floor level by 1776 and stripped to its core structure, but from Hollar's engraving it appears to have been at least a three-storey structure that had enveloped the original tower. There are discrepancies between the two engravings in that Hollar depicts only the front lateral buttresses projecting from the town wall, meaning that the front of the tower was flush with the town wall and projected into the town itself. Given that Taylor's engraving shows that it clearly projected outward from the town wall in conjunction with the design of the other three gates, it would stand to reason that Beverley Gate did likewise.

Archaeological work carried out on Beverley Gate in 1986 (Hull City Council 1987, 9; See Chapter 1, pp. 61-63) revealed that the Gate did not originally project from the wall, but that two buttresses were later added and that the width of the overall Gate was 12.5 metres and the entrance was 4.4 metres wide. Substantial additions had been made to the tower forming Beverley Gate that were no longer in evidence by 1776. From Hollar's depiction (Figure 83) two wings had been constructed either side of the tower, with each wing having a single-pitched roof and centrally the platform of the original tower was visible. There is a suggestion that the roof had been surmounted by a spire (Allison 1969a, 414) or a 'superstructure' (Hull City

Council 1987, 9 & 13) that accounted for the peculiar truncated structure and the later addition of buttresses. The 1986 excavations also revealed the addition of a brick rectangular chamber, or guardhouse, measuring 3.6 by 3.3 metres, which that was located behind the front of the Gate on its north-side (Hull City Council 1987, 13). Constructed from brick the chamber walls were set at right angles without foundations and a small chalk footing in its south west corner suggests the location of stairs to rooms above. Despite the later insertion of a brick-arched sewer to the south of the gate, destroying any archaeology, it is suggested that a similar chamber was located there (Hull City Council 1987, 13), which would concur with the pictorial evidence. By 1640 the additional wings or chambers had been built upon with timber and each had a pitched roof, thus representing an independent addition for the Gate's additional wings. Three chimneys are shown projecting from the two wings, indicating occupation of the gate. In 1607 Beverley Gate was leased for 21 years to the guilds of weavers, shoemakers, goldsmiths and bakers, each guild paying 5 s. annually to the corporation to use the gate as a 'place for their meetings and elecons', with an additional clause that they were to repair the windows and doors (HCA BRB.2, 372v). Although the layout of the entire structure is not elucidated, it is discussed as one chamber being leased rather than the entire gate, suggesting multiple rooms. It is conceivable that internal doors had been inserted connecting the two wings and rooms of the original tower to create larger suites of rooms. In January 1605/06 two rooms were leased to the newly appointed keeper or porter at Beverley Gate (HCA BRB.2, 366v). Given that the lease to the guilds for one chamber in 1607 was 21 years and assuming the keeper had similar terms of tenancy, there was therefore multiple occupancy and usage of the structure.

It seems that an alms-house may also have been located within or abutting Beverley Gate, judging from the allocation of lodgings to a series of women in April 1634: 'Elizabeth Jackson and Isabell dishforth shalbe placed in the howse wth Anne Bambrough in the room of Katherine Thompson who is lately dead out of the same, And Margarett Clarke is placed in the Chamber

over widow Empsons howse in the Beverley gaits out of wch Alice Johnson is lately dead' (HCA BRB.3, 339). Other terms used in the archival sources include references to a 'howse at Beverleygate', 'one new house lately built under the Walls nigh unto [Beverley] gates' and 'house on the Walls near Beverley gates' (HCA BRB.3, 550; BRB.4, 222; BRB.5, 583). Such terms of reference give an impression of a concentration of dwellings within, around or near to the gate. The concentration of houses on one side of the inner road from the gate testifies to this (Figure 83) Hollar also depicts a smaller roofed structure built on the left abutting the town wall and gate with a pitched roof that rose from the height of the crenellated parapet, suggesting that it was two-storeys high, with apertures on the first-floor inserted through the wall itself. Without sufficiently extant documentary leasing evidence, the references and illustrations, such as Hollar's, are the only means of attempting to understand the structural nature of Beverley Gate and the surrounding built environment. It is impossible to deduce the number of residents or suites within Beverley Gate itself and the additional wings, but as compared to both Hessle Gate and Myton Gate, it appears that it was a significantly more substantial structure with clear adaptations applied toward domestic, rental and guild purposes. In 1776 buildings were still seemingly inhabited and constructed abutting the gate and town walls, for Taylor depicts to the right of the gate a dwelling with a chimney and window inserted into the wall (Figure 84).

These additions would not have impaired the defensive function of the gateway for access, as it would still have been able to operate as a means of regulating entry and egress. In 1651 repairs to a portcullis are referenced (HCA BRB.4, 35), earthen bastion defences were constructed outside of it in the 1640's and maintained into the eighteenth century, as well as in 1646/47 an order was made for the providing of two small chains for the bridge without Beverley Gate (HCA BRB.3, 752). It is not clear if these were strung up across the moat or the bridge itself. Repairs for the drawbridge, described as an 'old one much in decay' in 1688 (HCA BRB.6, 205), is likely to have been similar to that found at the earthwork ravelin at Hessle Gate

that traversed the ditch, rather than existing within the gate itself. The gate and its environs, including the moat, meant that Beverley Gate was evidently a working fortification system with multiple lines of defence.

The most dramatic event associated with Beverley Gate occurred on the 23rd April 1642 and involved a volley of verbal altercations rather than artillery or musket fire. In early 1642, as part of the prelude to the Civil War, Hull found itself with two rival men appointed as governor of the town and the magazine, that title previously having been held by the town's mayor since 1552. The Earl of Newcastle was appointed by Charles I and Sir John Hotham by Parliament. The Earl of Newcastle was summoned to take up his seat in the House of Lords and the King acquiesced to Parliament's appointment of Hotham, which is suggested by Cooke (2011, 10) to reflect Charles not wanting to create a definitive breach between himself and Parliament. Large quantities of ordinance and munitions had been shipped from the Tower of London to Hull in 1638 (Gurnham 2011, 60). Owing to its geographical location, Hull was to be used strategically by Charles I in supplying munitions for the Bishops' War in Scotland and the ensuing campaigns (Howes & Foreman 1999, 23 & 26). Control of these supplies accounted for the dispute that arose over the governorship in early 1642, owing to the escalating and broadening of hostilities that would eventually come to include the whole of the British Isles during the English Civil War from August 1642. By mid-April Sir John Hotham was in Hull with troops, and on the 23rd April word came from the King that he would arrive at Hull from Beverley that day (Cooke 2011, 11). Believing that his orders from Parliament were not to allow the entry of a superior force of soldiers, Hotham determined not to allow Charles within the town (Reckitt 1988, 29). Therefore upon his arrival, the King found that he was barred from entering Hull, with Hotham and his troops lining the walls at Beverley Gate, whilst the citizens and the town's mayor were kept under guard and ordered not to approach (Hopper 2007, 24; Howes & Foreman 1999, 27). Despite a long parley between Hotham and the King and protestations of loyalty, Hotham maintained a firm commitment not to allow him entry without

Parliamentary approval, and was declared a traitor by the King (Gurnham 2011, 62). This unedifying scene of the King being openly defied and barred entry, to what was ostensibly his town, can be seen as a precursor to the Civil War, rather than the spark. The eventual raising of the King's standard at Nottingham on the 22nd August 1642 heralded the formal onset of the English Civil War (Reckitt 1988, 32; Cooke 2011, 13). Prior to this formal beginning of hostilities, July 1642 witnessed the first siege of Hull by the King's forces against Hotham and Parliamentary troops, ultimately resulting after three weeks in the Royalist forces abandoning the siege (Gurnham 2011, 63). This siege can also be understood as the first active military engagement of Hull's fortifications in their history up to this point.

Pictorial images created of Hotham's refusal of entry to Charles I include James Hulett's 1744 engraving (Figure 85) and a painting by George Arnald from 1819 (Figure 86). Both show King Charles I on horseback surrounded by several attendants standing before Beverley Gate conversing with Sir John Hotham, seen leaning over the battlements. Arnald's depiction of Beverley Gate appears to be based on Taylor's 1774 engraving (Figure 84) of the gate in a state of dilapidation, judging from the replicated perspective and form of the gate, with the addition of a crenellated parapet, several arrow slits and a small turret to give the imagined impression of it in a pristine militaristic condition. Hulett's engraving appears as an entirely fictitious rendering of Beverley Gate, for it is shown as a squat masonry bastion with a drawbridge and portcullis. In the background are three large circular towers that are reminiscent of the Henrician Blockhouses to the east of the town, yet they would not have been visible from the vantage point of the gate. Although these images are not able to aid in the analysis of the material structure of Beverley Gate, they are testament to a flashpoint in the build-up to the Civil War and may even represent the legacy of a visual culture. Cooke (2011, 12) refers to the months following 23rd April 1642 as a 'paper' war owing to the publication and distribution of propaganda from both sides of the dispute. On the 26th May Parliament published a remonstrance that was countered by one from the King, and as Reckitt

(1988, 39) states, 'the events in Hull were an excellent peg on which to hang the whole constitutional issue'. It is conceivable that some form of illustration was produced depicting the events of the 23rd April 1642 at Beverley Gate, owing to the straightforward and powerful symbolism of the escalating conflict between vying authorities, as represented so succinctly by Hull denying entry to its sovereign from Beverley Gate. Within York's House Books it is recorded that the Council paid 30 s. to a printer 'towardses his loss susteyned in printing the answeere of the house of Commons to the Scotts paper' and a further 10 li. by an individual alderman (YALH B36, 204r). It is therefore likely that elements within Hull may also have engaged with similar publications and printing activities.

Walls and towers to North Gate

There were thirteen towers between Beverley Gate and North Gate along the northern section of Hull's *enceinte* (Figure 87). The tower nearest Beverley Gate was circular with a non-crenellated parapet, and its height was not much greater than the surrounding wall-walk. It is the only tower shown not to be built into the wall itself, but rather bonded to the wall at its rear, suggesting that it was constructed at a different time. The fourth tower was circular and non-crenellated but built into the wall, and a doorway led in to it from the wall-walk. Tower eight was also circular and non-crenellated but open at the back. Tower three was significantly smaller in scale than the rest of the towers of this section, was semi-circular and open at the back. The rest of the towers were square and built into the wall, along with the majority of the preceding towers along the *enceinte*, although here four are shown to have been non-crenellated.

The significance of this non-uniform design of individual towers on this section of circuit is similar to the circular postern tower between Myton and Beverley Gates (Figure 82). It was earlier argued that the circular postern tower represented the oldest surviving and unaltered section of the *enceinte*. Therefore, the depiction of several circular towers, particularly as

the first tower nearest Beverley Gate was not built into the wall, suggests that the presence of circular towers was an architectural remnant of earlier defensive construction phases that were retained within later alterations. Without the existence of archaeological, documentary or material evidence this is simply supposition. However, in what was otherwise a relatively uniform design of square towers along the entire circuit, the concentration of four circular towers within this section of wall suggests they were architecturally and historically distinct. Rather than simply being incongruous they may indicate that a large-scale redesign of the *enceinte* had been undertaken that sought to harmonize the town's fortifications. The apparent pictorial evidence of the lowering of the walls at Hessle Gate and Myton Gate to that of the wall-walk height, as was depicted in 1640 and discussed above, supports this assessment. The retention of circular towers may have been for pragmatic, monetary or material considerations. Physically, the corner section of this wall between Beverley and North Gate's was the furthest point away from the defences, and most likely to be attacked from the sea and River Hull. These areas would have warranted increased expenditure and alteration and considering that Hessle Gate and North Gate were both far larger structures that spanned the moat itself, clearly great consideration had been allotted to the defence of either end of the medieval *enceinte*. This may have necessitated the retention of structurally viable towers of earlier defensive construction phases that came to appear anomalous when compared to the later uniformed square towers.

Tower ten is the only postern depicted with its correlating bridge over the moat in situ (Figure 87). In the engraving the postern tower appears slightly larger than its neighbouring square towers and has a flag flown atop its crenellated platform. It had a simple arched gateway and as with all the towers on this section, apertures are shown in the upper sections, indicating rooms. Hollar notes that the road leading to the postern from within the town was called 'the Loe gate'. Another name for the postern comes in November 1638, when it is simply recorded as the North Postern. This was in reference to defensive preparations being undertaken, contemporaneous

with the use of 35 trees at Myton Gate the ravelin in October 1638, when soil was to be dug from the moat outside the postern and 'laid wthin the wall' by workmen (HCA BRB.3, 495). Labourers were also to be engaged to 'cleanse and scoure' the town's moat from Myton Gate to North Gate in October 1638 (HCA BRB.3, 488), indicating the programme of defensive earthen preparations at that time across the *enceinte*. The addition of earthen *Trace Italienne* defences adds a new material dimension to the site, yet one that would have left no physical trace or foundations. As with the walls themselves, these earthen defences were also levelled, but from the archival and pictorial records, the maintenance and legacy of the Civil War was still clearly evident several decades after their addition and construction. Given the scale of such activity from 1638 and its impact upon the landscape outside the walls, it would suggest that Hollar had consciously omitted any visual depiction of them.

An earlier reference to the postern and its bridge may come from 1559 when concerns over the disposal of 'baggage', by the Glovers and Butchers of the town at the South End were raised and a bridge over the town moat was ordered for access to deposit such refuse (HCA BRB.2, 22r). An order from March 1601/02 stated: 'for the avoydinge and caryeing...out of the said postern gate such filthe ordure and excrementes as the inhabitants of this towne shall carry out...to the place appointed without the walles...to the end the walles shall not hereafter be pestered with such filthe ordure and to the end the health of the inhabitants of this towne may be carefully provided for' (HCA BRB.2, 341v). Such explicit, continued and seemingly intense usage of a postern by professions and inhabitants, combined with Hollar depicting this northern postern as the only one to have its bridge in situ, would suggest this was the postern referred to in 1559 and 1601/02. The overtly civic and non-defensive references toward the disposal of refuse and health issues for the benefit of the town, with particular concern again for the supplies or contamination of water (Rawcliffe 2013, 127), help to highlight that these structures were habitually used by the civic population. The construction of a bridge outside the postern immediately created a

weak point for the defences, potentially providing an easy point of access for any potential attackers. However, clearly civic concerns and issues of access could override defensive theory. The fact that an order was needed to ensure that refuse was not deposited around the base of the walls is indicative of the unused or impractical land between the wall and the moat, as well as the indifference toward the maintenance of the *enceintes* environs by sections of the town's population and the failure to positively present the 'public face' of the town (Rawcliffe 2013, 127). There is no archival evidence for the use of the land between the moat and the wall by either the civic authorities or the townspeople, aside from the prohibited dumping of waste. Yet, inferences of use could be possible if considering the domestically related activities that may have been undertaken by tenants from their dwellings in and around the walls.

In November 1634 a labourer, Henry Bird, 'being verie poore' had petitioned for a house 'on the North walls' to be leased to him free of charge. Hull's Bench agreed with the proviso that he was to maintain the house and that he was also to see to 'dressinge the walls and gaits as formerly hath bene done, and looking that noe pson doe bring and lye soile or dirt upon the same, nor take anie stones from of the said walls' (HCA BRB.3, 355). His liberty to reside within the house was dependent upon him reporting any offences to the mayor with the added incentive and 'for his better encouragemt' he would receive 2 d. for each reported misdemeanour, though failure to do so would result in his forfeiture of his lease (HCA BRB.3, 356). Such a record, whilst only several lines in length, is highly informative and multifaceted. Reference to dwellings on the 'North walls' clearly referred to the northern sections of the town wall between Beverley Gate and North Gate, with such structures not depicted by Hollar or any other pictorial source. The notion of such a rent-free leasing system to individuals to maintain the walls and gates was a customary practice judging from the term 'as formerly hath bene done'. The continued concern for the disposal of refuse against the walls is again evident, as well as the materiality of the walls as a structure that was open to vandalism and piecemeal theft of the

wall itself. The appointment of someone to maintain, guard and inform upon offences relating to the walls implies that the theft of materials and fly tipping occurred, if not endemically, then frequently enough to warrant a quasi-official, though untitled and unsalaried, civic and customary role.

The same source expands this system to the rest of the *enceinte*. At the same time as Henry Bird's appointment it was also agreed 'That all others wch have their dwelling upon the Townes Walls, shal have the same Chardge given them for dressing the walls and informing...upon like Condicons of forfeiture and reward' (HCA BRB.3, 356). The numbers of dwellings 'upon the Townes Walls' or there location is not stated, but the use of the term 'upon' suggests that they were built abutting the walls and in close enough proximity to merit multiple lessees being held responsible for aspects of maintenance and guarding its structural integrity. Analysis of the pictorial evidence alone, combined with the lack of archaeological evidence, is unable to reveal the possibility of multiple structures having been built upon the walls and the systems enacted toward their maintenance. That these structures did not survive and their form is unknown does not detract however from the documentary evidence that they did exist.

North Gate

North Gate was the northern end of the medieval *enceinte* located near the bank of the River Hull. Rather than being on the actual bank of the river, a small mud wall had been constructed, as shown by Hollar to the left of the gate (Figure 88). Silting of the river may have occurred or land had been reclaimed, which necessitated in May 1584 the building of a mud wall, though not brick, 'for the better defence and strength' of the area (HCA BRB.2, 584). North Gate was similar to Hessle Gate's design as both projected out over the moat from the town wall, though differed in that Hessle Gate consisted of two towers linked by a central section while North Gate was a single rectangular structure. The gateway was a round-headed archway and above were two apertures and one large vertical rectangular

opening, possibly masonry insignia; what may be an aperture on the side of the gate is shown by Hollar to have run parallel with the front openings, suggesting that North Gate was two storeys high and had internal rooms on the first floor. The platform of the gate was a single level and surrounded by a non-crenellated parapet, yet the architectural detail of raised heights at either end of the parapet would have given a profile of two towers, echoing that of Hesse Gate. On the corners of the front elevation parapet were two unidentifiable mounted statues and on the back elevation three figures, as well as a flag. This is the only pictorial example by Hollar of any architectural adornments or statues on any of the gates. Either side of the archway were two lateral buttresses two-thirds high with two chamfered offsets, followed by a further two buttresses on the other side of the moat without and within the town wall.

Records relating to the use of North Gate itself are sparse, but in August 1646 a William Bussey was recompensed 13 s. 4 d. 'towards ye taking downe of his house wch adjoynes upon ye Northgaites' (HCA BRB.3, 729). This reiterates that dwellings were constructed in and around the several gates. The payment predates the noted order of September 1646 for the continuation of earth being rammed against the town wall up to North Gate for the mounting of artillery (HCA BRB.3, 711), indicating that even in times of war consideration had been afforded to William Bussey as a householder and tenant before defensive works commenced. By March 1651/52 a section of wall near North Gate had 'shrunk from the Earthworke' and was considered likely to collapse and an order was made reduce the pressure of weight upon it by labourers removing the rammed earth (HCA BRB.4, 56). 15 trees were used earlier in November 1638 at the drawbridge at a cost of 13 li. 12 s., contemporaneous with the work carried out in October at Myton Gate for the *Trace Italienne* earthen defences constructed outside of the gates (HCA BRB.4, 85). There are no references to an internal drawbridge at North Gate itself and the majority of references to North Gate can be identified with the Civil War defensive additions. These several examples

from 1638 to 1651/52 demonstrate a continuing interest in the defensive capabilities of the site, far removed from the immediacy of a potential siege.

The most frequent references to North Gate relate to the land between the mud wall and the North Bridge over the River Hull, which was the only means of crossing the river by land. Hollar depicts North Bridge (Figure 89) as being supported by six arches that led to the North Blockhouse. On the engraving from 1640 the area of land between North Bridge and North Gate is shown as open ground, with no form of habitation or discernible function in evidence. However, from at least 1606 and into the eighteenth century, a number of shipwrights leased the land from the Bench. The shipwright Joseph Blaides developed the site of 40 yards of ground without North Gate from the mud wall and 5 feet from the North Bridge road, for lease at an annual rent of 20 s. (HCA BRB.2, 369v). Joseph Blaides was still in possession of the land in 1629, by which time a house had been constructed on the site and an agreement was made for him to construct an earthen wall along the bank of the River Hull. The wall was to be 6 feet thick, 10 feet high and faced with brick, with added fences along the bank so 'That noe foot men or others [could] come that way' (HCA BRB.3, 212). Whilst Joseph Blaides held the lease for the site he was able to sub-let it, though only to tenants approved of by the Bench and with a clause relating explicitly to defence: 'in case anie warre or siege against this Towne shall happen before his tenure ended Then he to surrender the said howse into the Townes hands to be disposed of as they please' (HCA BRB.3, 212). An emphasis on the defensive capabilities of the site was clearly important to the civic authorities. Through leasing the land they had been able to negotiate a tenant funding new earthworks toward the river, as well as ultimately coming into possession of a house and site equipped for shipbuilding that could be leased later, representing a symbiotic relationship between defensive architectural considerations and non-defensive and commercial activities.

By 1658 the land is referred to as lying without North Gate between the bridge and the 'bull work' for a 21 year lease to William Stevens, another shipwright, at the substantially increased annual rent of 3 li. (HCA BRB.4, 222). This may have been a sub-lease, for in 1675 the lease of Charles Harle refers to the land in the occupation of Joseph Blaides, inferring that the Blaides family had relinquished active possession of the site after 69 years. Harle's lease stipulates that the site was only to be used for the building of ships or the tenancy would be terminated, seemingly a testament to the authorities not wanting the defensive capabilities of the site to be undermined through increased domestic or commercial development (HCA BRB.5, 455). In 1693 the site is noted as 'the yard for building of Ships' along with all appurtenances, when it was once again brought back into the Blaides family with Benjamin Blaides assuming a lease of 28 years at an annual rent of 3 li. 10 s. (HCA BRB.6, 326 & 328). Clearly the pre-Civil War function of the site for shipwrights had continued after the conflict and was operating within the new earthen additions, including the bastion inspired bulwark or ravelin and drawbridge, throughout the seventeenth century and beyond.

John Speed's *Map of Hull* from 1610 is extremely limited in being able to analyse the architecture of Hull's urban defences, owing to the stylized and generic depiction of the town. Yet, he did include some details that Hollar chose to omit. From a detail of Speed's map (Figure 90), North Gate is shown in the foreground with North Bridge above and the North Blockhouse visible on the top right. Speed depicts a shipwright working a piece of timber with an axe besides a boat and a house, testifying to the legacy of this area as a shipbuilding yard that was evidently discernible and considered worthy of depiction. Hollar may not have shown the shipbuilding yard for stylistic and compositional purposes so as not to detract from the illustration of the defences. If so, it is therefore conceivable that other usages of the walls, apart from their military and architectural qualities, were omitted elsewhere on the circuit, such as dwellings or other structures built abutting the defences. In the case of the shipyard outside of North Gate the longevity

of one tenant or a single family to a site is evident. A detail taken from a map by Elias Holt of Hull from 1778 (Figure 91), after North Gate and the earthen defences had been demolished, records that the site was noted as 'Mr Blaydeses Ship yd'. Joseph Blaydes' initial 1606 lease, the subsequent investment, construction of a house and the shipyard, represented for that family a multi-generational investment over 172 years. It is tantalising to consider what other tenants and families felt toward homes and structures they had invested in, albeit perhaps more modestly and over shorter periods of time, in and around the town walls which have left no pictorial, documentary or archaeological evidence.

Along the bank of the River Hull

The concentration of buildings and dwellings along the eastern-half of the town nearest to the bank of the River Hull is depicted from Hollar's engraving (Figure 92). Hollar chose to record in a key on the right of the engraving the names of the staiths, or 'staires', running along this section of the town that from north to south were: 'the olde ferye place', 'Salters', 'Horneley', 'Chappell', 'Bishops', 'Scalelane', 'Kings', 'heringe' and 'Horse stairs'. This conurbation of urban buildings was sited between the River Hull and Hull's High Street. From the number of ships depicted along this section the port was a hive of activity and densely populated, judging from the numerous multi-storey buildings located here. Each staith would have been used for the loading and unloading of goods. In January 1560/61 an unnamed staith is described as 'decayed nott onlie to the greate hindrance of the same haven butt also to the greate hurte of the most pte of the houses standyng alongst the same haven' (HCA BRB.2, 42r). This may be referring to the structural integrity of the area, as well as the commercial interruption caused by a default in the staith. In June 1675 a petition by the residents near the Ferry Staith desired 'that the Gates of the said Staith may be opened and use made thereof, ffor that the same wilbe very commodious and useful to...the Inhabitants in that part of Town' (HCA BRB.5, 426). In September of the same year it was agreed it would be opened 'for the Service of the

Neighbourhood' (HCA BRB.5, 438). Therefore a communal and commercial aspect to these staiths that were maintained by the civic authorities was manifest.

From the 1650's, staith keepers are recorded as having been appointed, though it is likely to have been an earlier institution. In January 1650/51 John Boulton was appointed for 'dressing' the several staiths for an annual wage of 5 li. and the promise of 'a poores house the first that fallith' (HCA BRB.4, 14). Having died in February 1655/56 his wife had been maintained in the role for a time and duly paid, only to be joined by two other individuals who were allotted individual staiths (HCA BRB.4, 181). Heijden (2012, 145) argues that a widow or children continuing in the role of their deceased relative was common owing to them having observed and co-operated in the civic work over a number of years, a practice that may have been observable in other civic roles within Hull and not just the staith keepers. One example of an individual having priority over the Chapel Lane staith occurs in March 1677/78. For the purpose of constructing new additions at his home, alderman Daniel Hoare was granted the liberty of the staith and the 'keeping of the key of the staith gate for his conveniency', whilst for the 'prventing of all disorders' other citizens who made use of the staith were to remove all of their wares upon penalties for contravention, under the oversight of the Common Scavenger (HCA BRB.5, 562-563). Therefore this sense of communality and neighbourhood towards the staiths could be undermined on occasion. In the case of alderman Hoare his preferment of the staith and possession of its key may have been owed to his position as an alderman of the town.

Considering the staiths faced the River Hull they provided a means of entry to the town that circumvented the town walls, with roads leading from them directly to the High Street and the centre of town. References to the keys of the gates of the staiths have already been noted and from a detail of Herring Staith (Figure 93) a small round-headed archway within a wall is depicted at the end of the road that led from the staith; the road from the river is clearly

visible below where 'H' is shown on the engraving. The wall appears to have been at least two-storeys in height and abutted the surrounding buildings. An order from February 1586/87, one among several defensive measures, notes that the staiths were to be repaired 'and have good gaites made wth Iron boltes' (HCA BRB.2, 245v). These small gateways therefore acted in a similar manner to a postern gateway and formed another defensive feature, though one significantly smaller in proportion and not previously recognised as such within the historiography. In 1661 officers from the garrison complained that the Common Staiths were being left open at night, for which the Bench ordered that the staith keepers were to lock the gates 'when the Porte Bell shall ring and to be opened at sixe of the Clocke in the morneing', whilst all of the keys were to be brought to the mayor at night (HCA BRB.4, 405). These small gateways clearly had the means to be locked and to deny entry to individual citizens, as had happened during 1677/78 with Daniel Hoare, as well as being considered a concern and means of defence or security by the military authorities. The 1675 petition from the residents may have been in reaction to them having been denied the use of their staith on military or defensive grounds. Therefore this non-walled section of the town was not defenceless. The individual staiths and their correlating gates could serve the same function as the main gateways and posterns in the regulation of people, goods and at the same time serve as part of the defensive *enceinte*. Jurisdictionally they were under the control of Hull's civic authorities, for it was they who maintained them and the mayor who had custody of the keys in 1661, but they also garnered interest and interference from the jurisdictionally distinct, as well as potentially opposing, military authorities.

Henrician Castle and Blockhouses

The sixteenth century Henrician defences consisted of three cylindrical and bastioned forts linked by a crenellated curtain wall, which was encircled by a water filled moat fed from the River Hull (Figure 94). The central fort was known as the Castle, owing to it being the largest, while the two at either end of the curtain wall were known as the North Blockhouse, located opposite North Gate, and the South Blockhouse, which was situated at the mouth of the River Hull and Humber shoreline. These fortifications were constructed at a cost of £23,144 from 1541 to 1543 and were part of a larger nationwide refortification programme under Henry VIII at a total cost to state of £376,500 from 1539 to 1547 (Allison 1969a, 414; Howes & Foreman 1999, 14). There were two building programme phases, the first in 1539 that had concentrated on the southern coast of England, so that by December 1540 twenty-four new fortifications had been constructed and garrisoned, followed by the second phase which included the work carried out at Hull (Harrington 2007b, 29 & 37).

The footprint of the Castle (Figures 95-96) was 174 square feet, with 19 foot thick outer walls. It was square with two two-storey high curvilinear bastions projecting from two sides, had a courtyard and a central three-storey high keep 66 by 50 feet with 8 feet thick walls (Allison 1969a, 414). From Hollar's depiction artillery pieces are shown on the platform of the projecting curvilinear bastion that also had several gun-ports on the floors below and along the outer wall, with a doorway on the left. The Castle is shown having been built into the curtain wall and there were flights of stairs leading from the ground floor level either side of it to the wall walk. The curtain wall was 13 feet high, 14 feet wide at the base and narrowed to 11 feet at the top and was near half a mile long (Howes & Foreman 1999, 12; Harrington 2007b, 29). The North Blockhouse (Figure 97) and South Blockhouse (Figures 98-99) were identical in form, mirroring one another at either end of the fortification. Each possessed three 34 by 27 foot curvilinear bastions and one 37 foot square bastion projecting inwards that housed the

doorways into the. They were two storeys high with multiple gun-ports and platforms above and the walls were 15 feet thick (Allison 1969a, 414). The fortifications were constructed from brick and stone and from an estimate of wages for February 1541/42, the number of crafts involved over just a one-month period are detailed. There are references to 20 masons reclaiming stone from Meaux Abbey 8 miles to the north of Hull, 10 plumbers reworking lead also from Meaux, others reworking it on site, as well as 60 bricklayers, 30 lime-burners, 30 brick makers, 60 wood fellers and 300 labourers (Howes & Foreman 1999, 13; Allison 1969a, 414). What had been open ground prior to 1541, potentially exposing the eastern side of Hull to attack or bombardment, had been enclosed by the new system of fortification that sought to harness the role of artillery. The name of the designer can possibly be assigned to the master mason of Calais, John Rogers, as well as Richard Lee (Allison 1969a, 414). Lee was a surveyor of works who is known to have worked in English occupied Guisnes and Calais in northern France, as well as Berwick-upon-Tweed (Colvin 1982, 411), and is linked by Harrington (2007b, 15-16) to Hull owing to the similar design of forts and concentric designs at both it and the European sites.

The ability to assign an individual designer to Hull's fortifications is of relatively little significance since all of the new nationwide defences built under Henry VIII followed similar principles, in marked contrast to the medieval town walls. Whilst the town walls relied upon the height of the walls, moats and fortified gateways, the new additions were expressly engineered to support new artillery and provide defensive and offensive capabilities. As discussed above, the ability to mount artillery atop Hull's medieval town walls was not attempted until the 1640's, through the ramming of earth internally along the walls. The new Henrician works relied upon thick walled and squat structures that would be able to house a garrison internally, with the curvilinear shape and multi-story platforms allowing for numerous artillery pieces to be mounted and multiple lines of fire (Harrington 2007, 20). Colvin (1982, 377) argues that the Henrician designs represent a transitional architecture, between the medieval castle

and the angled-bastioned fortification of the Continent, and relegates the Castle and Blockhouses of Hull and others English examples of the 1530's and 1540's as *retardataire*. Emphasis on the design merits can lead to the previously discussed arguments that sixteenth century English defences 'were often outmoded by the time they were completed' (Saunders 1989, 11) and owing to the infrequency of their active military usage, they underwent little to no redevelopment in the succeeding decades and centuries. Hollar's 1640 depiction of the Castle and Blockhouses demonstrates that in the case of Hull, nearly a century after their construction, there had been no redevelopment of the fortifications. This would change toward the end of the seventeenth century, but for almost a century and a half the design and form of the eastern defences had not been altered. Issues far removed from defensive design merits need to be considered, compounded by the two successfully defended sieges of the town during the course of the Civil War, which suggest that the medieval walls and Henrician fortifications were not in fact *retardataire* in practice. A discussion of their design also does not take into account the contexts in which they were constructed, maintained, used and redeveloped by differing and alternating authorities, both locally and nationally.

With the state-funded new fortifications came the addition of a new form of authority within Hull. From 1542 a governor, Sir Michael Stanhope, and correlating garrison were instituted who were independent from the corporation and answerable directly to the crown (Gurnham 2011, 38). Prior to this appointment, Hull's mayor had had control over the keys to the town gates, yet Stanhope and the garrison took it upon themselves to assume control of the keys and the opening and shutting of the gates (Howes & Foreman 1999, 16). In 1546 two members of Hull's corporation were summoned to London to answer for their non-compliance and refusal to cooperate with the governor over command of the keys and perhaps other issues, for what may have seemed to the corporation a threat to their independence (Gurnham 2011, 38). Henry VIII supported Stanhope in this dispute and sought to assuage the corporation's concerns that he was

seeking to interfere with their liberty, arguing that such measures were for the benefit of the town and that they were to acquiesce in the matter (Howes & Foreman 1999, 16). However, during the reign of Edward VI in 1552, the ownership of the Castle and Blockhouses was transferred to the corporation of Hull for a bond of £2,000 and a grant from the King of the manors of Myton, Hull, Tupcoates and a sixth part of the Manor of Sutton for their future maintenance (Allison 1969a, 415). Through this transfer of ownership from the state to the corporation, the garrison was disbanded and the mayor of the town assumed the title of governor, thereby resuming the town's control of the keys and their independence. However, the town was obliged to maintain the Henrician defences at their own cost, leading to the fortifications slipping 'into a neglected state whenever the vigilance of central administration was relaxed' (Howes & Foreman 1999, 16). At the start of the period under consideration Hull's civic authorities formally and legally controlled and administered the Henrician defences, with potential disputes arising between them and the state seemingly negated by the crown's relinquishing of ownership. There was therefore established a legal system of civic administration, bound up with Hull's incorporated rights, which would endure for over 90 years before it was again brought under the auspices of vying authorities and the state.

Certainly issues of maintenance and cost are often referred to within Hull's Bench Books throughout the period 1550-1700, but this need not lead to the assumption that the defences were left in a neglected condition. In 1576 the corporation made a suit to Elizabeth I and her Council 'for some consideracon of ye better maintenance of ye Quenes [majesty's] castell and fortes'. Yet the mayor and aldermen added the proviso that those dealing with the suite on their behalf 'shulde not by any meanes condescende or agree to depte wth ye said castell and fortes to the Quenes [majesty] for her highness in [there] to place a garrison of souldiers' (HCA BRB.2, 150v). Whilst Hull's Bench was seeking some form of increased funding towards the Castle and Blockhouses maintenance, they were explicit in their determination not to relinquish their ownership over them to the crown for

fear that a garrison and governor would be installed, as was the position from 1542 until 1552. Allison (1969a, 415) argues that from 1576 the condition of the fortifications, primarily the Henrician defences, was to be a persistent source of disagreement and tension between Hull's civic authorities and central government. There existed a curious state of affairs in which the state had relinquished direct ownership over the Castle and Blockhouses, yet it retained the right to demand Hull's civic authorities fund repairs and was able to bring suits against the town for neglect of the defences, as occurred in 1583, 1588, 1601 and 1634 (Allison 1969a, 415).

The role of the mayor acting as governor with authority over the Henrician fortifications ended in 1642 with the conflicting appointments of the Earl of Newcastle as governor by Charles I and Sir John Hotham by Parliament. During a time of war this could be justified as a temporary measure. However, in 1646 the formal establishment of a state-run garrison under a centrally appointed governor was again instituted. Sir Thomas Fairfax was appointed governor by Parliament on the 16th April 1645, and on the 16th July 1646 the mayor received a copy of the Parliamentary order for the permanent 'Establishmt of ye Garrison' (HCA BRB.3, 721-725). The necessity to continue and retain a garrison was justified owing to Hull being 'a maritime Garrison eminent for situacon and strength and of great concernmt for ye safety of ye Northerne and other pts of ye Kingdome...Wch ye Lords and Comons now Assembled in Parliamt takeing into their serious consideracon, doe order and ordayne' (HCA BRB.3, 722). The order further stipulated that Fairfax, or those exercising on his behalf the governance of the garrison, had the authority to execute Marshal Law within the town according to the Laws and Ordinances of War as established on 25th November 1643 (HCA BRB.3, 723). Henceforth for the remainder of the seventeenth century and beyond, the corporation of Hull had no authority over the garrison or fortifications on the eastern side of the town. This state of affairs was in violation of the custom as had been established under Edward VI in 1552 and maintained until the Civil War of the seventeenth century.

Prior to the Civil War the Castle and Blockhouses were therefore under the command and authority of Hull's corporation. As part of their administration for each Blockhouse and the Castle, the corporation appointed a keeper. In 1620 the gunner Robert Coolinge was appointed keeper of the South Blockhouse, to oversee the ordinance and artillery stored there 'and other things as shalbe committed to him', upon condition that he allow the widow and children of the former keeper, his brother Thomas Coolinge, to remain living there (HCA BRB.3, 73). The continuation of the same family living there and the appointment of the Cooling's own brother, is another example of the corporation's pragmatic retention of individuals who would have been familiar with and taken part in the duties of their deceased relative (Heijden 2012, 145). His appointment alludes to the military nature of the South Blockhouse through the storing of arms and artillery, yet also that they were dwellings of multiple occupants and entire families. An earlier document from January 1596/97 saw the merchant Edward Thornton appointed keeper of the Castle 'there to dwell to keepe, oversee, and looked to the same as appertayneth...during the tyme of...his residence and abiding there' for an annual wage of 1 li. 6 s. 8 d. (HCA BRB.2, 304v). Again the role of the fortifications as dwellings is stressed. One role appertaining to the keeper of the South Blockhouse, the mariner Edward Browne, in March 1597/98 included boarding and searching 'from time to time of all straingers vessels and shippes' before they sailed in to the haven (HCA BRB.2, 311r). As keeper of the South Blockhouse he was paid 10 li. annually but for searching ships he received a further 3 li. 6 s. 8 d. annually (HCA BRB.2, 311r), indicating that the duties of the keeper of the South Blockhouse warranted a higher wage. In December 1598 the duties of the South Blockhouse keeper were extended to wave a flag to any unknown ship signalling them to anchor, which if they failed to do the keeper was to 'discharge a great peece wth shott to overshoot the same'; if they did not subsequently anchor then the keeper was 'to shoote further at them upon their [perils]', with a caveat that the offending ship was to pay for the cost of the artillery fired at them, assuming they were uninjured and able (HCA

BRB.2, 318v). In 1605 the annual wage for the keeper of the North Blockhouse, the one furthest from the haven, is recorded at the much lower sum of 5 li. (HCA BRB.2, 363v). Therefore the civic and military duties of the keeper of the South Blockhouse were distinguished from the other sections, encompassing maintenance of the ordinance, the firing of artillery and searching ships in a commercial and defensive capacity, yet all these structures were also domestic.

The domestic and also commercial dimensions of the fortifications are evident in the seventeenth century, as well as the potential for their structural integrity to be undermined by the activities of their occupants. In June 1634, the same year the suit was brought against the corporation by the state over the condition of the fortifications, the mayor and aldermen had surveyed the Castle and Blockhouses. As well as ordering repairs for the platforms, on top of earlier repairs to breaches in the Castle and North Blockhouse that were made in February 1633/34, new rules were to be enforced regarding the activity of those keepers and residents within the fortifications (HCA BRB.3, 342 & 335). From henceforth any gunner, joiner, carpenter, turner or artificer was prohibited from working 'their Traids or occupacons in anie of the Chambers' of the fortifications 'least by the shakeing knocking and rapping therein the floors of the Chambers be hurt or broken' (HCA BRB.3, 342). The occupational activities of individuals was to be restricted to the lower rooms and yards or simply for all activity to cease; the joiner Edward Haslam was specifically singled out and ordered to 'remove his tooles and other implemts out of the Chambers' of the North Blockhouse in which he lived (HCA BRB.3, 342). In March 1637/38 Haslam is noted as the keeper of the North Blockhouse in reference to the eviction of one of his Blockhouse assistants, William Law. Prior to January 1637/38 Law had seemingly leased rooms within the North Blockhouse to a Captain Lee and his servant without the consent of the mayor and aldermen. For his 'contempte and offence' he was to remove 'all his household stuffe and all other implemts' and deliver to Haslam the key to his rooms, thereby losing his civic position as assistant as well as his home (HCA BRB.3, 457, 458 &

464). Not only was unauthorised subleasing occurring within the fortifications, as well as authorised leases, these sources also reveal that there were multiple occupants and several differing levels of authority concerned with the maintenance of the defences and their general administration. These levels of authority included the Bench having overall responsibility for the defences, the individual offices of the keepers' and their assistants, the lessees living and working within them, as well as the possibility of intervention by the state. This exemplifies the defences having a plethora of individuals within Hull, as well as both civic and national institutions, holding an active interest in the use of them, further undermining the notion these structures were simply static and outmoded defensive features.

In 1634 there had been a concerted attempt to restrict non-military activities within the fortifications, with emphasis realigned toward the maintenance of the ordinance, arms, and ammunition. Chambers were assigned, or rather reassigned, for the storage of arms and ammunition, with two new locks on the doors and their keys to be thenceforth held by the mayor and the several 'keeps of the several howses' (HCA BRB.3, 343). Covenants were added to the keepers terms of appointment stipulating that no persons were to be admitted to view the fortifications without the mayor's consent, or alternatively without aldermen being present; no leases were to be made without the mayor approving of the tenancy; and no kin of the keepers were to be 'kept in anie of the said howses in winter time or otherwise by anie of the keeps thereof or others' (HCA BRB.3, 343). These new rules asserting the military primacy of the site alludes to the previous non-military uses having been prevalent and widespread. However, after 1634 leases were still permitted for dwellings, albeit with the consent of the Bench, and occupational activities were still possible within the environs of the fortifications, allowing the authorities to maintain the military and domestic, as well as commercial role of the fortifications and a form of civic salaried office.

The land enclosed between the fortifications and the River Hull was also used by the town's authorities and residents (Figure 94). Known as the Garrison Ground it was used for the grazing of horses, storage of hay stacks, the 'trayninge of men', as well as individual tenancies (HCA BRB.3, 231, 126, 49). In September 1592 a 21 year lease was granted to three citizens for an unspecified use at an annual rent of 8 li. and they were to carry out repairs to a jetty and staith, whilst also allowing the authorities 'libertie to do anie thinge needful abowt the blockhouses, castle, walls, Jetties, or other the townes business whatsoever wthin the ground as often as occasion shall requyre' (HCA BRB.2, 275r). For the Bench this ground was able to yield rental income and the town was able to affix and transfer the repairing of sections to tenants within leases. None of this activity is evident from Hollar's 1640 engraving and the land is shown as clear and open, with only two jetties shown extending out into the river. With the onset of the Civil War and formal establishment of the garrison in 1646, these conventions, activities and civic authority of the town were appropriated to the authority of the state, along with the physical fabric of the fortifications.

Although the ownership of the fortifications had been appropriated away from Hull, they were still responsible for the maintenance of the jetties and other timber and earthworks on the Garrison Ground along the river (Allison 1969a, 417). A new jetty was ordered by the corporation to be constructed at the South Blockhouse in March 1669/70 (HCA BRB.5, 216). In December 1670 the deputy governor wrote to the corporation from Whitehall regarding the same jetty, the letter itself suggesting that the jetty had not been constructed following the corporation's order from March. The deputy governor stressed that it was the responsibility of the town to maintain such works, in this case 'for the defence and [preservation] of the South Blockhouse', and a review and account of the works condition was ordered to be returned to the master of the Office of Ordnance in London (HCA BRB.5, 236). Throughout the rest of the seventeenth century large amounts of materials and money would be expended on the banks of the Garrison Ground, with particular works focussing on piling and constructing

breastworks (HCA BRB.6, 162-165). In July 1686 a vote was held by the corporation 'whither that the Brestworke lyeing on the East side of the Haven now building on the Garrison side bee forthwith wrought higher as it is pposed by the workemen or carried on as Sir Martine Beckman [prescribed] and the Major vote was to bee done as the worke men had propounded itt' (HCA BRB.6, 165). Sir Martin Beckman had produced the report for the Board of Ordnance on the state of Hull's walls in 1681 and the report also included the Henrician defences. Reference to a prescribed plan for the construction of the breastwork by Beckman in 1686 was in response to the larger refortification of the Henrician fortifications and site. The refortification programme had been initiated under the control of the Office of the Board of Ordnance in August 1681. As a department of state, the Board of Ordnance reported directly to the King and Privy Council (Howes & Foreman 1999, 56 & 59). In this regard the refortification of Hull was a nationally driven programme of works, removed from the civic considerations of Hull's corporation. Commissioners were appointed to oversee the refortification according to the designs of Beckman, and a nine-year programme of works was estimated to cost £14,759 3 s. 6 d., and included the renovation of the South Blockhouse, general repairs and the construction of new angled bastions around the Castle and South Blockhouse to create the Hull Citadel (Howes & Foreman 1999, 59). A detail from Holt's 1778 plan of Hull shows the new form of the fortifications and depicts the radical transformation of the site along the banks of the River Hull and Humber (Figure 100). The loss of Hull's civic authority and ownership would be definitively writ large with this new defensive scheme.

The Henrician Castle and South Blockhouse were retained but the curtain wall was largely demolished and the North Blockhouse, visible at the top of Figure 100, was outside of the new design. The triangular shaped Citadel (Figure 101) enveloped the Castle and South Blockhouse with new angled bastions on each corner, interval curtain walls and a new water-filled moat on two sides and the Humber to the south. The site occupied nearly 30 acres, the majority of which had been purchased by the crown between

1681 and 1682 on land to the east of the Henrician defences (Allison 1969a, 416; Howes & Foreman 1999, 60). From Holt's 1778 plan, silting appears to have occurred along the south where once the masonry scarp of the Citadel's southern curtain wall would have acted as a sea wall. The Castle and South Blockhouse provided storerooms and strong points within the new scheme of earthworks that were designed along the Continental model of fortification. The form of the Citadel exploited the angled bastion for the concentration of mounted artillery atop a platform (Howes & Foreman 1999, 84). Holt's plan also shows the line of earthworks and jetties constructed along the bank of the River Hull, as referred to in 1686, which allowed the ground behind it to be flooded for the moat, utilizing water defensively around the new Citadel's masonry encased earthworks. W. Maynard's 1787 depiction of the fortifications from the Humber shows the South Blockhouse and the Citadel additions (Figure 102). From this angle the Henrician South Blockhouse dominated the vantage point and appeared structurally unaltered from when Hollar depicted it in 1640 (Figure 99). With only the top half of the Blockhouse visible, Maynard's work also reveals that the curtain wall of the Citadel and angled bastions were roughly half the height of the sixteenth century defences, revealing the relatively limited extent of the masonry encased earthworks that were erected. From the ground level the 1680's additions appear to have been inconspicuous when compared to the sixteenth century works, with the bastioned design only appreciable from an aerial perspective of the entire scheme.

Howes and Foreman posit that the construction of the Citadel represented a distinct rupture between the previous notions of the Henrician defences protectively surrounding the town. They argue that whereas the corporation and citizens alike had been in control of the defences maintenance and operation from 1552 to 1646, from 1681 the Citadel represented an overtly threatening nature, through which the state would have been able to offensively attack the town. The curtain wall along the River Hull facing the staiths and heart of the town would have supported 27 artillery pieces and 'the threat which these guns posed to the town of Hull was implicit, but

clear' (Howes & Foreman 1999, 63). Certainly the new Citadel would have provided an increased concentration of firepower, yet Howes and Foreman disregard the fact that the Castle and Blockhouses also had gun ports that faced the town throughout their history. Their argument supposes that the Henrician defences were somehow benign and the Citadel was therefore malignant. Patently the earlier concerns expressed by Hull's civic authorities when the defences were first constructed in the 1540's attests to these historical concerns. The military capabilities of both the Henrician defences and Citadel to theoretically be used offensively against Hull itself had not changed. Discounting the architectural differences of the Henrician defences and the Citadel, fundamentally what had changed was the ownership and control over those capabilities from the civic corporation of Hull to the state. The context in which to interpret their significance, both contemporarily and historically, warrants a more nuanced understanding of the historical context beyond benign and malign, and the two relatively short periods of state fortification construction.

Plymouth was the only other contemporary site where a citadel was constructed and it too was an important seaport that also shared a legacy with Hull of having opposed Charles I during the Civil War (Howes & Foreman 1999, 62). As with the new Citadel at Hull, the use of bastions and masonry-encased earthworks were deployed at Plymouth, which by 1675 had cost the state £20,544 2 s. 4 d. (Saunders 1989, 91). The architectural deployment of bastions for a refortification programme under the direction of the state, during the latter half of the seventeenth century, serves only to highlight that this was the preferred form of fortification. This form of defensive architecture had already been adopted with the earthworks during the Civil War some forty years earlier, so in this sense the architecture of the Citadel did not represent a fundamentally different and unknown form. Howes and Foreman's interpretation of the political significance and rupture between Hull and the state, as expressed through the physical construction of the Citadel and the interpreted threatening nature of it, dismisses the fact that it was not until 1681 that the

refortification was begun, and that after the Citadel's inception further disputes arose. Also, as seen from Maynard's 1787 image, the Henrician defences dwarfed the height of the Citadel, undermining the notion of a new threatening and domineering form of architecture. Disputes arising between Hull and the state during the 1670's and 1680's went far beyond the design and construction of the Citadel, with the contentious role of the Citadel being symptomatic of other wider political and historical tensions of the period.

In May 1693 the corporation petitioned the King, Queen and Privy Council regarding the clause in their charter binding them to repair the banks and breastworks around the Citadel (HCA BRB.6, 315-316). They cite that the Castle, Blockhouses and Garrison Ground had belonged to the corporation until 1641 and the 'unhappy Rebellion...at wch time...the then usurping Power, did forceably dispossess the said Maior and Burgesses' of the fortifications without any monetary compensation awarded to the town (HCA BRB.6, 315). The emphasis placed on having been forcibly dispossessed of the fortifications and any profits associated with them was for the corporation compounded by clauses inserted in their renewed Charters since the Civil War, lastly under James II/VII, obliging them to continue to repair the banks and breastworks of the fortifications. (HCA BRB.6, 316). By 1693 they believed that the town was not legally obliged to maintain these works and proposed that should they no longer maintain and forgo all claims to ownership (HCA BRB.6, 316). This proposal did not come to fruition and in 1699 another appeal to the Board of Ordnance to either give up possession of the Citadel or repair the breastworks again yielded nothing in the town's favour. Therefore since 1641 and the formal establishment of the garrison in 1646, Hull had lost control over the fortifications on the east of the town and would never again take possession of them.

The walls and Citadel post-1700

Sir Martin Beckman's report from 1681 reveals the condition of Hull's town walls near the close of the seventeenth century. In his report Beckman apportioned the walls from Hesse Gate onwards into 22 sections. For example, the sections are referred to as 'from ye number 3 to [Myton] gate' and 'from ye number 19 to 20' and so on (HCA DX 130/5, 102r). Of the 22 itemised sections of the town wall and their condition, only three are listed as 'all good', four as 'all defective', whilst the rest list the number of buttresses Beckman considers necessary to be built. In all, 30 buttresses, 'if not more', were necessary 'other wyse the new walle and Butrisses will never stand', and later on within the report this increased to 35 buttresses costing 545 li. 14 s. 24 d. (HCA DX 130/5, 102r & 103r). Five sections of the wall were recommended to be pulled down at a cost of 150 li. and to be replaced entirely 'from the fondation to 14 foot heigh & 10 brik thick in the fondation to 4 foot heigh' at a cost of 1079 li. 18 s. (HCA DX 130/5, 102r & 103r). The basis for the method of repairing the town wall was taken from that carried out by the city itself in November 1646. This had followed the collapse of part of the wall between Myton Gate and Beverley Gate (HCA BRB.3, 744).

Beckman's detailed reference to the repairs undertaken in 1646 must have utilized documentary evidence within the civic records that possibly formed part of a separate account book dealing with the repairs of the town wall. It lists the costs and materials that included oak timber for the piling of the foundations, brick for the wall and buttresses, lime, mortar, sand, horsehair, as well as labour for piling and 'dressing ould brike and breaking downe the ould butrisses & wheeling Earth and briks away' (HCA DX 130/5, 102r). This short reference is able to indicate the materials and labour involved in repairing a section of wall in 1646 by the civic authorities, and it is likely this was an established procedure of construction and repair. Considering that the same processes were judged to be the most suitable from 1681, it is testament to the enduring reliability of those localised construction

procedures. In lieu of a detailed analysis of the surviving account books for works carried out during the early modern period, as well as the walls surviving themselves, this is the most reliable source available regarding the physical make-up of the defences and the processes of construction during this period. In adhering to work undertaken 35 years previously, it can be assumed that any works Beckman oversaw post-1681 adhered to the original design. Therefore the core medieval and early modern *enceinte* was uniform in materials, construction and design at the close of the seventeenth century, aside from an increased number of buttresses and additional *Trace Italienne* inspired earthwork additions.

In Daniel Defoe's *A tour through the whole island of Great Britain*, written from 1724 to 1727, he writes of the great commerce of Hull. Likening it to the trade found at Hamburg, Danzig and Rotterdam, he lists all the commodities that passed through it from the surrounding Yorkshire towns and cities as well as trade from London, stating that 'there is more business done in Hull than in any other town of its bigness in Europe' (Rogers 1971, 522). The strength of Hull's geographical location is cited as 'naturally very strong; and, were there any occasion, it is capable of being made impregnable', but that it would be open to bombardment from the sea (Rogers 1971, 528). Direct references to the town walls or the defences on the eastern bank of the River Hull are not referred to at all even though they were extant at this time. Instead the need for fortifications was dismissed upon the grounds that at this time Great Britain held naval supremacy, therefore 'there's no need of fortifications at all; and so there's an end of argument upon that subject' (Rogers 1971, 528).

In every city or town of note, town and city walls and defences were integral to Defoe's estimation of a place. For example, Manchester is noted as a great village, but it was not walled, did not have city status and was not incorporated. In Liverpool there were no fortifications, 'the inhabitants resting secure under the protection of the general peace', although during 'the late northern insurrection...they could have been glad of walls and

gates'. In contrast, one of the four remarkable aspects of Chester was its walls that were 'in very good repair', creating 'a very pleasant walk round the city, upon the walls, and within the battlements' (Rogers 1971, 544, 541, 392 & 394). Defoe's emphasis on the trade within Hull at the time he was writing in the 1720's must therefore have been the overriding impression of the significance of the town, accounting for the limited reference to defence and complete omission of the town's still extant fortifications. The only military preparations to be undertaken on the town's *enceinte* during the eighteenth century was during 1745 and the Jacobite Rising. 3,000 people are argued to have been involved in deepening the moats, repairing the ramparts and earthen works, yet the town saw no military engagement or siege in 1745 (Howes & Foreman 1999, 151).

Between 1700 and 1750 exports stood at between 100,000 to 200,000 pieces a year, rising to 307,662 in 1768 and 402,857 in 1783. This increase in exports correlated to the increased registration of ship tonnage from 7,000 to 20,000 tons between 1702 and 1773, rising to 72,000 tons by 1829 (Gurnham 2011, 87-88). As early as 1756, Hull's civic authorities were making reference to the need for an additional harbour using the ground around Hesse Gate, in response to the increasingly congested River Hull and insufficient staiths and wharfage (Howes & Foreman 1999, 155). Having sought to have the crown pay for repairs to the bridges over the town's moat and earthworks in 1751, Hull's corporation successfully petitioned for ownership of the fortifications in 1772 and obtained from Parliament the Hull Dock Act in 1774 (Allison 1969a, 417). The Act created the Hull Dock Company with the power to raise money through shares for the express purpose of building a new dock (Gurnham 2011, 92). By this Act all of the defences west of the River Hull, including the walls, gates, ditches and earth works, were transferred to the ownership of the Hull Dock Company (Howes & Foreman 1999, 155). A detail from *A plan of Kingston upon Hull and its environs* from 1774 (Figure 103), the year the Hull Dock Act was passed, depicts the extant walls from Beverley Gate to North Gate, the moat and the earthen ramparts. Holt's map of 1778 (Figure 104) reveals the

complete levelling of the defences that had taken place in less than four years for the construction of the New Dock. The New Dock, as designed by John Grundy, was the second largest dock in the country and within the ten-acre area it was capable of accommodating 100 square-rigged vessels (Gurnham 2011, 92).

The demolition of the entire northern section of the walls and defences, from North Gate to Beverley Gate, decisively ended the conception and physical reality of Hull as a walled city. Prior to the 1770's Gurnham argues that growth within the town had been modest and held within the walls, yet with the removal of the northern defences the first substantial suburbs came to be developed that would continue into the nineteenth century (2011, 96). In building a new larger dock, Hull had also conversely lost its exemption dating from 1559 not to operate a Legal Quay, for the new facilities allowed customs officers to operate effectively (Howes & Foreman 1999, 155); the Commissioners of Customs are said to have pressured the corporation to establish a Legal Quay during the 1770's (Gurnham 2011, 92), thereby the development of the New Dock was not entirely spearheaded by the corporation or merchants of the town itself, whose trade now came under the scrutiny of government officials. In un-walling itself, Hull clearly felt that it was beneficial to the future expansion of the town and its trade to remove its historical defences. Defoe's emphasis on trade in the 1720's was writ large in the demolition and excavation of the defences whose position was suitable for the positioning of a new dock owing, ironically, to the legacy of a defensive water-filled moat. A new Act of Parliament was obtained in 1802 for the construction of the Humber Dock between Hessle Gate and Myton Gate, which as with the New Dock, resulted in the levelling of the defences; by 1827 the only section of wall to remain was that between Myton Gate and Beverley Gate and in that year work on the Junction Dock commenced, thereby creating a unified dock system around the town along the lines of the former defences (Gurnham 2011, 92-93). C Burton's 1829 *Plan of the wet docks at Kingston upon Hull* (Figure 105) depicts this system that had created over 22 acres of new dock

facilities to envelop the town (Gurnham 2011, 92-93), dwarfing that which had been available on the eastern half of the town prior to the walls demolition and dock construction from 1774 onwards. In contrast to York's construction of the railway in the nineteenth century that retained and restored the walls, there had been no attempt at Hull to allow for the accommodation of expanding infrastructure and the retention of historical structures.

In 1801 Hull paid £2,400 for the fort at the South End, and in 1802 £8,000 for 37 acres of land around the Citadel, including the North Blockhouse, in spite of the fact that the town had previously asserted their legal ownership over the fortifications and ground (Allison 1969a, 417). The last time the guns of the Citadel were fired was for a 12-gun salute celebrating the wedding of Edward the Prince of Wales and Princess Alexandra of Denmark in March 1859. A year prior to this the Office of the Board of Ordnance had transferred ownership for the Citadel to the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, representing the end of the Citadel as an active and state-maintained defensive structure. A Bill of Sale of Crown Lands in 1859 sought to sell the Citadel and the 60-acre site, for which Hull corporation offered £105,000 for the intention of creating a recreational site for the use of the people of Hull. This offer was rejected and the town brought a suit to the Court of Chancery in 1860, revising their claims to ownership of the Citadel and land based upon the granting of them by Edward VI in 1552 (Howes & Foreman 1999, 173-174). In 1861 the courts found against the town, citing the purchase of 37 acres in 1802 as particularly undermining to their historic claims of ownership and the site was sold in 1863 and razed to the ground for shipbuilding works and dockside facilities (Allison 1969a, 417-418; Howes & Foreman 1999, 174). After bombing of the site during the Second World War, a dual carriageway was constructed in the 1970's and named Garrison Road (Howes & Foreman 1999, 174). The name of Garrison Road is today the only means of commemorating a site that had since 1541 undergone two distinct phases of fortification, had been integral to the

architectural landscape of Hull and bore witness to the changing context of the town from 1550-1700 and beyond.

Conclusion

Owing to the removal and demolition of the medieval *enceinte*, Henrician Castle, Blockhouses and the seventeenth century Citadel during the eighteenth and nineteenth-centuries, the analysis of Hull's defensive architecture has by necessity been limited to pictorial and archival evidence. Hollar's engraving of the town from 1640 is perhaps the most reliable image depicting the entire defensive circuit as had existed from 1541 until the addition of earthworks in the middle of the seventeenth century and the refortification of the Henrician defences during the 1680's. The high degree of detail depicted across the circuit, including varying tower forms and not necessarily pronounced architectural features, suggests that this engraving was not simply a generic depiction. This lends a high degree of reliability in analysing for the first time the architecture of the circuit in its entirety. An analysis of the engraving reveals that there was a relatively high degree of uniformity to the design of the *enceinte*, with most variation being found in the form of the individual town gates and small clusters or individual examples of circular towers, rather than the more prevalent square examples. The concentration of circular towers near to Beverley Gate and the single circular postern gate leads to the inference that they were examples of differing construction phases. Evidence for differing construction alterations is also compounded by evidence of the walls having been reduced in height where they were bonded to the gates. Combined with the archival evidence a greater appreciation of the defences as a dynamic functioning structure, is discernible. However, the level of information contained within the records is limiting in adding to the architectural knowledge of the defences. For example, with the leasing of Beverley Gate multiple tenancies are in evidence, but the layout of the rooms is not, as well as the ability to ascertain that dwellings were built abutting the walls but with no details over the form they took. Yet, the archival evidence reveals that both domestic and commercial activities were in operation in and around the town's defences, but Hollar had seemingly

chosen to omit these for compositional purposes, so as not to obscure the structure and defensive nature of the walls themselves.

For the period 1550-1700 Hull's medieval defences underwent no major structural alterations, with only limited masonry additions at the South End, the addition of buttresses following Beckman's report of 1681 and sporadic repairs. The most significant additions were the earthworks constructed during the Civil War along the circumference of the wall and gates. These defences were under the ownership of Hull's corporation following the Civil War, but should be viewed as distinct from the fortification on the east of the town and the medieval *enceinte*. They were a reflection of the seventeenth century military legacy of the town writ large in earth. The Henrician defences of the 1540's and the subsequent refortification of the site for the bastioned Citadel of the 1680's, were two examples of state-driven defensive building programmes unburdened by the budgetary constraints of a town and also from the consideration of the corporation that they surrounded. Their transfer to the corporation by Edward VI in 1552 brought them into the remit of the town and the archival evidence reveals the multifaceted uses of them, both defensive and non-defensive. Through the appropriation of them by the state in 1646, though in fact several years earlier, there then existed two distinct spheres of influence and vying authorities. This context had initially existed from 1541 to 1552 but rematerialized almost a century later. The extent to which the state's refortification of the site with angled bastions and a Citadel represented a physical embodiment of the strained relationship between town and state is debateable. Further consideration of the local and national political context during the second half of the seventeenth century is required with a fuller appreciation of Hull's customary use of its defences prior to the rupture of the Civil War and the proceeding political tensions. The following chapters will draw on the documentary evidence relating to early modern York and Hull in order to bridge the gap between the surviving material remains, or not, and the historical record.

Chapter 4- Urban walls and their officials

Introduction

This chapter will identify and codify the civic officials whose duties specifically pertained to the maintenance of York and Hull's respective urban defences. Far from civic corporations exhibiting disinclination toward the repair of their *enceintes*, the documentary evidence reveals that there were both formal and informal means by which maintenance work could be instituted and overseen. Within texts that identify civic offices related to urban defences, such as the RCHME (1972) for York and *A history of the county of York volume I: the city of Kingston-upon-Hull* (1969), their significance is only cursorily considered or entirely omitted (Allison 1969, 412-418). From the documentary evidence and through a biographical consideration (Mytum 2010; See Chapter 1, pp. 66-67), it is possible to identify the increasing professionalization of civic corporations and individual officeholders towards the reform of their historically instituted offices. This is in accordance with a system of professionalization identified by Braddick (2000, 283, 433 & 435; See Chapter 1, pp. 50-51) during the period, which is argued to have been instituted by the central government following the Civil War and achieved through the appointment of salaried officials, within a codified remit of authority. Yet this chapter will argue that there is evidence of locally-driven reforms of civic offices that predate the time frame proposed by Braddick during the second half of the seventeenth century.

At both York and Hull, the responsibilities for civic maintenance were vested within a single individual over several decades, in marked contrast to the previous custom of annual and amateur appointments, which were bound to notions of civic duty and corporate advancement. Removed from the official civic offices, the role of non-officials and building professionals were also integral to the maintenance of an urban community's structural fabric and in the execution of corporate building programmes. This has only been

revealed through a careful assessment of the documentary evidence. The presence of skilled local craftsmen within the records is able to provide a valuable contrast to previous discussions of nationally and internationally recognised figures in relation to Europe and central governments (See Chapter 1, pp. 22-31). The chapter identifies the presence of recognisably skilled crafts and individual craftsmen, where this is in evidence, to inform upon local customs of building work and maintenance, thereby reflecting the wider civic context of each site in relation to their defences. It could be possible to draw a distinction between civic officers and building craftsmen, but often it is impossible to definitively identify whether an officeholder also belonged to such a building craft. What can be identified, however, is the increasing emergence of individuals during the period under discussion and the ability to recreate a limited biography of them. This may be indicative of the increasing professionalization accorded to civic building work and maintenance, including urban defences, which engendered the emergence of named persons being recorded (See Item 11, Tabulation of office holders, York and Hull). What follows is not simply a biography or narrative of individuals, but an attempt to comprehend the local and historically-specific uses of urban defences, the meaning of them within the urban landscape and the complex systems of incorporated governance. The chapter will now begin with the civic office of the muremasters that were operational within York at the start of this period.

The muremasters of York

The system across England for the maintenance of city walls and defences was a royal tax licence known as Murage. Originating in the thirteenth century, it enabled a city to levy tolls on goods being imported for sale, with the income used exclusively for wall construction and maintenance (RCHME 1972, 18-19; Withington 1998d, 90; Creighton & Higham 2005, 85). In York this tax had been licenced and renewed from the middle of the fifteenth century and muremasters, collectors of the murage, were first recorded in 1487. The annually elected office of muremaster with four appointees was maintained until 1577, and it subsequently came to be replaced by the office of a single city husband from 1585 until 1710 (RCHME 1972, 18, 34, 35; YALH B27, 84r). The oath of muremaster stated that:

‘Ye shall swere that ye shall welle and trewely use and execute the office of mooremasters of this city with your fellows and diligently vewe and survey the walles of the same and also make reparaciones of the said walls ther as neyd ys by comaundment and advice of my lorde mayor and his bretheryn during the tyme of your office. And ye shall weikely true accompte yeelde on the Satterday at nyght before the wardeyns of that ward ther as the reparacions shalbe made and to show and declare unto them the partyculers of the same reparacions to the intent that your troathe and diligence may be known and none of the comons money to be consumyd nor wastyd thrughe your defaulte...’ (RCHME 1972, 34).

This oath indicates that muremasters acted as surveyors of the city walls and implemented repairs. There was an emphasis on prudent expenditure, a prescribed command structure of reporting to individual wardens and the involvement of the aldermen and lord mayor. Of the 34 muremasters identified by the RCHME (1972, 174-175) between 1551 and 1578, the variety of professions elected to the office was diverse and included a capper, butcher, miller, draper, baker, plumber, victualer, mariner, glover, glazier, roper, skinner, gentleman, two pewterers, two parchmentmakers, four tanners, four tailors, eight cordwainers, and finally one tiler. Only the tiler, bricklayer and builder could be considered to possess the necessary architectural knowledge and building expertise to carry out the surveying of the city walls and any repairs. This system of electing individuals without

any perceivable building expertise continued after the institution of a city husband in 1585. What appears to have distinguished the office of muremasters from the later office of city husband is the expectation that the office holders could theoretically be elevated to higher civic offices. Palliser (1979c, 71) argues that the office of muremaster formed part of 'a recognized ladder of promotion' in sixteenth century York. Election as muremaster or bridgemaster secured election as chamberlain, leading to the appointment to the Common Council, then election as sheriff, followed by elevation to the Twenty-Four, the appointment as alderman and finally, election to the mayoralty. Of the sixteenth century muremasters after 1550, fifteen went on to serve as a chamberlain and two subsequently as sheriff. From 1585 to 1700 two of the twelve city husbands had served as chamberlain prior to their appointment in 1574 and 1621, not subsequently (RCHME 1972, 174-175).

A decree of 19th January 1553/54 states 'ffrom hensforth none shalbe made chambrelayne of this citie but he shall paye for his exoneracions or fine accustomed viii li. to the comon profite, Except onely suche as have ben brigmaister muremaister or ells hath been fyned for the same ~~two~~ officers' (YALH B21, 25r). Therefore, in principle civic promotion was defined by the ability to pay for exoneration or to fulfil the office of muremaster or bridgemaster, with the administration over the repair of the city walls acting as one key tenet of civic advancement. Though the profession of many may contemporarily not be deemed to have supplied them with the relevant practical knowledge, this was evidently not considered detrimental to an appointment being made. Indeed, Sharpe argues that civic administration depended throughout the early modern period upon such amateur local officials (1999, 29). Heijden goes further and argues that it was the rationale of civic duty to place a greater value in commitment and experience, rather than capability according to modern perceptions of professional standards (2012, 176). Administrative qualities were perhaps considered preferable or simply the ability to pay for the exoneration would have hastened civic advancement. Examples of citizens refusing or paying exemptions for the

office of muremaster to become a chamberlain, the next rung of civic advancement, are evident. From January 1554/55 'Willm ffourwedard powderar newly electe one of the muremaisters and John Holegate carpenter electe brigmaister of Ousebrig paying eyther of theym viii li. apece to the comon chamber for ther [exonerations] shalbe in the office of chambrelaynes for this yere' (YALH B21, 70r) and similarly in January 1555/56 (YALH B21, 119v).

Possibly in response to this on 17th May 1557 the Council stipulated that the four muremasters for that year were to be elected from the city's guild of cordwainers at the next meeting (YALH B22, 62v). No reason is given why members were to be elected from a guild representing shoemakers and leather workers. The nature of the decree and the Council imposing the office on a particular guild implies reluctance on the part of the civic population to accept the role. On 21st May the cordwainers were charged to elect amongst themselves four persons. 'Suspectyng they [the cordwainers] could not agree' or 'wold not chose iiii theymselves', the Council proposed pre-selected muremasters. Returning from their deliberation the guild answered that they would not elect any muremasters, just as the Council suspected, leading to the authorities announcing their pre-selected choice of four names and the cordwainers then 'answer[ing] and sayd plainly ewy of theym they wold not be muremaisters nor wold take no othe'. In response to their 'obstynacy and disobedyens' the four individuals were committed to the Kidcote prison upon Ouse Bridge (YALH B22, 63v). Three days later, on the 24th May 1557, two of those imprisoned 'did humbly submyte theymselfs' to the office of muremaster, took the oath and were duly released from their incarceration. However, the remaining two still refused resulting in 'their windows [being] shut up' and they were to be treated as 'strangers' (YALH B22, 64r), denoting that they had lost the right to trade, their premises were closed and they were disenfranchised as citizens of the city. Finally on 11th June 1557 they submitted themselves to either serve as muremaster or to pay a fine. They both received a fine of 20 shillings 'for their wilfull refusing

to be mure maisters' and a further 21 shillings for their re-enfranchisement to the freedom of the city (YALH B22, 66v).

The imposition of the office upon the cordwainers, combined with the severity of the punishment for their refusals, highlights both the perceived civic importance of the office and the potential reluctance of some to assume it. Yet, Swanson has identified what they describe as historical discrimination against the cordwainers by civic authorities. Across the country cordwainers appear to have had a reputation for civic conflict, to the extent that in 1490 York's Council disenfranchised the entire profession for a time. They were banned from acting as searchers to determine the quality of leather goods at this time and again in 1519, and were later accused of buying and selling goods at Hull in the guise of merchants in 1499 (1980b, 98, 101, 318 & 340). The cordwainers were a profession given over to riot and idleness according to one source, with evidence of apprentices forming fraternities in the late medieval period and agitating for better pay (Swanson 1980b, 102). The constitution of York had been revised in 1517 to institute the body known as the Forty-Eight, with members to be drawn from the major and minor crafts of the city, which is argued by Swanson to have been an attempt to persuade 'substantial craftsmen' to support the Council. Certain crafts were formally excluded, such as the smiths, carpenters, tapiters and cordwainers, the selection of which bore no correlation to the size of the craft and was an attempt to exclude historically troublesome and socially inferior professions from civic government (Swanson 1980b, 340-342). By 1557 relations may again have been strained between the Council and the cordwainers, supported by the Council pre-selecting those who would serve as muremaster in advance of the meeting. Having been excluded from the revised constitution of 1517, the office of muremaster would have enabled those cordwainers to have theoretically progressed up the civic ladder of promotion. Yet in this instance the reticence of the profession to engage with the appointment of its members and to 'take no othe', indicates this official role was unwelcome. It is significant to note that people did not stand for election, but were appointed

and were expected to fulfil their civic duty, or that even in 1557 that it was possibly a form of civic chastisement to fulfil the role. Combined with examples of exoneration through fines and the singling out of one profession during the 1550's, clearly coercion could be resorted to in seeing the office of muremaster occupied and preserve the perceived ladder of civic promotion. In this instance the emphasis appears to have been on ensuring the office of muremaster was occupied for that year, though further research on the craft of cordwainers at that time could reveal other motivations and conflicts.

The degree of control exercised by the muremasters over their office is debatable, with orders relating to their repair of the walls and activities being scarce. In March 1574 muremasters are noted as having surveyed the city's stock of rented buildings and lands accompanied by the lord mayor, chamberlains and bridgemasters. In April of the same year the wardens were ordered to direct the muremasters within their respective wards for the repair of the city walls (YALH B25, 122r & 124r). It is recorded in January 1573/74 that owing to the four muremasters 'have bestowed no cost in reparyng the Comon Walls of this Citie as they ought to have done', they were ordered to remain in office and to see 'the said walles repared this yere as the Brigmaisters of this Citie have heretofore used to doo' (YALH B25, 105v). The system of maintenance as is recorded within the House Books appears to have been predominantly disconnected from the muremasters. For example, the other office of bridgemasters, charged with collecting rental income, is referred to as having carried out work on the walls while the formal office related to the walls maintenance had been negligent. Creighton and Higham (2005b, 182) argue that from as early as the fourteenth century the system of murage had faltered for many cities as an effective system of revenue collection. This was in part due to increased exemptions of individuals, town burgesses and religious institutions from paying the tax, decreasing the explicit revenue for walls over time. No reference to the collection of the Murage Tax is referenced at all during this period. The ability to apportion funds appears to have been derived from

the chamberlains, under the authority of the Council. Orders were made in April 1558 to repair the walls at Fishergate Postern and 'wthowte myklith barr' and, later in the same month, the frontage of Micklegate Bar was described as 'moche ruynouse and loose', with the repairs needed to be under the oversight of the wardens and funded 'of the comon chardge of this cittie by the chamberleyne' (YALH B22, 124r & 126r). In neither instance are the muremasters referred to, in spite of the fact that the office's formal function was to administer the maintenance of the walls. It would appear that they were merely sporadically called upon to act as part of the wider civic retinue of figures, in a ceremonial manner reinforcing a traditionally held and long-standing office, whilst deferring to those higher offices that truly had control of funding and authority to initiate building works. Later in February 1562/63 it was the aldermen and wardens of the respective wards, not the muremasters, who were to 'assemble...and repayre to certayne decayed walles of this citie...And apou their view...take ordre for good and spedy amendment' (YALH B23, 90r).

Yet there was some form of financial arrangement through the muremasters being liable for the debts of those preceding them in office. In January 1572/73 it was decreed that no muremaster would be charged more than 10 li. in their duties (YALH B25, 48r), while in February 1574/75 the new muremasters were obliged to pay the former officers for their expenses totalling 34 li. 17 s. 7 d. (YALH B26, 3r). Earlier in June 1556, the Council had agreed to allow the four present muremasters a loan of 5 li. each, presumably to meet the costs of work, but with the stipulation it was to be repaid by Christmas of that year (YALH B22, 23r). This would indicate that the office holder traditionally responsible for the wall's maintenance personally incurred costs. This is implied by the dearth of information for the Murage Tax and the convention of being reimbursed at the end of their period in office. Given the reluctance of individuals to accept or afford the office, and the seeming failure of individual muremasters to carry out the agreed programmes of building, it is unsurprising that the ineffectual civic office of muremaster was discontinued. An unremarkable and brief record

dated 26th February 1577/78 notes that the current two muremasters should have their expenses reimbursed from the chamberlains, rather than as was accustomed by the newly elected muremasters, signalling the termination of the annually elected office (YALH B27, 84r). Prior to the abolition of the office the chamberlains had in 1576 paid John Farley 3 li. 'for certayne stones of his that were taken for repayrng of the Citie walles', a duty that should have been considered part of the muremasters remit (YALH B26, 73r). In April 1579 the chamberlains are noted as repairing the walls and towers from the Merchant Taylors Hall near Monk Bar to Layerthorpe Postern (YALH B27, 151r), continuing the role and responsibilities that they had carried out even when the muremasters still operated.

The RCHME (1972, 35) states that muremasters were only elected intermittently owing to the reticence of citizens to assume the office and that the election of individuals to the office was not always even recorded. The implication of this is that the office was inconsequential for the civic administration, those being elected and the city as a whole. The dearth of subsequent research into the office of muremaster would appear to stem from the assessment of the RCHME in the 1970s, with subsequent reference only fleetingly made by Palliser (1979c, 71) within a discussion of the panoply of other civic offices. The logical conclusion is that if the civic office traditionally pertaining to the urban defences was negligible, then so too were the efforts directed toward their maintenance by the civic authorities. However, this is patently not the case, as shown by the lengths to which the Council sought to fill the office by force and threats of disenfranchisement and admonishing those muremasters failing to carry out their civic duties. That a specific office existed at all should alert historians to the significance of maintaining York's *enceinte*. The institutional failures of the office itself, the individual office-holders and their reticence to assume the duties, implies a fundamental flaw in the administration of the city walls, particularly the annual tenure of the office. Yet this should not be misconstrued as indifference from the Council or the citizenry more

generally. The actions taken by the Council in the years immediately preceding the abolition of the muremasters can be understood as exemplifying this historic administrative weakness that affected not only the walls, but also the wider stock of civic property and buildings.

Contemporaneous with the office of muremaster was the city's employment of a Christopher Walmesley, engaged for 'his arte of sciens of free maisonrye' (YALH B24, 117v). In January 1563/64 Ouse Bridge, the only bridge traversing the Ouse within York, collapsed following a frost and sudden thaw that caused ice flows to damage the central piers (Mee & Wilson 2002, 55). As part of the ensuing repairs, the overseer of London Bridge, Thomas Harper, was engaged with for a short time by the Council for his counsel towards its repair and was paid 5 li. (YALH B24, 14r & 15v). This work included devising the arch for the bridge, 'as by consell of the most expert and politik men', whose building led to the appointment of the mason Walmesley, first referenced in April 1566, 'for the sure making of the said arche' at the weekly wage of 6 s. 8 d. (YALH B24, 44r-44v). In May 1566 Walmesley is referred to as the Chief Mason of Ouse Bridge (YALH B24, 46r) and the RCHME refers to him as the Common Mason of the city from September 1568 (1972, 174). What distinguishes Christopher Walmesley from other officials relating to the maintenance of buildings was his status as a professional builder and proto-architect, yet at the same time he was not, at least initially, a freeman of the city. This was in contrast to the many seemingly inexperienced citizens occupying the role of muremaster that was associated with building repairs, maintenance and the traditional civic ladder of promotion. With the city having actively sought out building professionals from outside of York during the 1560s, this would suggest that there was a contemporary recognition of the need to employ those with the requisite technical skills for large projects, skills seemingly not found within the panoply of local offices, officials or craftsmen, which at other times would have traditionally been sought to fulfil the need for building work and maintenance.

For such a large project as the rebuilding of Ouse Bridge the engagement of external and non-resident specialists could be expected and the situation reverting to the traditional offices afterwards. However, in September 1568, some two years after Walmesley's initial consultation and engagement with Ouse Bridge, the Council granted him an annuity of 26 s. 8 d. and expenses incurred in 'comyng caryeng here and returne homeward' annually (YALH B24, 117v). His place of residence is not recorded, yet considering he was to be paid expenses for travel he must have lived some distance away. It is suggested by D Woodward (1995, 17) that Walmesley's employment is indicative of the previous low demand in York at that time for masons, necessitating the engagement of an 'outsider'. The annuity was granted for life on the condition that he visited every year to: 'view [peruse] and searche the defaults decay and state of Ouse Bridge ffosse bridge laythorpe bridge and others the works of the said citie aperteyning to his arte or sciens of free maisonrye...and there geve his faithfull advyse and counsel for the nedefull amendynge of the said bryggs and works And...in dewe and seasonable tyme...amende the said defaults' (YALH B24, 118r). Specific reference was made to the bridges of the city as well as other 'works', and he would be paid from the city's central funds by the chamberlains, suggesting that local professionals and offices were not considered up to the task. Walmesley was recorded within York in March 1568/69, 1571, 1573, 1579/80, 1580/81, 1583 and lastly in May 1587 (YALH B24, 129r, 196v; B25, 4r, 15v; B27 226r; B28, 99v; B29, 191r). The majority of the records note his work on the bridges, but in March 1579/80 evidence of his wider remit is demonstrated when the walls near Micklegate Bar were ordered to be repaired and Walmesley was 'to be spoken to worke and repaire the same' (YALH B27, 228v). The final reference to his working in the city refers to the decays of the staith in May 1587 but he may also have been repairing a buttress along the walls near Walmgate Bar (YALH B29, 191r).

The continuation of muremasters for several years implies corporate reluctance to reform their traditional forms of civic offices and advancement. The non-freeman Walmesley's tenure of 21 years working

across the city on numerous projects represents a clear break with, and undermining of, the previous civic role of annual appointments. Clearly the benefits of a building professional engaged over a protracted period of time were considered advantageous by the Council, in contrast to the rotating office of muremaster that adhered to notions of civic duty and the gradual accrument of experience. That his services were retained for so long and the muremasters were discontinued several years into his tenure proves that the Council sought ultimately to professionalise the maintenance of their building stock, including the defences, as well as reduce the number of redundant and ineffectual offices. Walmesley's employment was a precursor to the system of maintenance that the Council sought to affect throughout the rest of the early modern period. This system saw the gradual concentration of individuals removed from the traditional ladder of civic offices who were retained in the role of building maintenance over sustained periods of time. The affirmation of the muremasters within the civic ladder of promotion on 19th January 1553/54 and subsequent discontinuance of the role in February 1577/78, does not reflect a disinterest by the Council in the maintenance of the urban defences. This should be understood as attempting to institute appropriate maintenance of the defences and wider civic property, removed from the remit of antiquated offices proven to be ineffectual.

The city husband- Edmond Gyles and the professionalization of the office

The office of city husband represented the professionalization of an office for repairing, maintaining and building civic property, with a wider remit than the muremasters that were limited to the *enceinte*. The RCHME cites 1584/1585 as the date for the establishment of the city husband, eight years after the termination of the muremasters (1972, 34). However, research reveals that the title 'husband' can in fact be traced earlier. On 15th January 1561/62 it was agreed John Hwdoorne the younger would be '[master] overseer of the yerely reparacons of the citie walls and for his paynes to

have a yerely fee of xxvi s. viii d. to be payd of the chamber over and beside his [daily] waiges every day he workyth and he to husband' (YALH B23, 44r). This was the same sum of money granted for the annual annuity of Christopher Walmesley. Unlike the muremasters, still technically a civic office in 1561, John Hwdorne was to have a salary and a daily rate of pay, suggesting his belonging to a building profession. In January 1584/85, twenty-four years later and seven years after the abolition of muremasters, Robert Pearson was appointed 'husband and [overseer] of the works of the cittie and to gather the cittie rents...and he to have vi li. fee for the same' (YALH, B28, 178r). Prior to Pearson's appointment and following the last reference of Walmesley working in the city, the wardens of Bootham Ward were to direct the repairs of the city walls near to Lendal Tower in April 1583 (YALH B28, 95v). Therefore prior to Pearson's appointment there was no single formal civic office that had oversight of civic maintenance and building work.

Whereas in 1561 John Hwdoorne had been appointed solely for the repair of the city walls, in 1584 the overseeing role of Pearson now had a larger remit that encompassed rent collection, as well as the broadly definable city 'works'. The intervening time between the appointment of Hwdoorne and Pearson had witnessed the employment of Walmesley, with an emphasis on professionalism, as well as the abolition of the muremasters. Therefore Pearson's appointment highlights the changing attitude of the civic government toward maintaining its property over the preceding twenty years and the reform implemented toward the systems of building maintenance. Pearson is recorded as supplying and sourcing timber for repairs and negotiating the leasing of acreage of meadow belonging to the city (YALH B29, 5v, 20v). The wider remit of rent collection and negotiation of leases, as well as maintenance, implies greater responsibility in the office, but it appears that individuals were still elected or appointed annually at this date. Pearson is noted as having provided forty trees for the repairs of a jetty in March 1584/85 and is last referred to in June 1585 as the 'Cityyes husband' having concluded the leasing of acreage at Naburn for 'the most

comodytye' (YALH B29, 5v & 20v). By July of 1594 the wardens of Micklegate were to consult with a Martin Arkendale 'or some other workemen for making up the Cittyes Wall at Northstreet posterne', with no reference to Pearson or a city husband (YALH B31, 76r). Therefore it seems the Council had yet again rescinded the position of city husband and had reverted to other traditional civic offices for administration of building maintenance.

As part of the same entry an insight into the state of sections of the walls is recorded, as well as how individual citizens perhaps considered their material fabric. A warrant had earlier in the month been issued to several aldermen and 'others' to conduct a search of Micklegate Ward for 'fre stones fallen from the Walles of this Citty and conveyed away by others' (YALH B29, 20v). As well as highlighting that stones had been stolen it reveals that the walls had deteriorated to such an extent that they were collapsing, the causes of which pertain to either a lack of maintenance or a high degree of concentrated theft at this particular section. Five citizens were caught in possession of stones that the aldermen referred to as 'owers', meaning the city's: Widow Halleyes possessed three, Miles Prince two, Robert Malton one, Brian Wharton seven, and Percival Barnes nine or ten. Brian Wharton was the ferryman leasing North Street Postern from September 1593 and whose descendant, Henry Wharton, the Council had sought to evict from the Postern during the 1630's (YALH B31, 26v; B35, 98v). Five of the stones he held are recorded as being found in 'the towre in the chambre' of the Postern itself and two in the adjoining garden, perhaps denoting Wharton's differing intention for the stones within and without (YALH B31, 76v). Clearly the Wharton family regularly found themselves in contravention of the Council's commands.

It is not recorded what these persons intended to do with the stones, yet leases of the defences and the reaction of the Council toward the attempted demolition of Clifford's Tower can elucidate the possible uses of pilfered limestone. The dismantling of Clifford's Tower in 1596 elicited a concerted

attempt from York's Council to stop the gaoler Robert Redhead from further destruction of it, noting in their petition to the Privy Council that he had 'burnt into Lyme' the limestone of the tower (YALH B31, 190r-190v). Two years later in July 1598 Henry Lynn's lease for Lendal Tower, located on the opposite side of the river from Brian Wharton in North Street Postern, specifically forbade him to 'erecte make kepe or use any plaister kilne or lyme kilne' so as not to 'impare or hurt the Cittie walles' (YALH B31, 367v). The implication is that the Council was concerned Lynn would, as Redhead had done at Clifford's Tower, demolish sections of the city walls for the production of lime. All three references to the demolition, or threat thereof, occurred within a relatively short period of time. This indicates a particular time of increased lime production for building works, as well as revealing that the physical fabric of the walls and towers possessed an intrinsic material and monetary value. Only weeks prior to the theft of stone from Micklegate in July 1594, the Council had concluded negotiating the purchase of 500 stones from the parish of St Trinity's for 5 li. and by 26th July, orders were made for repairing the walls at North Street Postern and the theft of stone is noted (YALH B31, 73v, 74r & 76r). Therefore the Council was in possession of a large number of suitable building stones from a parish of the city, with such quantities only available from a former religious building within that parish. R L Kemp (1996, 219) cites the re-use of stone from the Priory of Holy Trinity in Micklegate for the repair of Ouse Bridge in 1564, and again in 1603 for repairing sections of the defences, several decades after its dissolution. Such urban monastic sites were able to provide hewn and dressed stone, either through purchase or pilfering, as well as other commodities through the production of lime with a limekiln. The similar re-use of monastic building material was evident with the construction of the Henrician defences of Hull, which in 1542 employed 30 lime-burners to process the stone from Meaux Abbey (Howes & Foreman 1999, 13).

Those stealing the stones from Micklegate may well have sought to sell the stone to a figure such as Redhead, produce lime for their own purposes, or of course use the stones physically for construction. The Council referred to

Clifford's Tower, within the state's jurisdiction of York Castle, as 'bewtyfyinge' the city in 1596 (YALH B31, 192r), so it is legitimate to argue that they will have bestowed similar sentiments toward those defences under their jurisdiction and ownership. M Reed's assessment that many town and city walls were in a state of ruination from the mid-sixteenth century, compounded by the active re-use of defensive material by corporations and citizens alike, is undermined by the documented efforts undertaken by York's corporation to ensure the structural integrity, architectural splendour and in providing building materials for the city's defences (2000, 289).

It was not until February 1597/98 that Peter Waite, an officer to the lord mayor, is appointed as 'overseer of the common works this yeare' with a salary of 40 s. (YALH B29, 20v; B31, 329r). As with Pearson, Waite's appointment appears to have been only for a single year. During his short tenure Waite is recorded, along with a warden of Micklegate, as having worked on the walls surrounding the Old Baile, 'being so lowe...as people do come [over] yt' (YALH B31, 349v). The terms 'overseer' and 'husband' are accorded to the chamberlains in 1599 when overseeing repairs at the city staith and paying workmen (YALH, B32, 30v), signalling their having assumed responsibilities toward maintenance and construction. One year later in June 1600 the Council agreed that a 'sufficient man as shalbe thought mete and discrete' would be sought and appointed as overseer; Roger Jackson was appointed in July 1600 with salary of 5 li. and a bond of 100 li. provided by two citizens to vouch for his 'trewe [accounting]'. Yet, only seven months later Jackson was dismissed having 'yeilded up his office' and, as in 1599, the chamberlains were appointed overseers 'as in tymes past hath bene accustomed', with the Council declaring 'that ther shalbe no comon husbandes' (YALH B32, 99r, 101v, 131v).

This evidence suggests that following the termination of the office of muremaster, the Council had at various times instituted and rescinded a specific salaried office to maintain the walls, but also other civic works

within the city. The turn around of officers and the retention of an annual appointment does not appear to have instituted a distinct and permanent office with which to deal with the defences. Yet it did set the framework for a salaried role that sought to oversee all aspects of civic property and building maintenance, including the walls, and one that was not directly linked with future civic promotion. The antecedents of this had been evident earlier in the century through the employment of figures valued for their professional skills, such as Christopher Walmesley. There was also a patent desire to retain their services as was demonstrated by the institution of a waged role, a financial aspect that was not traditionally afforded to notions of civic duty and office. Through the establishment of an office, removed from notions of civic progression and elevation, the intent of the Council was to professionalize the maintenance of their property and defences. Yet clearly figures such as Roger Jackson were considered to have failed in their duties, thus leading the Council to temporarily revoke the new role and revert back to other traditional civic offices and officials, such as the chamberlains, who at various times had been involved in building repairs. In reverting back to traditional non-salaried offices, the Council too would also have negated the need to expend money on an additional salary and adhered to civic notions of members accruing knowledge and experience that might benefit them in subsequent civic positions.

The appointment of Thomas Jordan in June 1601 heralded a new relationship toward the maintenance of the city's property and the defences owing to the duration of his tenure. His appointment specified that he was '[overseer] of the Cities worke in place of a common husband this year' and in that December was paid 50 s. for his work and 'discharged from that place till forther order' (YALH B32, 149r & 180v). The particular reference to 'in a place of a common husband this year' demonstrates that the Council was not seeking to appoint a city husband and Jordan's appointment was limited to a specified period of time. In support of this is Jordan's salary being half of Jackson's when city husband, indicating that a reduced number of responsibilities were envisaged for the overseer. Jordan's services were in

fact retained beyond this initial period and in December 1603 he was paid 3 li., though the increase of 10s. can be accounted for as restitution from the Council following its decision to lease a tenement on Ouse Bridge that he had intended to occupy. In December 1605 the House Books record a further payment of 5 li. for his work as overseer for the preceding two years (YALH B32, 386r). Therefore for the first four years of his appointment as overseer Jordan nominally received the stipulated annual wage rate of 50 s., even if irregularly paid.

Work carried out on the leading of Micklegate Bar and Monk Bar in 1607 cites the overseer of the city's works as implementing their repair, presumably Jordan, but it is not until April 1611 that another overseer is referred to by name, James Gibson (YALH B33, 83r, 240v). Previous muremasters, city husbands and overseers had held the posts for only a year or less, whereas Thomas Jordan may have held the position of overseer intermittently for eight years until 1608/09. The termination of Jordan's role is demonstrated by his omission from an order in March 1609/10 for four individuals and the chamberlains 'to oversee and loke unto the Citytes works wch are to be done this yeare', specifically the King's Staith, the city walls, Skeldergate Postern and the causeway without Monk Bar (YALH B33, 196r-196v). Within the record only the forename of Anthony is legible but his role was to 'attend unto the same worke' and provide 'and get such thinges for the same worke' under the direction of those officials appointed as overseers. This suggests Jordan's appointment had marked a divergence from the previous convention of annual civic and salaried appointments, with the Council seeking to move toward a system of formally retaining an individual over a prolonged period of time with a specified annual salary, which for several years had seemingly worked successfully enough for Jordan to be repeatedly reappointed. However, by 1608/09 Jordan's tenure as overseer had been terminated for unknown reasons and the civic authorities again reverted to the traditional and annually elected office of the chamberlains to substitute the role of one individual.

By April 1611, as had occurred in 1601, the Council yet again agreed that a man was to be appointed overseer 'of the Cittie workes and to have the same place upon his good behaviour' (YALH B33, 240v). On this occasion the Common Council presented four individuals for the position to be considered, implying an active interest and involvement from outside the upper circle of the Council of the lord mayor and aldermen, as well as displaying a determination to find a suitable candidate. James Gibson was appointed with an increased salary of 5 li. annually 'for his paynes and labor' drawn from the city's 'comon chamber so longe as he shall have the same office and place' (YALH B33, 244v). For the next 17 years Gibson was referred to several times. In 1615 he was sent to London to enquire after workman to dredge the River Ouse, his advice was also sought for the establishment of a ducking stool within the city and in April he is also noted as having paid 6 li. 13 s. 4 d. towards the city's debts (YALH B33, 240v, 244v; B34, 64v, 146v; B35, 32r). Regarding the enquiry of a workman to dredge the Ouse, in consideration of the 'instruccons for this busines' he was to receive from two aldermen, Gibson clearly commanded the confidence of the Council to conduct enquiries and engage professionals for such work. In 1627/28 Gibson is recorded as assessing the *enceinte* at Robin Hood Tower, at Ouse Bridge he was to confer with workmen and provide lime for repairs, and finally assess repairs for Tadcaster Bridge and several others (YALH B32, 56v, 59r & 60v). Subsequent to his first reference as overseer in 1611 he is thereafter simply referred to by name. Though not continuously waged or formally recorded as an official, Gibson's affiliation to the repairing and maintenance of the city's property, researching future projects and assisting monetarily towards reducing civic debts, signifies a long consultative and engaged relationship with the Council.

From 1631 through to the appointment of Edmond Gyles as city husband in the 1640s, the position of city husband was formalized. The decade preceding the Civil War witnessed the appointment, discharge and re-appointment of four separate city husbands. John Clarke and John Key were appointed in 1631 and 1634, having stipulated their roles in viewing the city

walls, causeways and city staith's for a wage of 4 li. and 5 li. respectively (YALH B35, 111v & 276v). This is the first instance in the records since the termination of the muremasters, that the defences were specifically identified in relation to the office of city husband. However, John Clarke's appointment as an officer with responsibility for the walls was in conjunction with the appointment of alderman Belson to that role also, suggesting a continuing degree of aldermanic oversight or harnessing of civic experience, accounting for Clarke's reduced wage of 4 li. (YALH B35, 111v). In contrast to Clarke's appointment, John Key was appointed independently from sharing the role with any other individual and also notably his salary was higher, indicating recognition of greater responsibility having been imparted to him by the Council.

The formalization of the office is further evidenced in March 1634/35 through the creation of an inventory 'of all the implemts belonging the Citty' (YALH B35, 276v). In April 1637 these were itemized as part of the city husband or overseer's apparatus of office: 'one gyrm, one dig, one spade, one shovel, a tent, one borrow, one [rammer?], 20 traces, one rope' (YALH B35, 329r). The reference to the tools of the city husband is the first evidence of the physical nature of the office, either on the part of the officer or the workmen who may have used them, as well as demonstrating the formal development of the office that required specific tools. In March 1634/35 it is also revealed that Key was to repair the city walls, Monk Bridge and the causeways according to the directions of the ward's wardens, thereby acting as a deferential functionary to other civic offices. He was dismissed in August 1637 and replaced by John Myers, only for Key to later be reappointed in October 1642 and then once again dismissed in November 1643, with the stipulation that the lord mayor was to settle his wages 'for as little as he can' (YALH B35, 337v; B36, 77r, 93r). The intervening city husband had been a John Williamson. Appointed initially in August 1640 as the city's rent collector 'to enter into the houses and lands of such tenantz to the Citty as refuse to pay', then in the following June he was appointed the city husband (YALH B36, 45r & 58r). As the rent collector, Williamson would

have had accrued knowledge of the city's housing and renting stock, thereby making his appointment for the maintenance over the same property a rational decision. Yet, the reappointment of the former city husband can potentially also be seen as evidence for the defensive preparations being made in anticipation of the Civil War threat, under the perceived guidance of a more experienced individual. Further research across multiple case studies would aid in determining how individual towns and cities sought to respond to the immediacy and threat of the Civil War and if adjustments were made to their traditional means of maintaining their defences and related offices as a result.

Edmond Gyles, Keys successor, was elected city husband in the December following the negotiated end to the siege of York by the Parliamentarians in August 1644 'to be a husband for' the city and would come to hold the office for thirty-two years until his death in 1676, with an annual wage of 5 li.; his tenure represents the longest recorded period of any one official relating to York's building maintenance from 1550-1700 (YALH B36, 114r; B38, 120r). In January 1654/55, Williamson received a retrospective payment of his annual salary of 5 li. for a three year period for 'his service as Citty husband', over a decade after his dismissal (YALH B37, 68r). Therefore, Williamson's dismissal as the city husband would not appear to have been related to his having died in office but for some unrecorded reason. The ultimate failure of the Royalist forces during the siege may have influenced his dismissal.

Gyles was by profession a glazier. There is a reference to an Edmond Gyles being made an apprentice to an unspecified profession, paid for by the Council in January 1626/27 (YALH B35, 32r). Given that he became a freeman of York and a member of the Guild of Glaziers in 1634, it is therefore likely that the Gyles referred to in 1626/27 was he (Brighton 1978, 74). This reveals that prior to his appointment as city husband he was known to the Council and had benefitted from their charity in paying for his apprenticeship. It is only conjecture, but this may have had some bearing upon his later appointment in December 1644, owing to the lack of

references to him or his having been engaged by the city for building work before this date within the House Books.

Gyles' predecessors in the office of city husband included a tanner, inn holder, haberdasher, tailor, tiler and carpenter (RCHME 1972, 175). Brighton (1978, 75-77) argues that Gyles was not a practicing glass painter, but in fact renewed the leading of windows and presumably had wider craft and building knowledge pertaining to the city's need for structural repairs, as well as being appointed 'on account of his sympathies with the parliamentary cause'. This may further account for the dismissal of his predecessor Williamson and his own appointment. Withington notes that Gyles combined the role of city husband, chamberlain and a militia commission for a time during the 1650s (1998, 138; Brighton 1978, 75). Within the House Books he is recorded in February 1659/60 as 'mr Chamberlaine Giles' when repairing Layerthorpe Postern's gate and hinges (YALH B37, 134r) and in January 1658/59 as seeking to make a tenant repair a section of the city walls in Bootham in his capacity as an 'officer' of that ward (YALH B37, 134r & 121r). The use of the term 'Chamberlaine' by the scribe may owe more to the historical role that the chamberlains had often been assigned to as overseers of building works, as discussed earlier, rather than indicating that Gyles actually fulfilled the official office of chamberlain. If he had performed multiple civic roles concomitantly with that of being the city husband, it is notable that in both of these roles Gyles was still involved with the repair and maintenance of the city's defences, as well as dealing with tenant and lease issues.

Following Gyles' appointment in the December, his first task in January 1644/45 was to provide 'lyme and other necessaries' for unspecified sections of the city walls. Yet, beforehand, a survey by the aldermen and mayor was to take place in which they would 'take into consideration the repaire of them' (YALH B36, 118r). In specifying that he was to provide the raw building materials it would support the argument that he was part of a building profession with skills beyond that of a glazier. Notably the

aldermen were to survey and have oversight over the repairs, indicating that at least initially his role was as more of a functionary deferring to higher civic offices, a system that had traditionally operated at times when there was no one individual appointed as either overseer or city husband, as in 1599 and 1609/10. As part of this survey, the walls around the Old Baile were specifically referenced in March 1644/45 to 'make the same answerable in hight' to the surrounding walls for a cost of 48 li., revealing that this section had particularly been damaged following the siege (YALH B36, 126r) The walls of the Old Baile were again repaired in July 1645 and later surveyed by several aldermen 'with mr Gyles' in June 1674 (YALH B36, 138r; B38, 96v). When repairs of the city walls were ordered in June 1557, the Old Baile walls were described as 'where most nede is', while Peter Waite had repaired the section in April 1598 to prevent people climbing over them (YALH B22, 66v-67r; B31, 349v). In 1566 a tower at the Old Baile 'allready [broken] from the citie wall' was demolished and the stone reused for the rebuilding of Ouse Bridge; its removal was deemed suitable 'wthowte enfeblyng or greatly defacing of the sayd wall' (YALH B24, 48v). Clearly the walls around the Old Baile had required historical maintenance prior to the Civil War siege and on at least one occasion had provided building materials for use elsewhere in York. Aside from the Old Baile walls, Gyles was also to construct a brick watch house there 'five yeads in length and 2 yerds and a halfe broad' and remove quantities of earth around the site, the weight of which no doubt contributed to the deterioration of the defences (YALH B36, 126r). As well as the watch house at the Old Baile, others were constructed 'for the Solgers' at Walmgate Bar, 'for watching the River' at Skeldergate Postern and on Toft Green (YALH B36, 126r, 129r, 129v, 131r). This initial concern to erect watch houses specifically for the use of the soldiers appears to have waned by June 1647. At Skeldergate the 'Centree house' was leased domestically to Marie Fell, on the condition that 'she keepe the same in repayre and yield possession when my Lord maior requires' (YALH B36, 206v).

As city husband Gyles was not alone in working on the defences, with a deputation of aldermen recorded as having viewed the walls near Micklegate Bar and ordering the 'overseers of the workers to sett workmen' on the repairs (YALH, B36, 129r). There was also Abraham Smith who had worked on the walls at Fishergate in March 1645 and received 40 s. 'for the worke done by him aboute the Citties walls for the time past' in May of that year. Fishergate clearly represented a particular weakness of the *enceinte*, as Smith's repairs were to ensure that 'noe psons may clime over the same ether into or out of the Citty' (YALH B36, 129r & 135v). At the same time Gyles was charged to preserve the water levels sourced from the Foss around the Castle Mills, described as being 'for the pservation of the Citty' (YALH B36, 131r), which referred to the defensive body of water known as the King's Fishpool. An understanding of water management would have been necessary, again supporting the view that Gyles had building or engineering skills and experience. Gyles and Smith also collaborated on repairing the 'draught house' that was located at the Common Staith, for which they were to 'have satisfaction for the same', alluding to the prospect that they would initially fund the work and later be remunerated by the Council (YALH B36, 131r). Further defensive repairs undertaken by the aldermen pertained to the deepening of the moat at the Red Tower so 'that nether horse nor man can come or goe that way forth of or into the Citty', the blocking up of Bootham Bar and the repair of Castlegate Postern to make it 'fitt for opening and lockinge' (YALH B36, 131r, 129r & 143r). As well as the repair and maintenance of the defences, there was also a clearly offensive addition to the *enceinte*. In March 1645 Gyles was ordered and agreed to construct 'a platt forme for a peece of ordnance' at Toft Green for 60 li., of which 3 li. was to be paid to Thomas Haggas and Michael Hindley for repairing the walls near the corner tower (YALH B36, 131r). By the 20th May this had been accomplished but for the increased cost of 150 li. and it had involved the construction of a supporting buttress (YALH B36, 135v).

Gyles' appointment had seemingly not been unconditional. By August 1645 the Council was 'well satisfied' with his work and he was to receive an

additional 5 li., besides his ordinary wages, which was drawn from the assessment taxed for the repair of the city walls, and his services were to be retained until November 11th 1645, St Martin's Day (YALH B36, 149r). Any speculation over his continuation as the city husband is only again referred to in February 1672/73 when the House Book notes 'that mr Gyles the Cittyes husband be continued till further order' (YALH B38, 84v). It can be assumed that during his tenure there was little reason for the Council to consider removing him as city husband. Monetary preferment was bestowed upon him in February 1645/46 with 20 s. 'for his paines' over three weeks attending to the workmen at the Common Hall and again in July 1646 when it was ordered that, as well as his 5 li. salary, he was awarded a further 6 li. 'for the good service done in the Cittyes works' and that from henceforth he was to receive additionally 'dayly waiges as other workemen' did (YALH B36, 190r). By September of that year this amounted to a further 40 s. or 2 li. for 36 days work (YALH B36, 194r). By receiving a civic annual salary in conjunction with a daily wage, this distinguished Gyles amongst other contracted workers. All of these repairs and additions immediately following the siege and Gyles' appointment are clearly overtly defensive in nature and helped to cement his position. Yet, this should not belie the overtly civic work that he also undertook in his capacity as city husband, as is alluded to by his oversight of work at the Common Hall.

Other civic works undertaken by Gyles included: repairs to the prison on Ouse Bridge, in consultation with an alderman, being 'desired to oversee and directe the worke'; assessing what repairs were necessary for St Cuthbert's church; constructing a ducking stool to be located at North Street Postern; finding a suitable location in Monk Ward for livestock to be held in a pinfold; in November 1649 he was to 'fourthwith cause a turnpike or what els shall be conceaved necessary for hindringe horses' at the Common Staith; and to assess two tenements near Micklegate Bar (YALH B36, 176r, 181r, 182r, 206v, 239r; B38, 96v). In August 1654 'Giles [was] employed as overseer' for works undertaken on the fabric of York Minster and in May 1665 was paid 12 li. for work on a house in the Minster Yard (YALH B36, 59v & 72v). It was

also Gyles who was to be paid in September 1658 for having constructed the scaffolding on the Pavement 'for pclaiming his highness the Lord Richard [Cromwell] ptector' (YALH B37, 115v). The relatively minor and non-defensive nature of the repairs and projects continued throughout the rest of his tenure. The majority of the later defensive repairs pertained to repairing the gates of the city (YALH B37, 178r; B38, 58r & 96v), Layerthorpe Postern's gates and hinges, as well as being appointed on behalf of the Council to collect from the military authorities at Clifford's Tower 36 barrels of gunpowder 'belongine to the Citty [to be] brought back' (YALH, B37, 134r; B38, 6v).

The appointment of Gyles after the siege of 1644 and retention until his death is indicative of the Council's regard of his reputation and proficiency in the role of city husband. Within the House Books there is a record of the Council paying 30 s. for his son to be bound apprentice to a cobbler in July 1649, similar to his own experience of the Council having paid for his apprenticeship in 1626/27 (YALH B36, 229v). In 1656, being 'much out of purse for the Citties use aboute there necessary workes', his bond of 40 li. was reduced to only 3 li. and in 1666 25 li. for his bond was lent to him by other freemen (YALH, B37, 95r; B38, 32v). The mitigation of his finances and assistance in helping him apprentice his son by this date suggests that a level of familiarity between Gyles and the civic elite existed. The fact that his son Henry was contracted to carry out a commission on the window of the Guildhall from 1679 to 1684 indicates the continuing favour of the civic elite towards Henry Gyles, even nepotism, after his father had died (YALH B38, 163r, 210v).

As well as operating as a glass painter within York, Henry Gyles was also part of a seventeenth century group operating from the 1670's known as the York Virtuosi (Brighton 1978, 85). This group's members included artists, antiquarians, scientists and ecclesiastics, with two of these being the artists and engravers Francis Place and William Lodge. The York Virtuosi have been described as a group of connoisseurs who were instrumental in

publicising the art of the Continent and being part of a network with links to York, Leeds and London (Brighton 1978, 85). In his youth Place was well acquainted with Wenceslaus Hollar, the engraver who produced the rendering of seventeenth century Hull in 1640 (Griffiths 1998, 251), accurately depicting and focussing on the defences of the town (Figure 1). Place and Lodge provided some of the finest topographical and architectural renderings of York, as well as examples of Hull, during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-centuries. Their works are often taken from the vantage point of the defences, displaying a keen interest in the rendering of them along the outskirts of the urban topography. It is likely that their interest in these structures may well have been further informed by the knowledge of Henry Gyles, who himself no doubt had come to know them well during his father's 32 years of maintaining the defences.

In conjunction with maintaining the defences for York as city husband, Edmond Gyles also had a personal interest through leasing sections of them. From 1648 through to 1675, the year before his death, he is recorded within the city's leasing accounts, the Receivers' Rolls, as renting at different times Fishergate Postern, Layerthorpe Postern, Castlegate Postern and their adjacent gardens or land (YALH C70.1, C72.4, C73.1, C74.2, C74.3, C74.4, C75.1, C76.2). Gyles undertook work on the causeway near Fishergate Postern in April 1652, as well as on the locks, gates, hinges and 'other necessaries' for Layerthorpe Postern in 1659 (YALH B37, 28V & 134r). These references are found within the House Books and it is likely that repairs carried out at other times were recorded in now lost documents. Having undertaken these repairs for the Council, Gyles would have been aware of the condition of them and their environs, no doubt confident in their structural integrity and also their potential for profit. Being so closely associated with the maintenance of the defences he may have had some preferment in their being leased to him. Given this association it is ironic that Withington (1998d, 172) identifies that in the early 1650's Gyles was presented at the Quarter Sessions as a lessee failing to maintain the defences. J T Brighton identifies Gyles as having owned a house opposite the

church of St Martin-cum-Gregory, of which he was church warden, with the church and house situated centrally on the road of Micklegate that led from Micklegate Bar to Ouse Bridge (1978, 76). Appropriately, given the Gyles family connection, the church is now home to The Stained Glass Centre (<http://www.stainedglasscentre.org>).

Considering that Castlegate and Layerthorpe Posterns were outside of the ward of Micklegate in which he owned a house, it is unlikely that he rented them for personal habitation, but rather for subletting. In the year 1664 to 1665 Gyles is noted as leasing Layerthorpe Postern for 13 s. 4 d., while 'Eliz. Errington 16 s.' is also recorded, inserted at a later date by a scribe (YALH C74.2). In 1668 to 1669 a new tenant of Layerthorpe Postern, Robert Wright, was paying the same rent of 13 s. 4 d. as Gyles had paid (YALH C75.1). Therefore, Errington's 16 s. might refer to the yield Gyles received from subletting Layerthorpe Postern, amounting to 2 s. 8 d. This may seem insignificant compared to the rent of the postern, but within the same year the rent for an orchard in Fishergate was 1 s., a tenement in North Street 3 s. and a moat near Lendal Tower 2 s. (YALH C74.2). Therefore Gyles, or any lessee of the city, would have been able to extend their income or yield from land through subleasing. The distinction between the structures and adjacent gardens within the Receivers' Rolls implies they were distinct holdings and not necessarily one lot to be leased, meaning Gyles could have utilised the land while subleasing the building. It is noteworthy that records relating to the rents of Edmond Gyles within the Rolls only refer to his leasing parts of the defences, defences he was responsible for maintaining as city husband. The length of time Gyles was city husband and his appointment during the Civil War accounts for his dominance within the documentary evidence and more limited secondary literature (Withington 1998; Brighton 1978).

In 1669 the Council instituted a monthly survey of every ward to be conducted by the city husband alone, including all of the 'comon works or buildings belonging to the corporation [that] are in decay and which ought

to be repaired' (YALH B38, 57v). This served to further professionalise the role and widen the city husband's remit to encompass all of the city's civic buildings, such as the staiths and bridges and not just the city walls. This had been observed earlier but came to be concretized with Gyles. In specifying only Gyles within the new monthly surveys it clearly elevated him to a newly formed position of authority and autonomy within the corporation, to the perceived detriment or dilution of aldermanic power and involvement. A year later Gyles was to open up a street that had been obstructed by a citizen, but pointedly the House Book notes 'by mr Edmond Gyles or such as he shall imploy' (YALH B38, 58r). The ability to direct work and appoint workmen indicates a freedom that had not been enjoyed by many of his predecessors. Both of Gyles' successors were notably from the building and craft professions of carpentry and joinery (RCHME 1972, 175). The appointment of John Etty in June 1676, 'in roome of mr gyles deceased' (YALH B38, 120r), demonstrates the integral and practical nature of the city husband by this point, with no demonstrable hesitation in affirming the civic office on a new appointee.

Etty's first project in August 1676 was the repair of Bootham Bar's gates, 'soe as to pvent people goeing under the same', followed by repairing the banks without Skeldergate Postern, a bridge and renovating two shops of a tenant (YALH, B38, 121v & 177r). The largest project of Etty related to 'the woodwork' he had made in 1688 'for scoureinge the River of Owse', a longstanding concern of the city, indicating a degree of engineering skill on Etty's part (YALH B38, 254v). Reference to the repair of 20 yards of the city wall at Micklegate was directed by aldermen who were to 'contract and agree with such workemen as they shall thinke fitt', a use of phrasing not dissimilar to that which had been applied to Gyles and his determining who to employ in 1670. On the same day Etty is merely recorded as having been paid 40 s. for taking Thomas Cade as an apprentice for nine years. He was seemingly omitted from the concerns of repairing the city walls whose oversight was now the preserve of the aldermen (YALH B38, 188r). Indeed, in March 1689/90 the wardens of every ward were to inspect all of their

respective sections of city walls and to 'take care about the Stones and order what is to be done about the reparaire of the breaches in the said walls' (YALH B38, 12v). The lack of reference to Etty as the city husband regarding the wall's repair may be symptomatic of his dismissal only three months later in June 1690, and reveals the possible extent to which the remit of the office had dwindled from the time of Edmond Gyles, or rather the perceived incompetence of Etty in that office (YALH B38, 15v).

After a period of 14 years Etty was dismissed as city husband in 1690 and ordered to bring in a schedule of 'all the utensils and Staffings...belonging to the city...that they may be mad use off for the Cities service and also deliver upp the said utensils' (YALH B39, 15v). The reference to 'Staffings' indicates a developed system of workmen as well as the listing of utensils attesting to the professionalization of the office that had established instruments for the office's practical execution. Etty appears to have been in dispute with his successor, John Ballard, and the Council from 1695 to 1696, which implies that his dismissal had been acrimonious. In March 1695/96 the Council sought to affirm that only Ballard was to 'be employed in what doth Apptaine to the City by virtue of the said office and employment' having 'faithfully and diligently executed' the office since replacing Etty (YALH B39, 98v). However, in April 1696 Etty is noted as having independently undertaken work on a section of *enceinte* within Bootham and in the Exchequer Court, without the Council's or the city husband's approval. This is particularly significant considering the lack of evidence for Etty having been involved in the repairs of the defences during his tenure in office. The Council ordered that no chamberlains were to pay him or anybody else for building work without the explicit approval of the city husband Ballard (YALH B39, 99v). This suggests that Etty had instigated the work on Bootham's walls of his own volition, with the implication that either he used personal funds for the work or was able to bypass the Council and city husband and deal directly with the chamberlains for remuneration. With the Council seeking to assert the primacy of Etty's successor to determine building work, it could be evidence that Ballard was unable to garner the support of lesser civic

officials in the conduct of his duties. Seemingly Etty had been able to instigate work on the city walls and the Exchequer Court uninhibited and in collaboration with others, signalling the lingering respect toward the office of city husband or Etty personally, even when not in post. This perceived authority and independence of the office had not been evident within the documentary material prior to the appointment and development of the role of city husband under Gyles. Just as the ineffectiveness of the muremasters had been reformed with the ever-greater concentration of responsibility with individuals and processes of professionalization, by the end of the seventeenth century the Council considered that this needed to be curtailed. From April 1699 the wardens were to survey for repairs but report to the Council first, and 'the Cityes Husband nor any other Workman doe [not] begin any worke att the Citys charge without an order...after such request' (YALH B39, 119r). Considering Etty's previously independent actions taken toward implementing repairs even when not the city husband, the order from April may well have pre-empted his reappointment in December 1699 and limited the independent effectiveness of the office and Etty personally (YALH B39, 121v). Considering Etty's behaviour in April 1696 his reappointment might be seen as puzzling on the part of the Council, yet may also have contributed to the eventual abolition of the office of city husband in February 1710/11; it was not until March 1734 that a new office of City Steward was instituted (RCHME 1972, 175).

Conclusion

The House Books reveal the growing desire and multiple attempts of York's civic authorities to professionalize the officials responsible for the defences and the wider stock of the city's properties throughout the early modern period. The annual, largely civic and ineffectual role of muremaster had been replaced by an intermittent salaried position, with responsibility for the 'common works'. The discontinuing of a purely annual position among the freemen of the city with an eye to civic advancement, led to individuals holding office for longer periods of time that arguably benefitted them in

accruing knowledge and expertise in the exercise of their duties. Edmond Gyles' holding of city husband for thirty-two years is certainly significant, but the antecedents of his eventual prominence and the eminence of individuals can be observed through the abolition of muremasters and the appointment of the professional outsider Christopher Walmesley from 1568 to 1587. The reform of the civic role of the walls as part of the ladder of promotion was also fundamental. Whereas promotion had theoretically been dependent on serving as muremaster or bridgemaster in the sixteenth century, albeit with the ability to pay for exoneration and bypass the office, the administration of the defences had theoretically been one of the central tenets of York's civic governance. Once discontinued, the importance of the maintenance of the defences did not diminish but actually increased, particularly in seeking to engage individuals for prolonged periods of time and in the appointing of building professionals. Therefore, throughout this period a concerted, if often adjustable, method of administration and perceived priority is distinguishable.

Examining the officials responsible for the city walls during this period allows for their formal administration to be noted with named individuals. The evidence of wardens, chamberlains and Council officials substituting that of muremaster and city husband has been alluded to previously within the records. Therefore, the ability to name individuals with specific responsibility for the defences, such as Gyles, should not detract from the multiple examples of civic officials across the strata of the administration being repeatedly involved in their maintenance. The plethora of officials highlights that the structural integrity of the walls and defences was a continual concern and one that was intermingled across multiple official remits and contexts. That the officials and repairs are referred to throughout the early modern period is testament to the involvement of the upper tiers of the corporation. Had separate accounts for the muremasters and city husbands survived, a greater understanding of the ordinary routine of their work and the defences, as well as wider civic building work and those professions employed, would have been possible to comprehend. In lieu of

such records surviving it is still possible to infer that building and maintenance activities were far more numerous than those that are recorded within the documentary material. Consideration of the wider context of the period and the utilisation of the walls across the civic strata needs to be considered further. The thesis will now turn to the system and offices employed at Hull from 1550-1700.

The common officers of Kingston-upon-Hull

In Hull, there is no recorded office of a muremaster or officer whose remit was to deal specifically with the maintenance of the town's *enceinte*. A Murage Tax was initially implemented in 1321 to pay for the construction of the walls and four gateways and again in 1341 and 1348 (Gurnham 2011, 10; Howes & Foreman 1999, 4). However, within the Bench Books there is no documentary evidence of either a Murage Tax or related official before or after 1550, whereas York had maintained the office of muremaster until 1577. Given the similarity of Hull and York's governing structures, by way of incorporation, it is surprising that a similar means of maintaining their defences is not evident and may be indicative of the medieval localised conventions. A 'Toll or gatelaw' is sporadically referred to in the Bench Books from 1661 that involved an appointed individual with a livery uniform to collect a toll 'for all carts and waggons that shall come within the gates' and over the bridges (HCA BRB.4, 436, 491; BRB.5, 255, 260; BRB.6, 324 & 352). In 1693 John Burnsall was allowed to remove manure from beneath the town walls near Beverley Gate and was charged 2 d. a cartload for 'gate Law' (HCA BRB.6, 324). In June 1694, Robert Partridge was appointed to collect the Gate Law and in September authorized to collect the toll at the Low Gate, the postern gateway between Beverley Gate and North Gate, 'from time to time' and provide an annual account of moneys received; upon his death his widow continued in the role and on 21st August 1700 was authorized by the Bench to sue George Beadall 'in the Names of the Mayor and Burgesses' for his refusal to pay 4 d. for each cart load of hay brought into the town (HCA BRB.6, 347, 352, 445 & 446). Again, the retention of a

deceased's official's family member is evident and in this instance widow Partridge was even charged to issue legal proceedings, indicating her proficiency and knowledge within the office of Gate Law collection (Heijden 2012, 145). This form of toll may have had its antecedents with the earlier Murage Tax system. Yet, owing to the intermittent references to it only from 1661 onwards, it cannot be definitively assigned to the maintenance of the *enceinte* or reveal where the funds were directed (HCA BRB.4, 436). Therefore there is not an identifiable toll or traditionally held civic office pertaining specifically toward the maintenance of Hull's defences during the early modern period.

Forster (1969, 126) argues that the office of common officer, first appointed during the Tudor period, had initially been appointed to oversee the town's properties, but by the mid-seventeenth century had been renamed the town husband and had assumed far wider financial responsibilities. The officials whose remit included the city walls' maintenance operated within the far wider context of the citywide stock of properties and buildings, not dissimilar to the role of the city husband within York. A civic legacy of the Murage Tax and medieval systems of administration may have been subsumed into the role of common officer. Creighton and Higham's (2005b, 182) argument that the system of murage had faltered as an effective system of revenue collection in the fourteenth century may account for this, and while York continued to maintain a specific civic office - albeit ineffectual - Hull had clearly not sought to do so. As such, the maintenance of the town walls would not have determined the formally perceived route for civic promotion within the corporation. Yet as this chapter will demonstrate, the lack of a traditional recognised civic office for Hull's defences does not reveal a civic disinterest nor preclude a high degree of civic involvement toward their maintenance.

A record within the Bench Books of January 1560/61 outlines the general form of maintenance for Hull's civic property. The order refers to the decayed state of a jetty or staith near the haven that is described as

'decayed', a 'great hyndrance' and also a threat to the surrounding buildings. In this instance the mayor and aldermen ordered the construction of a new jetty 'att the costs and charge of the [towne] chambre' (HCA BRB.2, 42r), while later an order from June 1565 notes that the common officer, Thomas Foxley, was to repave the bridge of Myton Gate. Both instances indicate that orders for repairs originated from the mayor and aldermen that were then acted upon by other officials (HCA BRB.2, 55v). In this regard the individual common officer was not liable to expend his own funds, as the money for any works was clearly to be drawn from the town's chamber. This system differed from York in which the muremasters were personally liable for the cost of building works and would be reimbursed by their successors. At the instigation of the Bench in July 1565 a chamberlain, merchant and two wrights were to assess all the repairs necessary on the town's stock of property 'and to make [report] thereof to mr maior to the ende order may be given to ye [common] officers for thamendment of them' (HCA BRB.2, 56r). In this instance the chamberlain can be understood to have represented the monetary considerations of the Bench, while the two wrights were designated for their building expertise to assess what work was required. The common officers were removed from monetary considerations and not sought for their building knowledge, thereby acting purely as functionaries in overseeing any subsequent works that were to be ordered once the assessments had been carried out and programme of works agreed upon. However, this does not diminish their significance regarding certain recorded examples of works and repairs that were undertaken. Following an assessment of the fresh water supplied from the nearby Julian Dyke amid concerns over its pollution in September 1578, it was the common officer who was to 'fourwth cawse some woorkemen to erecte and sett...a good and sufficient [dam] of woodde' at the dyke (HCA BRB.2, 198v). This implies that the common officers operated a network of workmen and building crafts that they could call upon and were responsible for, yet only after the authorities had given the command for works to be undertaken.

The collaborative nature of assessing for repairs was demonstrated in July 1576, with the Bench ordering an assessment of all Hull's tenements, lands and corresponding tenants for a report of rental incomes and 'what repairs they stande nede of'. Within the retinue were two chamberlains and three individuals whose roles are not recorded (HCA BRB.2, 147v). It is conceivable that the chamberlains were there to assess the rental incomes and leases, while the other three men would have had building expertise. A definition of the role of the chamberlains from 1674 records that the 'Office duty and impliment is and alwaies hath been to receive the Revenues and Rents...and to make such Disbursements for the Repairs of the said Town and other necessary Disbursements' (HCA BRB.5, 365). It is notable that in this instance the role of common officer was not referred to during this preliminary assessment, with primacy afforded to the office of the chamberlains. In April 1606 an annual assessment of the tenements and repairs was instituted and headed by the mayor, four aldermen, 'fower of the best [commoners] and fower workemen most meet for this purpose' (HCA BRB.2, 367r). Again there is no reference to the common officer, with emphasis placed upon including building professionals with the requisite skills to assess the condition of Hull's properties. The common officers therefore were not integral to the systems of building maintenance, but there is evidence that they would instruct workmen to carry out work following an assessment by higher civic offices and professionals. It was these higher civic offices that had the power to order repairs and expend the town's finances, a system not dissimilar to the limited role and power of the muremasters within York.

One financial aspect of the common officers involved levelling fines against individual offenders. In September 1585 the Bench attempted to prohibit the sale of goods and merchandise, specifically salted fish, between the citizens of Hull and 'anie aliene strainger or straingers' prior to the cargo first being brought into the town. Such a practice was judged to bring about the 'overthrough of fishinge voiages to the impoverishinge of the burgesses and inhabitants of this towne and the utter overthrowe of a greate sorte of

pore men and their wives and children' (HCA BRB.2, 239r-240r). As well as potentially disrupting the local economy and livelihood of Hull's citizens, presumably the town would also have lost revenue from any transactions conducted outside of their jurisdiction. The fine to be incurred was 5 s. for every pound in weight that was part of an unauthorised transaction and the recouping of this by way of distress. 'Distress' meant that the individual offenders property would be sold, rather than simply the paying of a fine. The added chattel, as well as monetary deterrent, reinforces the seriousness of the Bench towards such practices. It also highlights the trust imparted to the common officers to carry out such work, as both enforcers and financial regulators, with the potential means available to subvert the edict and make inappropriate personal financial gains through extortion of the offenders and their goods. In February 1627, owing to the 'townes chamber being not only oute of Stocke but also greatly indebted in dyvers and sondrie somes of mony to severall psons to the vales of sixe hundred powndes and above', a loan of 1,000 li. was agreed to be lent to the town by alderman Thomas Ferries for a bond of 2,000 li. (HCA BRB.3, 181). The record notes that Ferries delivered this money over to the common officer in the presence of the Bench, rather than the chamberlains as might be expected, indicating the possible financial involvement of the office in respect of the corporation's overall finances.

Their financial and oversight function toward Hull's defences is alluded to during repairs that were ordered on the Castle and Blockhouses in November 1633. Within the Bench Book is a long list of repairs to be implemented (HCA BRB.3, 328). However, before work was undertaken an appraisal of the town's account books was ordered to ascertain what monies had previously been expended on the Blockhouses, walls, jetties and banks in order for 'Collecons to be made out of the same' and that 'the Common Officers books are also for this purpose to be [perused]' (HCA BRB.3, 328). It is likely such 'Collecons' were previous revenues raised annually or specifically toward the maintenance of the Henrician defences. This programme of works on the defences highlights that the common officers

managed their own account books and schedule of works, distinct from the Bench's overall accounts that were under the oversight of the chamberlains. In seeking to consult their 'books' the common officers had been responsible for and were involved with the building and maintenance work of the Henrician defences for a prolonged period of time. Six months earlier in May of 1633 repairs for the walls of the Henrician defences were ordered, but in this instance an individual was appointed as overseer of the work and was to receive 'some reasonable allowance for his paines by day or weeke' (HCA BRB.3, 312). No salaried civic official is named, yet given the remit of the common officers and their previous involvement with the site as confirmed by the 'books', it is notable that they were not specifically appointed. An allowance to be paid per day implies that the overseer would be a professional who was working on a daily rate of pay rather than a contract, as well as a figure not already in receipt of any stipend from the Bench in any civic capacity (Swanson 1983a, 4).

In December 1634 the merchant Thomas Foxcroft 'at his request [was] elected and chosen Comon Officer in place of Thomas Wilkinson' and was to pay an unspecified bond and receive 'as is usuall...fees incident to his place' (HCA BRB.3, 359). Therefore, contemporaneous with the work on the Henrician defences and the appointment of a separate overseer, the salaried office of common officer was occupied and available to oversee any building work. Of note also is that Foxcroft had requested the office of common officer, though this may owe more to the formulaic prose of the Bench Books throughout this period that might belie his being appointed without consultation, as was in evidence with the cordwainers of York in the sixteenth century. By 1636 the common officer was engaged with procuring and supplying gunpowder to the Henrician defences, inventorying the gunpowder, ammunition, artillery, armour and provisions, as well as overseeing the indentures of the Blockhouse keepers' who would maintain those provisions (HCA BRB.3, 417-418 & 434). Although the common officer was responsible for procurement and administrative aspects of the defences, by this date he was not responsible for their structural

maintenance. This would account for the Bench's appointment of a merchant as common officer in 1634, Foxcroft, rather than somebody from the building profession, which is compounded by the Bench having sought to appoint a specific overseer in 1633 for the Henrician works. There therefore existed a multitude of potential civic offices and appointees with overlapping functions and remits that varied in respect of maintaining the town's properties and defences. By the 1630s this had demonstrably passed out of the remit of the common officer.

As observed above, the higher levels of the civic government were closely involved with the formal ordering and authorising of repairs and regularly assessed the stock of civic property with building professionals. An entry from October 1629 suggests that during the 1620's a new form of administration had been enacted with the appointment of two individuals to 'oversee the Townes works and repaires' (HCA BRB.3, 201). In this instance aldermen had been directly assigned primacy in the role of surveying and implementing repairs within the town. Significantly they also had the authorization to disburse payments up to the value of 40 s., with any sum above only then requiring the sanctioning of the chamberlains. The 1629 entry notes that the mayor Robert Morton had instituted this, which according to the list of the town's mayor's can be dated to the mayoral year of 1627/28 (HHC anon, 2010). Of the two men appointed, Thomas Raikes is known to have been an alderman as he is referred to as such in January 1632/33 during construction of the new Council House (HCA BRB.3, 304). As well as the Council House work during the 1630's, Raikes was also involved in overseeing the work on the staith by Hesse Gate (HCA BRB.3 303 & 378) and along with another alderman and two chamberlains was in 1637: 'intreated to survey all the wants of repaires of this Towne and to make knowne to this boarde what shall be nedefull, once every fortnight under their hands in wrytinge or under the hands of any three or two of them, Of wch one of the Aldermen to be one' (HCA BRB.3, 450). Considering the financial autonomy to instigate repairs from the town's funds by the appointed aldermen there must have been far more instances of repairs

than are recorded within the Bench Books. Similar accounts to those that the common officers are known to have kept may have also existed for the aldermen overseeing building work. This demonstrates a clear distinction between the fiscal powers of the aldermen and the common officer, for which there is no documentary evidence of the latter wielding any such authority to expend civic sums without first having the approval of either the Bench or the chamberlains.

With the appointment of aldermen to head the town's repairs and maintenance, while concomitantly maintaining the office of common officer, the ability to assess and instigate building works was therefore vested with the upper tiers of the Bench through the offices of aldermen and chamberlain. Robert Morton, the mayor who had instituted the aldermanic assessment for repairs, is recorded as assessing the defects of the South Blockhouse in March 1635/36 (HCA BRB.3, 367). This post-dates his mayoral term by several years and highlights his continued interest or civic involvement toward them, leading to the inference that as mayor Morton had consciously sought to reform, or even formalize, the configuration and processes of implementing works within the aldermanic remit. Evidence for his direct involvement with the maintenance of the Henrician defences, after having already served as mayor and after he had resumed his role as alderman, indicates that civic advancement had not been predicated on maintenance of the defences. An active and prolonged interest of individuals from the upper tiers of the civic government reveals a permanent concern toward Hull's defences.

Thomas Raikes served as mayor in 1633 and it was he who also served, contrary to convention, consecutively for two terms as mayor before and after the second siege of Hull from 1642 to 1643/44 (HHC anon, 2010; Cooke 2011, 21-22). Raikes was clearly at the heart of the civic government and intimately involved with the maintenance of Hull's civic buildings. Beyond his role as an alderman, the suitability of him to oversee such works is unclear. However, in August 1586 a Richard Raikes is recorded as being

granted the stones of a house he had demolished that adjoined the *enceinte*, on condition he would then repair the wall (HCA BRB.2, 243v). The allotment of building material to this Raikes in the late sixteenth century and his subsequent repair of the *enceinte* indicates that he belonged to a building profession with the relative practical expertise; a skill that his descendant in the first half of the seventeenth century may also have possessed. Towards the end of this thesis's period another Raikes, Robert, held the position of town husband from 1694 (HCA BRB.6, 359). It is only conjecture that these three individuals were of the same family, but if they were it demonstrates the longevity and association of one family within the corporation regarding building maintenance, from at least 1586. Considering the primacy afforded to higher levels of civic office towards finances, assessments and the implementation of repairs, the role of common officer can be understood as a general appendage of the town's administration and one that did not have a clearly defined remit of authority or responsibility. This differed from the appointment of city husband's in York when the walls, as well as wider civic property, were often specifically listed as being within the remit of that office.

The only record of a specific individual with direct responsibility for the maintenance of the town's defensive walls occurs in September 1610. Thomas Almond, a bricklayer, received 5 li. in September from the Bench for repairs undertaken along the *enceinte* from Hesse Gate to North Gate, which also included work on the gates (HCA BRB.3, 11). Following this he was appointed directly by the Bench to repair 'yerely hereafter...all the walls and gats' for an annual salary of 20 s., though with the stipulation that he was to provide both the bricks and mortar. His association with the walls is not found within the Bench Books thereafter, but he may have continued on the town's payroll. Interestingly a George Almond is noted as being an alderman in 1605 when he acted as a guarantor for the conduct of the newly appointed keeper of the Town's Gates (HCA BRB.2, 366v). This may again be demonstrative of the close links between families and civic governance with the potential for preferment or nepotism. Why the Bench should have

appointed a single professional builder in 1610 but chosen not to continue this subsequently is not known. It may be that such appointments were continued and recorded outside of the Bench Books. This single appointment also reiterates the fact that there was no recognised civic office that dealt specifically with the maintenance of the town walls.

Of particular note is the appointment of a bricklayer and not a mason in 1610. This provides a stark contrast between Hull and York regarding the material makeup of their defences with brick used in Hull and stone in York. The geographical location of Hull precluded the availability of quality building stone, thus accounting for the prevalent use of brick, although non-civic use of brick within the town itself was limited before 1600 (Woodward 1995, 19). Following repairs on a section of wall near Lendal Tower in York during 1602, reference is made to the mason Christopher Beane transporting capping stones from his quarry in Tadcaster to finish the repair of them for 4 li. (YALH B32, 217v & 224v). This implies that other workmen had repaired the walls but that the task of dressing the walls with limestone had been reserved for the skills of the professional mason Beane, whereas in Hull reference is only ever made to bricklayers, such as Almond. While architectural details found within York's *enceinte* required the skills of a mason, which for Swanson (1980b, 217-218) has given undue historical emphasis to masonry crafts, no such architectural and material references are accorded to Hull's *enceinte* and the bricklayers who worked on them. This may further account for the dearth of research pertaining to Hull's medieval and brick urban defences, in contrast to the surviving masonry at York.

When compared with York, a distinguishing feature of Hull's early modern records is the number of direct contracts that were made between the Bench and individual craftsmen, such as Thomas Almond, which often led to lasting associations over several years or decades. Under the oversight of alderman Thomas Raikes and others, the bricklayer John Catlin was engaged as the builder of the new Council House from June 1633 (HCA BRB.3, 313-

314). The new Council House was paid for from the legacy of alderman Thomas Ferries in March 1631/32, the same man who had lent the Bench 1,000 li. in 1627. His loan and subsequent bequest had seemingly ameliorated the town's finances to the extent that they felt able to embark on a new programme of civic building work (HCA BRB.3, 279). The expertise of Catlin is demonstrable in the detailed provisos of his appointment that included preparing the ground for piling the foundations, supplying the materials 'appteyning to the bricklayer', build a chimney, the floors and roof, as well as finish the windows and stone work 'wth cut and hewen stone in the best manner of that sort of workemanshipp'; the town itself was to provide all of the wooden materials, 'wrightworkemanshipp, Iron...Plummer and Glasier worke' (HCA BRB.3, 304, 314). His fee for this was 120 li. paid in 20 li. instalments according to the progression of the work, such as when the walls were 5 feet above the first floor and when the roof could be constructed. In January 1632/33 workmen were to be consulted regarding materials and most likely the design of the new Council House (HCA BRB.3, 304), the dimensions of which are clearly detailed by June 1633 along with the first recorded appointment of Catlin (HCA BRB.3, 313). This suggests that as the acknowledged builder, Catlin himself had provided architectural and structural guidance for the scheme.

A provisional completion date for the work to be completed by 24th August 1634 was overly ambitious and Thomas Raikes was still disbursing 100 li. for the work in March 1635. On 20th October 1636 an order was made that it was to be 'forth wth finished And that workmen shall be presently sett on worke about it' (HCA BRB.3, 367 & 374). Work and alterations on the new Council House in fact continued throughout the seventeenth century, with Christopher Harrison in the 1670's being paid 10 li. 10 s. for painting the stairs, gilding the town's coat of arms above the doorway, washing the walls, windows, roof and subsequently painting the ceiling for a further 50 s. (HCA BRB.5, 335 & 355). As part of this later programme of works the son of John Catlin, William, was also engaged in building work for the town.

In March 1643/44 John Catlin had taken a lease of 31 years for part of the Trippett Ground, land situated north of the North Bridge and earthen defences on the western bank of the River Hull (HCA BRB.3, 660), for the annual rent of 5 li. Within the lease was the stipulation not to erect a lime or brick kiln without the consent of the mayor and aldermen and that if they were built and found to be a nuisance they would be torn down (HCA BRB.3, 661). This lease came only seven months after the second siege of Hull in September 1643, when the banks of the River Hull were cut and had flooded the land around the town, including the Trippett Ground (Cooke 2011, 21-22). Considering that the Trippett was within the firing line of the earthen defences, the area had been flooded twice within the previous fourteen months and the decisive victory for the Parliamentary forces in Yorkshire at Marston Moor would not occur until July 1644 (Cooke 2011, 21 & 62), Catlin's lease of 31 years was certainly a potential financial risk. That he and the Bench undertook it indicates that the land immediately outside of the town's walls was actively encouraged to be leased for commercial activities, as shown by the reference to the lime and brick kilns and Catlin's known profession as a builder. In November 1658 John Catlin's two sons, William and John, renewed the lease of the Trippett 'formerly promised and granted to their father'; the same rent and the conditions relating to kilns were included as before, with the added proviso that they were not to build any more houses on the site nor to lease any to persons liable to 'be chargeable to the Towne' (HCA BRB.4, 269 & 271). Near the expiration of the 1658 31-year lease, William Catlin concluded negotiations with the Bench from March to April 1688, in order to purchase the Trippett Ground and houses for the large sum of 90 li., with an annual rent of 20 s. (HCA BRB.6, 204-206). The agreement states that the Trippett Ground formed 4 li. of the annual Fee Farm paid to the crown. Therefore the Bench was relinquishing a well-established and profitable plot of land, originally derived from the crown, for an immediate lump sum of 90 li.

The added significance of this purchase by William Catlin is the reduction of the purchase price by 30 li., in what should otherwise have cost him 120 li.,

‘for his paines taken in and about the Townes Worke upon the Garrison side for three yeares past’ and overseeing the ‘brest and Jeatie works’ (HCA BRB.6, 205-206). As well as revealing some of the costs incurred by the town over a three-year period toward the eastern defences, which by 1688 were not under Hull’s jurisdiction, it also reveals the preferment of building works, even national defensive works, to a local builder whose family had a well-established legacy of civic building. William Catlin was engaged during 1671/2 to replace the ‘not at all gracefull’ stairs at the new Council House, being ‘desired to assist and have the Oversight of the same worke’ which for his ‘advice and paines’ he was paid 25 li. 9 s. 7 d. (HCA BRB.5, 245 & 276). In August 1673 Catlin was employed to build a new chapel at the Charter House and a circular bench for the mayor and aldermen in the Guildhall and for both projects a ‘Modell’ had been presented and agreed upon, indicating the production of a three-dimensional architect’s model and his status as a proto-architect (HCA BRB.5, 334 & 355). Regarding the new chapel the Bench Book records that for the work a ‘Draught for the Articles [were] to be signed between the Maior and Burgesses and the said mr Catlin’ (HCA BRB.5, 334). This signifies that Catlin was not an official but an independent professional, one who was contracted to work for the Bench. Following the Bench’s decision in July 1679 that the Guildhall’s frontage was to be ‘beautified And the kings stature or picture’ was to be ‘sett up over the Hall dore’, as well as wanting to replace the main door, Catlin was again shown preferment (HCA BRB.5, 622). Having worked on the breastworks for the Henrician defences from 1685, later named the Citadel, he must also have had some engineering expertise. This is further highlighted by his consultation regarding the ‘cleansing and reparacons of the Haven’ in 1681 that may refer to issues over water supplies or possibly dredging (HCA BRB.5, 744).

Records within the Bench Books also reveal that his employment was not limited to the Bench. The military governor of the garrison in July 1679, James Duke of Monmouth, through his representatives within the town paid William Catlin 5 li. for his ‘paines and extraordinary worke’ in constructing a

'new Court of Guard for the Garrison', meaning a guard house; by the November Catlin was required to modify the chimney 'soe that the Smoak maybe clearly carried away without [prejudicing] the Souldiers' on guard duty (HCA BRB.5, 623 & 643). One of the last references to William Catlin's work refers to overseeing the repairs of a house for which he was paid three guineas in May 1696 (HCA BRB.6, 392). At no point during these instances, of either John Catlin or his son William, were they accorded any civic title, such as common officer. Rather they were employed directly for their expertise and building proficiency that saw them work across multiple and varied forms of projects. These projects included the new Council House, a chapel, civic furnishings, architectural adornment, domestic dwellings, a guardhouse for soldiers and the large engineering works of the eastern defences, amongst others. Yet, William Catlin's involvement with the civic government of Hull was not confined to the remit of building work. January 1685/86, July and September 1686 and January 1689/90, were four occasions when elections were held for a new alderman in which William was a candidate, but on all four occasions he was never able to achieve the 'majority of voices' or votes (BRB.6, 156, 167, 168 & 252). In July 1686 he is referred to as having formerly executed the office of sheriff, but does not appear to have progressed any further up the civic ladder (HCA BRB.6, 167). Had he been elected an alderman it is likely that he would have had the opportunity to serve as mayor, owing to the annually rotating nature of the highest civic office amongst the aldermen. The reasons as to why he was never elected an alderman are unknown, but evidently over the preceding decades his familiarity with officials and the Bench had significantly developed to such a degree as to warrant his nomination for election as an aldermen on several occasions.

A possible indication for this lack of civic advancement occurs in May 1664. The Bench Book records that a letter was to be written to Colonel Gilby noting Lord Bellasis' 'reference of the differences betweene the Towne and Capt Gower and to acquaint the Coll with Capt Gowers actings against the Townes eleccon of mr Catlin as [Master] of the Grammer schoole' (HCA

BRB.4, 582). Lord John Bellasis was appointed governor of the garrison in the 1660's following the Restoration, having earlier been a Royalist commander during the Civil War (Reckitt 1988, 111); R Gurnham and Forster argue that it was under Bellasis that a programme of repairs were initiated that would ultimately culminate in the construction of the Citadel from the 1680's (2011, 80; 1969, 112). Evidence for this within the Bench Books themselves is limited, but this may be representative of the jurisdictional distinction drawn between the civic government and military authorities, the latter of which was not actively reflected within the civic records. Colonel Anthony Gilby was the deputy of Bellasis and involved to a degree with the defences. For example, following a letter from Bellasis in July 1667 the Bench had lent Gilby 30 li. towards repairs of the eastern defences and in August 1665 he is described as the deputy governor (HCA BRB.5, 97 & 34). As Bellasis' deputy it is logical that he was written to about a dispute of a captain of the garrison under his jurisdiction in 1664. The 'actings' of Captain Gower against the Mr Catlin are not detailed, nor is any subsequent action taken by either the civic or military authorities. It can be assumed that the Catlin in question was not William, but rather one of his relatives. Later in 1675 a citizen, John Perkins, is described as being 'afraid for his life, or some bodily harm to be done to him by [Colonel] Gilby' and was seeking the protection of the Bench; the Bench replied that they would not wish to arrest someone 'under his [Gilby's] Qualificacons' and would seek to resolve the unspecified differences between Gilby and Perkins (HCA BRB.5, 437). This indicates a degree of jurisdictional tension between the authority of the Bench and garrison, in which the former sought to protect the rights of its citizens and their authority to appoint people to civic positions, such as in 1664. In the General Election of 1679 the Bench had chosen not to re-adopt Colonel Gilby as its MP, contrary to the Duke of Monmouth's wishes (Gurnham 2011, 82), highlighting that there was prolonged localised animosity between elements of the Bench and garrison. It is possible that resistance to a member of the Catlin family being appointed master of the grammar school in 1664 came to have some bearing on the decision to, or rather not, appoint members of the Catlin

family to formal civic office. No reference to a Catlin in the position of master of the grammar school is made after May 1664, indicating that his appointment had been rescinded.

In spite of this, the Bench Books reveal that a prolonged professional role, almost civic, is known to have existed between the Bench and the Catlin family. The number of recorded instances of their being engaged on important civic projects by the Bench, as well as one instance with the state, testifies to this. Indeed, in June 1693 a payment of 5 guineas was made to Catlin from the mayor in respect of his having 'severall times attended the Townes business and given his advice about the repairs of the Jetty works' (HCA BRB.6, 320). The Catlin's were no doubt successful commercially, something evidenced by the family's leasing and purchase of the Trippett Ground, combined with the substantial fees recorded for the work they undertook. The emphasis of one surname within the documentary evidence is likely to belie the network of other professionals operating below the level of the Catlins that would also have been involved in such projects. Yet, the evidence for the Catlin's is significant in revealing the Bench's sustained preferment at an aldermanic and mayoral level for individual contractors and professionals outside of the corporation, as well as the breadth of expertise of builders within the town during the early modern period. It is clear that the Bench's involvement with building projects and the maintenance of the town's property and defences was considerable throughout the period 1550-1700, to the perceived archival detriment of lesser civic officials, such as the common officer. However, this would come to be undermined or at least diminished from 1641 onwards with the appointment of Matthew Hardy.

Matthew Hardy and the institution of the town husband

In August 1639 the housewright Matthew Rowton was engaged by the Bench to repair the staith at the South End, described as 'ruinous and in decay', for a fee of 25 li. with an added proviso that if that were 'too little for

his paines after he hath done the same The board [would] relieve him further' (HCA BRB.3, 507). The reference also notes that he and his servants were to help load and unload the timber for the work from boats that the town was supplying, indicating a convention that Hull would at times provide the raw materials for the craftsmen and workers. In June 1642, less than a month before the first siege of Hull, the town again engaged Rowton. On this occasion it was for work identified by an aldermanic report on the decays of the staith at the South Blockhouse and, as in 1639, the Bench was to provide all the necessary building materials and his fee was 25 li. (HCA BRB.3, 561). It is likely that the siege had interrupted the work on the staith as in January 1642/43 aldermen were appointed to 'view the Lockerworke lately done at ye jetty and other places nigh the South blockhowse' and report whether 'Rowtons worke be done according to the agreemt'; the same aldermen were also to inspect the town walls near North Gate for repairs (HCA BRB.3, 579). Contemporaneously with Rowton's employment is the first reference to Matthew Hardy as the town's officer in 1641 (HCA BRB.3, 550). The title of town officer would appear to be a deviation on the title of common officer, for Hardy is later referred to as 'ye Comon officer' in 1646 (HCA BRB.3, 729) and thereafter simply by name or as the town's officer. However, this is altered from April 1664 when Hardy is first referred as the Town's Husband (HCA BRB.4, 578), with the new title representing a reform of Hull's means systems of maintaining their property, the defences and the town at large. Within the Bench Books the title of common officer, town's officer and town's husband are often interchangeable. For example, in March 1674/75 Hardy is noted as the 'Town's Comon Officer', yet in February 1675/76 is once more referred to as the 'Town's husband' (HCA BRB.5, 415 & 456) The antecedence of this reform for a new civic office can be gleaned from the collaborative work of a professional house wright and civic official during the 1640's and 1650's, Matthew Rowton and Matthew Hardy.

The first reference to Matthew Hardy as the town officer comes from November 1641 and his leasing the 'Winter eatage' of the Garrison Ground

for an annual rent of 20 s. (HCA BRB., 550). Yet, this is only the sixth item following a list of repairs that were ordered by the Bench including: constructing railings to 'prevent the passage of horses upon' the town walls; the removal of material from under the North Bridge and underpinning it; repair of stone work for another bridge and Hesse Gate; repairs to the South Blockhouse jetty; and finally repairs to the 'New works' at the Southend postern that refers to the earthwork defences. As Hardy's lease of the Garrison Ground is listed immediately after these repairs and he is noted as the town's officer, he was likely to be involved with these largely defensive projects. Why Hardy would lease ground in a personal capacity when preparations were being made for a potential siege is unclear, though the inclusion of this after the listed defensive repairs may indicate it was to do with his official capacity. For example, in November 1613 the Garrison Ground was to 'be kept in the townes hands' for that year and in April 1624 it was exclusively let to Hull's aldermen 'for their horse pasture' (HCA BRB.3, 35 & 123). At the same time Rowton was working on the South Blockhouse staith in June 1642, less than a month before the first siege of July, Hardy is recorded as possessing 7 li. 16 s. 6 d. that was intended to purchase materials for the construction of sentry houses for soldiers; no deal was in fact made as the town had a supply of ready materials but clearly Hardy was involved with the defensive preparations of Hull and had oversight of not insignificant funds (HCA BRB.3, 559).

By March 1643/44 Hardy and Rowton were ordered to fell and retrieve 'timber as shall be needful for the repairing of the Northblockhouse and other publiq servies' from 'my Lord of Dunbarrs grounds about Burton howse' under a warrant from the 'Lord Generalls' (HCA BRB.3, 613). Burton House is today known as Burton Constable Hall and is located roughly 9 miles northeast of Hull. The recorded works of both Hardy and Rowton up to this point all indicate that they were involved with defensive preparations before the first siege in July 1642, as well as repairs prior to and following the second siege in September 1643. The date of Hardy's appointment is not known nor is his profession, but it can be assumed that it was around 1641

and that he possessed some administrative or monetary qualifications, this being commensurate with previously appointed common officers, such as the merchant Thomas Foxcroft in 1634. On the 25th October 1644 Hardy and Rowton, along with a chamberlain and three individuals who were most likely aldermen, were ordered to assess the banks around the South Blockhouse that were considered likely to collapse (HCA BRB.3, 646). This follows the previously known system of multiple officials being involved with repairs and the expending of money, combining the common officer, chamberlain, aldermen and the engagement of professional builders or craftsmen.

Two years later in October 1646 Hardy and Rowton formed part of a larger civic group of citizens including three aldermen and John Catlin (builder of the 1630's Council House). They were charged to 'take an exact survey' of 'all those ruines and defects' and produce an estimate of costs for repairing the 'Castle blockhouses walls gaites bridges Jettyes locker works...occasioned' by the Civil War, so that a petition could be presented to Parliament for an allocation of state funds (HCA BRB.3, 740). This is evidence of the continued organisational and collaborative aspect of the town officer's role, apparent during earlier decades, whereby the office did not have any primacy towards instituting works and deferred to higher civic offices. By December 1646 the town had agreed with the Treasurer of the Committee of Sequestrations, Henry Winchester, that they would be loaned 60 li. toward the 'great breach in the Townes walls...betwixt Beverley gaites and Myton gaites' that was to be 'made upp and fortified wth pallizadoes' (HCA BRB.3, 748). However, the Committee for Sequestrations had stipulated that the money was to be repaid if it would 'not be allowed in their accompts by the Comon Wealth'. In the margin of the Bench Books it is noted that alderman Dobson had repaid the Committee, indicating that the state had disallowed the 60 li. previously allocated.

Considering the scale of the repairs listed to be surveyed in October and that 60 li. was required for a single breach in the walls, the cost implications of

defensive repairs can be elucidated. It was Hardy who was charged to receive the 60 li. from the Treasurer, perhaps having partaken in the negotiations for the money and continuing the association of the common officer with finances, as well as 'to see the same disposed and disbursed in the said worke' (HCA BRB.3, 748). In keeping with previous conventions, alderman Dobson and alderman Blaids were appointed as overseers. Therefore, during Hardy's tenure as town officer in the 1640's, the system for instituting repairs appears to have correlated with the earlier conventions, which included a multitude of officials and named professionals. Unsurprisingly, the majority of works undertaken at this time relate to the defences of the town. There is, however, a primacy afforded to Matthew Hardy in his civic role that was not evident with earlier common officers, intimating his central involvement with the finance and organisation of the defensive repairs that eclipsed the involvement of previous office holders. The last order referring to both Matthew Hardy and Matthew Rowton occurs in November 1650, when they were 'to sett workemen to make up the breach at the Southend' (HCA BRB.4, 11). The order does not refer to Hardy by his title and presents them both as directing the work informed perhaps by the longevity of Rowton's engagement with the town and the presumed effectiveness of his work. Yet, from February 1650/51 Hardy alone is charged with repairing the banks of the Garrison Ground and the staith of the South Blockhouse, even though Rowton had previously undertaken work on the area in an individual capacity in June 1642 and in collaboration with Hardy in October 1644 (HCA BRB.4, 16 & 55; BRB.3, 561 & 646). Rowton may have died by 1650/51, thereby accounting for his absence thereafter from the archival record. Considering that he had worked so closely with the Bench over the preceding decade and collaboratively with Hardy and others, Rowton was never in fact afforded any formal civic office. His absence and the pre-eminence of Hardy from 1650/51 implies that with Rowton's death, the significance of Hardy's civic role was elevated. After nearly a decade of working closely with professionals like Matthew Rowton and the experienced John Catlin, combined with his intimate knowledge of the

defensive programmes that were undertaken during the 1640's, Hardy was well placed to professionalise the remit and effectiveness of the common officer.

Matthew Hardy held the office of common officer, town officer and ultimately town husband from at least November 1641, until his death around 29th September 1680. Noting his death the record notes that he 'entred upon his office of Towns Husband vizt. from [BLANK] until Michmas 1680', with the blank reference possibly being demonstrative of the longevity of his tenure, which after 39 years was not remembered (HCA BRB.5, 702). A later entry notes his tenure 'commencing in the year 1641 and ending at the year 1680' (HCA BRB.5, 730). This surpassed the length of Edmond Gyles' tenure as city husband at York, though both figures came to dominate the repair and maintenance works of their respective town and city from the 1640's until their deaths. Brighton and Withington both posit that Gyles had Parliamentary sympathies that may have accounted for his appointment as city husband, combined with his professional skills as a glazer (1972, 75-77 & 175; 1998, 138). His appointment came after the victory of the Parliamentarians over the Royalists at York in 1644, supporting the view that he had Parliamentary sympathies. In contrast, Hardy was in his post prior to the unedifying refusal of entry to Charles I at Beverley Gate in April 1642, the first siege of Hull in July of the same year, the formal declaration of the Civil War on 22nd August 1642 and the second siege in September 1643 (Cooke 2011, 11, 13-14 & 21; Reckitt 1988, 32). Considering that Parliamentary forces had prevailed during both of Hull's sieges, Hardy's civic position or sympathies were not open to being questioned by the emergence of new and vying authorities, as had occurred at York that changed from Royalist to Parliamentary control. As observed above, Hardy was involved throughout the 1640's with defensive preparations and repairs, as well as dealing with the Committee of Sequestrations, acquiring building materials with warrants from the military forces, thereby working with both local and non-local authorities. The dominance of Hardy and Gyles cannot be disconnected from their rise

during the context of the Civil War defences and subsequent lengthy periods of office. The necessary repairs of the defences at that time made them essential, even indispensable, from the perspective of their respective civic authorities and influenced the future practices of maintaining civic property and urban defences under the auspices of individuals with proven skills and experience. At York this trend toward individuals retaining formal office for the maintenance of civic property was already apparent, but was unaccustomed at Hull before the Civil War.

Within Hull the term 'Husband' was applied in February 1662/63 to alderman Ripley and alderman Dobson, possibly the same Dobson who had paid 60 li. to the Committee for Sequestrations and acted as overseer for the breach in the walls in 1646, when they were appointed to receive the accounts of the town's supplies of gunpowder and 'to be husbands of the same' (HCA BRB.4, 499). Two definitions of 'Husband' taken from the Oxford English Dictionary are 'to administer as a good householder or steward' and 'to cultivate' (<http://www.oed.com/>). In being applied to the specific administration of Hull's gunpowder, the term could therefore be task specific. The title of common officer included multiple tasks and remits that were determined by the requirements of the Bench, primarily the mayor and aldermen, as and when required. The title of town husband therefore implies a generally broader remit that encompassed a permanent role and administration for the town as a whole. This is certainly reflected in the prevalence and dominance of Matthew Hardy throughout his tenure as Hull's town husband and the extensively varied duties and projects that he undertook in that civic capacity.

During the 1650's, Hardy continued to work on the banks and jetties of the Blockhouses and Garrison Ground, as well as: removing the earth thrown up against the town wall to 'ease...the weight lying upon it'; removing wooden stakes projecting out from the Haven; inventorying with a chamberlain the arms and munitions of the town; and dealing with the finances for the assessments towards paying the garrison that amounted to 340 li. (HCA

BRB.4, 55, 244, 56, 245, 61, 124, 61 & 124). These projects were clearly orientated toward maintaining the defences of the town. Yet, in March 1653/54 Hardy was part of a group of several aldermen, a chamberlain, a carpenter or housewright and a bricklayer, all of whom were charged to assess the condition of 'all the houses and Tenemts belonging to the Maior and Burgesses' and produce a report of the defects (HCA BRB.4, 125). Contemporaneous with the defensive repairs, Hardy was also undertaking far more mundane and domestic projects. This included repairing the roof of two leased shops, repairing and paving a bridge, constructing a double door at the Scalelane staith, erecting and mending fences between neighbouring plots of land, constructing a staircase for access to stores of linen and raising the floor 'of mr Geeds Measondiew' with sand and brick paving as it did 'lyeth under water' (HCA BRB.4, 283, 370, 405, 421, 576 & 484). A far larger civic concern pertaining to the supply of water occurred in April 1664. The sluices of a water supply had been 'stopped...whereby the water [was] much putrified to the great dainger of infecting [diverse] of the inhabitants...at the Northend and other ptes' (HCA BRB.4, 578). Hardy was to oversee the opening of the sluices until otherwise ordered not to do so. This again reiterates the significance of water supplies as well as evidence that civic authorities at this time were well aware of the dangers posed by polluted water supplies (Rawcliffe 2013, 353). Charging Hardy with such a task that potentially affected the health of Hull's citizens, exemplifies his perceived standing and skills in the eyes of Hull's corporation.

Therefore, while working on the defences, repairing the town's stock of civic property and tenements, he was also engaged with securing fresh water supplies, representing a varied body of projects throughout Hull. The dual nature of his remit toward civic and defensive repairs is highlighted with the one order of October 1662: 'It is ordered that mr mathew hardy doe forthwith see that all the draw Bridges without this Towne be forthwith putt into good repayre and also to repayre and make up the [partition] in mr harrisons measondiew' (HCA BRB.4, 464). In February 1664/65, when another assessment of the town's properties was made, the number of

persons appointed was much reduced from eleven down to six, of which three were Hardy, 'one Wright and one tyler' (BRB.5, 16). The first reference to Hardy as the Town's Husband occurred only ten months previously in April 1664 (HCA BRB.4, 578), meaning that by this stage his official autonomy to carry out assessments and the implementation of repairs had been formally established. In deferring to Hardy and the professionals he engaged with, this would account for the reduced presence of higher civic officials being recorded as carrying out assessments.

Forster's (1969, 126) contention that the role of common officer simply came to be retitled during the seventeenth century does not take into account the fact that a common officer was retained and that the office of town husband constituted an entirely new creation. In August 1668 the Bench sought to prohibit boatmen unloading 'loads of Ballast' upon the Garrison Ground, considering that they 'doe trespasse the Maior and burgesses of this Towne, whose right of Inheritance the soyle of the said Garrison side is' (HCA BRB.5, 138). They also iterate that as they maintained the banks and jetties of the site, but not by this time the Castle and Blockhouses, that they 'ought to receive the whole benefitt' of the land. To counter this trespass the town's officer, Ralph Persivall, was to levy against those offending 1 d. for every ton of waste. Therefore, in tandem with Matthew Hardy's elevation to the new office of town husband in 1664, the common officer had been retained with a new individual appointed, and was not simply amalgamated into a single office. Throughout the entirety of *A history of the county of York I: the city of Kingston upon Hull* (1969), Forster is the only contributor to reference the common officer and town husband by name, even then only cursorily, whilst the specific section of 'Fortifications' omits them entirely. Similarly, more recent work by Howes and Foreman (1999) also fails to cite the significance of these offices within their work on the development of the Citadel in the second-half of the seventeenth century. Given that the archival material allows for an understanding of the developing role of the common officer that lead to the creation and appointment of a town husband during the early modern

period, it is surprising that until now the significance of these offices has not been further researched.

The greater significance of the town husband over the common officer is further highlighted through the collection of the Gate Law in June 1671. The mayor reported to the Bench that Persivall had been unable to collect the Gate Law 'for waines and Carts' entering the town, owing to him being 'very much hindred from his attendance upon other the Towns busiennesse which mr hardy assigns him to', necessitating the appointment of somebody else to collect the toll (HCA BRB.5, 255). The mayor had ordered the augmentation of Persivall's income of 4 s. by a further 6 d. a week, 'in lieu of the Proffitt' he would have received from collecting the tax, which was drawn from a form of expenditure reserved to the mayor and known as the 'weekly Comand' (HCA BRB.5, 255). The Weekly Command appears to have been administered by Matthew Hardy at times for he was to 'take notice hereof for the increased salary; the augmentation of Persivall's salary ultimately came to be rejected by the Bench on the 13th July 1671. Persivall was initially appointed 'to the office and place of hall keeper and Comon officer' in 1665, 'to Assist and attend on mr Mathew Hardy the Townes Husband' having replaced the deceased Robert Puckering (HCA BRB.5, 55). Puckering had assumed the office of 'hall keeper' in October 1662, following his predecessor relinquishing the office owing to 'age and weaknesse', promising to 'attend mr hardy from tyme to tyme take his direcons and order for looking after the Townes worke folks' (HCA BRB.4455, 464, 500 & 510). As part of his appointment he was also expressly awarded the collection of the Gate Law and to provide an annual account. The reference to the 'Townes worke folks' clearly indicates a system of salaried craftsmen under Hardy and that the common officer or hall keeper was directly under the authority of the town husband. In February 1677/78 the carpenter Richard Shephard was granted the freedom of the corporation for 40 s., which would be payable by his being employed 'upon the Towns worke' for 4 s. a week upon a bond 'to be kept in mr hardys hand until the whole money be paid And mr hardy forthwith to sett him on worke' (HCA BRB.5,

556). Therefore, as town husband Hardy was in a position of authority and able to direct the common officer, have direct oversight over craftsmen, such as Shephard, while these records also demonstrate that he was able to operate a form of financing on behalf of the mayor. On one occasion the Bench even paid for the release of Robert Eggleston from the custody of the sheriff for Hardy to employ him on 'Labourer's work' until he had cleared his debts (HCA BRB.5, 417). With such responsibility over officials, employees, convicts and close engagement with the mayor, this indicates a high level of trust having been imparted upon Hardy and the new office of town husband, well beyond the remit of the previous common officer.

The regard felt toward Hardy by Hull's civic authorities can be gleaned from the additional 10 li. they awarded him for his 'extraordinary paines taken...for the towne this last yere', compounded by his having fallen from his horse 'in their service of which he lay above a ffortnight' (HCA BRB.5, 160). Only four months later in April 1669, 'upon the petition of mr mathew hardy the Townes husband', 4 li. was added to his unspecified annual salary that was to be 'continued...at the pleasure of this Board' (HCA BRB.5, 172). Concern for his health, rewards for services rendered and an increase in Hardy's salary, all indicate that he was considered proficient in his duties and held in high regard. Indeed his opinion would appear to have brought about a dispute between the Bench and the 'Company of Carpenters or housewrights' in April 1669. The warden of the company had presented to the Bench five individuals 'for the Townes worke', but they were described as 'old weake and unfit psons', presumably upon the opinion of Hardy, resulting in the Company refusing to assign any other carpenters for the work (HCA BRB.5, 173). Hardy was thereafter empowered by the Bench to employ 'workemen forth of the Country' who would be 'priviledged to worke on the Townes worke' at the expense of Hull's local Company of Carpenters. As well as revealing the weight of Hardy's opinion and the deferral to his judgement by the Bench, it also alludes to the process of engaging professionals on building projects and whom Hardy would have overseen. The inference is that a form of local tendering existed whereby the

Company would assign members for certain jobs. In this instance they were refused on the advice and discretion of the town husband, thereby losing out on employment from the town. In seeking out workers from the 'Country', meaning non-locals, concerns over 'aliene stranger or straingers' as was referenced earlier regarding the sale of goods in September 1585 (HCA BRB.2, 239v), would no doubt have become manifest and soured relations between a local trade and the Bench. Seemingly the opinion of Hardy as the town husband was preferred above those of the warden of the Company of Carpenters.

A further dispute arose between the Bench and the chamberlains over the period from March 1673/74 through to at least March 1677/78 and came to involve Matthew Hardy the younger. A report of the mayor on 23rd March 1673/74 details that the chamberlain Tristram Sugar was summoned to answer for his refusing to pay 'the Weekly Commands of mr Maior and the Weekly Repairs of the Town and Myton'; his reason stated that he had no 'money of the towns in his hands' and could not 'spare it out of his own money' (HCA BRB.5, 362). A central tenet of civic office holding was considered the expending of personal funds in the performance of civic duty, which at a later date might be remitted from central funds, or rather simply were considered a facet of incurring financial losses while in office (Heijden 2012, 27). Having also refused to undertake a bond of 100 li. from the Bench towards meeting the payments, despite assurances that no interest would be accrued for the loan, Sugar also refused to hand in his 'Book of Account of the Rentall' detailing the properties and tenant rents he was responsible for collecting. Hardy was 'immediately' dispatched by the Bench to inform the tenants not to hand over any rent to Sugar. Eventually Sugar 'humbly submitted himself to the Bench on the 9th April and promised to fulfil his duties for the remainder of his term as chamberlain (HCA BRB.5, 363). On 28th April the Bench reiterated that the duty of the 'ancient Office' of the chamberlains was to receive the revenues and rents of the town 'and to make such Disbursements for the Repairs of the said Town...as they should receive Orders from the Maior' (HCA BRB.5, 365). Clearly the financial

burdens or impositions of the office were a feature of this dispute for Sugar, with it possible that the Bench could view his reticence to expend his own sums of money as a dereliction of civic duty. Clearly Sugar had no desire to execute further civic office, as in 1685 he is recorded as one of four citizens who paid a fine of 100 li. to be exempted from serving as sheriff (HCA BRB.6, 146).

At this time there was an endemic failure and breakdown between the Bench and the chamberlain, for on 12th October Hardy reported that having visited the home of James Rauson, another chamberlain, he too had refused to pay the 'Wekly Bills of the Commands and repairs' for the town and 'did absolutely refuse to pay' the bills that amounted to 15 li. 9 s. 1 d. (HCA BRB.5, 386). In response, 40 li. was given to Hardy to carry out the ordered repairs and duties of the chamberlains by the Bench. With 40 li. being given over to Hardy there was therefore not a shortfall of moneys available from the Bench that could have been used to alleviate the financial burdens of the chamberlains and avoid a breakdown of civic functions. That funds were not made available to supplement the chamberlains reinforces the notion that civic officials were expected to incur personal costs in the performance of their duties as a central tenet of civic office holding. In October 1674 Hardy again visited Rauson but he refused another bill amounting to 6 li. 9 d., leading the Bench to order that Hardy would every Saturday 'carry the Comands and Repairs given out by mr Maior unto mr Chamberlain Rauson and there demand the sum charged' and report back what transpired (HCA BRB.5, 394). Despite Rauson declaring 'he would use his endeavour to gather the Rents and was ready to serve the Bench' in December 1674 (HCA BRB.5, 400), by 15th January 1674/75 a suit was to be brought against him by the town at the Guildhall in London (HCA, BRB.5, 406). This was followed in February 1674/75 by proceedings being issued against another chamberlain, George Bacchus, for the same dereliction of duties (HCA BRB.5, 410). Of note is that the Bench voted in May 1675 whether to hold the suit at London, York or Newcastle, opting to 'lye the Venue in the Causes against the Chamberlains at the guildhall London there to be tryed' (HCA BRB.5,

419). Obviously York would have been the most logical in terms of distance to travel, but in opting for London the accused would be compelled to travel over 200 miles south, with the inevitable added costs and inconvenience.

The outcome of the suit is not recorded, yet this episode reveals the degree to which the Bench was willing to pursue the offending and negligent chamberlains through the courts, as well as the relative powerlessness of them to compel civic officials to do their duty. Significantly, it was Hardy as the town's husband who was called upon to undertake the duties of the chamberlain for a time and he who was used to parley with the delinquent and self-professed insolvent chamberlains. In April 1675, 200 li. was 'putt into the hands' of Hardy 'for the payment of the Towns Repairs and Comands' as a contingency for the occasions when the chamberlains refused to pay the bills (HCA BRB.5, 420). To invest such a large sum of the town's money with one individual, albeit with the stipulation that he was to keep an account, circumvented the office of chamberlain to disrupt civic administration and signifies Hardy's perceived abilities and credibility. This issue with the chamberlains and the levels of available funding to them does not adequately appear to have been resolved, for in April 1692 the then holder was also refusing to pay the Commands and Repairs (HCA BRB.6, 288).

The involvement of Hardy with the political machinations of Hull's civic authorities indicates that he was far more ingratiated with the civic elite than one might assume from simply examining the plethora of orders for him to carry out repairs within the Bench Books. Following the events of 1673/74 to 1675, in the following September 'Mathew Hardy jun[ior]' was put forward for election as chamberlain, though he was not in fact elected (BRB.5, 481). However, following the death of John Neese whilst chamberlain, Hardy junior was elected in December 1676 and 'tooke the oath for the execucon of the said office' in the Council Chamber (HCA BRB.5, 490). It cannot be a coincidence that the son of the town husband, a figure who had been integral to the proceedings against and admonishing of the

earlier chamberlains, found himself elected to a civic office and one whose conduct would be accounted for by his father, the longstanding and trusted Matthew Hardy senior. Within Hull the office of chamberlain was considered an integral rung on the corporate ladder toward the mayoralty (Allison 1969b, 33). Following his term as chamberlain it is noted that the Bench had forgone 15 li. 13 s. 11 d. of uncollected rent from Hardy junior, on account of him having 'severall times demanded of the Tenants but they refuse[d] to pay' (HCA BRB.5, 560-561). This implies that he was not respected in his office by the tenants and had been deficient in that role. Considering the decision to issue proceedings against previous chamberlains for neglect, it is noteworthy that no such action was taken against Hardy junior.

In January 1676/77, as the town husband Hardy was able to instigate works through petitioning the Bench, particularly in relation to the defences. On this occasion he requested that members of the Bench would examine 'breaches made by stormes at the ffowle and clean South end', referring to the banks running along the defences, as well as to provide timber for work on the North Bridge, to which the Bench ordered he was to 'forthwith take care for the repairing of the said breaches' and later purchase timber for 25 li. (HCA BRB.5, 496. 503 & 509). This demonstrates that the town husband was not an indifferent official but rather proactively surveying for faults and seeking the requisite authority and funds to carry out repairs. Part of the duties of the town husband would appear to have been the point of contact for the negotiation and appropriation of building materials. In June 1677 Hardy presented to the Bench an offer that was made 'by the Lord Hallifax his steward living at Rufford Abbie' for the sale of timber from the estate (HCA BRB.5, 517). Presumably on Hardy's advice and his communication with the steward, the Bench thought that the timber could be 'had at a penny worth'. They therefore ordered Hardy to Rufford Abbey and to contract the sale and to 'buy so much timber as may be necessary for the service of the Towne at...rates he can agree for'. Today by road the journey from Hull to Rufford Abbey in Nottinghamshire is roughly 70 miles. This would surely have constituted a significant logistical feat in transporting the

timber back to Hull. It highlights the network of contacts Hardy seemingly fostered beyond Hull and Yorkshire, as the steward apparently offered him preferment of the timber, suggesting a degree of familiarity. It also demonstrates the trust imparted on him by the Bench to select, negotiate and pay for materials.

The penultimate project of Hardy related to the work on the frontage of the Guildhall being 'beautified' in July 1679, that required him to 'advise with mr Catlin about doing of the same worke' (HCA BRB.5, 622). This was the same William Catlin discussed above who was a contemporary of Hardy and whose family had a prolonged professional and limited, perhaps thwarted, civic relationship with Hull's corporation. The record of both Hardy and Catlin working together on the Guildhall project succinctly illustrates the collaborative nature of maintaining and carrying out civic projects between long-serving civic officials and professionals. The stonemason for the work, Richard Roebucke, is noted in August 1680 to have acquired and delivered the stone 'for the beautifying of the ffront wall and Arch at the Guildhall' at a cost of 7 li. and to 'worke in preparing and fitting the Stones' under the direction of Hardy, who was to 'see to the same worke' (HCA BRB.5, 635). At no point are masons referenced as having worked on Hull's *enceinte*, but clearly they were engaged for civic projects within the town. In March 1677/78, Hardy had been charged to 'forthwth cause the new dorestead mr Robinson' had made within the town walls at the South End to be 'shutt and stopped up' (HCA BRB.5, 563). Hardy's final project again related to the repair of the town's defensive banks and staiths and the jetty of the South End, highlighting the consistent efforts undertaken to maintain them and the structural integrity of the walls throughout Hardy's tenure and the period in general (HCA BRB.5, 680). This final order came only two months before Matthew Hardy died and the election of his successor.

The tailor Tristram Berry was elected on 21st October 1680 to the office of town husband, promising 'all care and diligence in the discharging of the duty of the said office' (HCA BRB.5, 699). At Berry's appointment, evidence

for the annual wage of the town husband is noted as 16 li., as well as 40 s. towards the cost of 'livery money', indicating that the office commanded a substantial salary and warranted a livery uniform. In November of the same year Matthew Hardy junior brought to the Bench his father's 'two large books of Account and two smaller books containing all the Accounts of the Town for Comands, Repayr's for the Town and Repaires of Myton ever since' he had 'entred upon his office of Towns husband' (HCA BRB.5, 702). Hardy had therefore maintained substantial records for the period of his office and had personally retained possession over them. This is in spite of the fact that the Bench had ordered the construction of a specific new room over the Council House 'with a Chimney to lodge the Towns books and Records' in February 1672/73 (HCA BRB.5, 317). It reveals a high level of autonomy being imparted from the Bench through the keeping of his own accounts, removed from the town's general means of storing its civic records. These records, such as they survive, have yet to be fully transcribed and systematically analysed, but this future work would no doubt form a unique and detailed record of the role, development and operations of the common officer, town officer and town husband over a period of 150 years. Hardy junior also delivered to the Bench 'Twenty new blancke Auditt books' that were to be 'delivered to the Auditors appointed to take the Accompt of the Chamberlains' (HCA BRB.5, 702). This would indicate that Hardy senior had been responsible for, or at least involved with, oversight of the chamberlains that possibly originated from the disputes during the 1670's, in conjunction with his other civic duties. He may even have been conducting an inquiry into the conduct of the chamberlains prior to his death owing to his widow, Ellin Hardy, being paid 10 li. in respect of her husband's 'great paines in transcribing the Chamberlaines Accompts...commencing the year 1641 and ending at the year 1680' (HCA BRB.5, 720).

Having served as chamberlain during 1676 to 1677, Matthew Hardy junior was referred by name as one of the eleven aldermen in the new charter that was granted to the town by James II in July 1685. Within the same record, he and alderman Lambert, 'according to the Nominacion of them in the said

Charter', were elected as the town's Coroners for that year (HCA BRB.6, 135). As Coroner Hardy junior would have exercised quasi-magisterial powers to compel witnesses and suspects to appear at the assizes, imprison those suspected of murder, take depositions and draft the reports of the inquests that would then have been sent to the King's Bench in London. J A Sharpe's (1999, 47) work on crime in early modern England notes one Sir Thomas Smith's assertion from the 1550's that coroners were considered 'the meaner sort of gentleman, and for the most part a man seen in the laws of the realme', an assessment Sharpe considers to be applicable throughout the early modern period. In light of this assessment of early modern coroners, it can be supposed that Hardy junior had an education in the law, thus elevating his lower social status, and had not sought to emulate the profession or civic role of his father. Therefore, Matthew Hardy junior, the son of Hull's common officer and then town husband, had circumnavigated his way through the civic administration of seventeenth century Hull to achieve election to the highest civic body within the town. It is notable that it was the son, possibly trained in the law, and not the father who was able to achieve this, implying that the civic office of town husband, or rather those individuals responsible for maintaining property and building professionals like William Catlin, were unable to achieve elevation to the Bench.

As an alderman, Hardy junior is only significantly referred to twice after July 1685, the latter of which notes his death and the election of his replacement in September 1686 (HCA BRB.6, 168). One of those candidates was the builder William Catlin, who on several occasions had failed to achieve election as an alderman. Most significantly, Hardy junior was one of three aldermen who in October 1685 dealt with Sir Martin Beckman regarding the construction of the jetty and bank work of the Garrison Ground, which formed part of the refortification design for the state funded Citadel (HCA BRB.6, 147). As part of the discussions with Beckman, Hardy and the other aldermen had committed the town 'and their successors...from time to time and at all times hereafter' to 'sustaine and repaire' the earthworks of

the Citadel's banks. The nine-year programme for the construction of the Citadel was promulgated and instituted from August 1681 (Howes & Foreman 1999, 56 & 59), after the death of Hardy senior, but it is notable that it was the aldermen of the town that were in communication with Beckman, with no reference being made to the current town husband in 1685. This would suggest that aldermanic supremacy had been re-established regarding the town's building projects. It is notable that Hardy might have represented a degree of civic and familial continuity toward such projects during the discussion with Beckman, on account of his own familiarity with his father's work on the defences when town husband. Given Howes and Foreman's interest in the context in which the Citadel was constructed in the later seventeenth century, research into one of the aldermen, Hardy junior, who could trace a familial and civic relationship toward the maintenance of those defences from the 1640's through his father, can only add to our understanding of how Hull's corporation regarded their defences throughout the period.

As town husband, Tristram Berry only worked on several minor projects within Hull before his death and the election of his own successor in May 1681 (HCA BRB.5, 730). He was ordered to repair the tenement of Margaret Silbourne and construct a chimney, as well as replace the roof tiles of Margaret White's house (HCA BRB.5, 705). Finally, Berry appears to have carried on the construction of the new room at the Council House that had begun under Hardy in February 1672/73 to house the town's records to be 'kept and lodged there' (HCA BRB.5, 317 & 719). The construction of a new room to store Hull's corporate documents highlights the importance accorded to documentary and archival material within the bureaucracy of the period, as well as the growth of such material requiring adequate and accessible storage (Tittler 1998c, 214 & 291), pertaining as it did to Hull's rights and privileges. Berry also served to collect from the sale of 'white cliffe Stones' to a Francis Hill for 26 s. 4 d., which represented 4 d. a ton (HCA BRB.5, 727). This record serves to highlight a form of financial and commercial responsibility performed by the town husband at this time and

which may have existed under Hardy also. Although Berry's profession was noted as a tailor upon his appointment as town husband in October 1680, in July 1681 his widow petitioned the Bench for recompense as he had before his appointment conducted a 'Survey of the Sewers and ditches about the Spring head and drew a draught...and did many other services for the Town'. In response to this and for 'her said husbands paines', she was granted 3 li. (HCA BRB.5, 737). To have conducted a survey of the town's sewers and water supplies indicates that even though his occupation is recorded as a tailor, clearly his proficiency and skills outside of tailoring were significant, making him suitable for the role of town husband. Despite his short tenure as town husband and owing to his unspecified 'many other services', in November 1692 Berry's son, Daniel, was apprenticed to the mayor's cook for 5 li. and provided with clothing funded by the personal capital of two aldermen, the mayor and from the town's own coffers (HCA BRB.6, 305). A similar concern to apprentice the son of Edmond Gyles was evident when York's civic authorities granted him 30 s. in 1649 for that purpose (YALH B36, 229v). Such concern for the families and relations of Hardy and Berry in Hull, as well as Gyles in York, highlight the civic regard that was afforded to their conduct and the esteem felt toward them by their respective corporations.

Berry's successor as town husband, John Cawood, assumed the office on 18th May 1681 for the same salary of 16 li. and 40 s. for a livery uniform, though with the added proviso that 'the same John Cawood to be continued if approved' (HCA BRB.5, 730). This would suggest that his appointment was subject to an initial probationary period, which was perhaps judged appropriate as in 1692 he is referred to as 'John Cawood of Weeton' (HCA BRB.6, 299), Weeton being a hamlet over 30 miles to the east of Hull. This may indicate that Cawood was not local, which would account for his seeming absence within the House Books until his appointment as town husband. Evidently he was approved of as he was retained as the town's husband until at least July 1691 (HCA BRB.6, 271), which represented a term of over ten years.

Cawood is recorded as working on the banks and breastworks of the Citadel and Garrison Ground in June 1684, June 1685, two occasions in April 1688, March 1690 and June 1690 (HCA BRB.6, 97, 129-130, 205, 206, 256 & 259). In June 1685 the Commisisoners 'of his [Majesties] ffortificacon' ordered 'the secureing of the New draine cut through the Banck' which, owing to Hull being '[obliged] to maintaine the said Banck' following Hardy junior's and others agreement to do so in October 1685, resulted in the Bench appointing four aldermen 'to give such direcons...and informe the Bench from tyme to tyme' of the works progression (HCA BRB.6, 129-130). Cawood's role as the town husband was to merely 'observe such direcons as the aforesaid Aldermen...shall appointe', while William Catlin was to assist in the 'Contrivance of the said worke'. In this regard a clear demotion of the responsibilities of the town husband can be observed, whereby Cawood acted as a mere functionary to the directions of the aldermen and the non-civic office holder Catlin. In April 1688 further work on the breastwork, 'agreeable to the other breastwork already done', simply involved him setting workmen to the task that seemingly required no input from him toward the design (HCA BRB.6, 206). Yet on the same day Cawood had concluded a two and a half year lease by a tenant of the Tilery Ground outside of Beverley Gates for 20 s. a year. Earlier in February 1683/84 the cushions of the pews for the mayor and aldermen in St Trinity's Church were ordered to be 'amended with plush and what requisite and mr Cawood is to take Care about the same', whilst three aldermen were appointed to survey the Garrison Ground jetty and 'give their Judgments' about its condition (HCA BRB.6, 87-88). This indicates that aldermanic involvement had been reasserted toward defensive projects following the death of Matthew Hardy senior, with a diminished role for the town husband, whose remit now encompassed liturgical soft furnishings and tenancies. Even in relation to the relatively small repairing of a tenement in September 1683, it was alderman Mason, Delachampe, Field and an unnamed 'Townes workeman' who were to survey it without Cawood (HCA BRB.6, 69).

The repair of the George Inn in May 1683 involved Cawood engaging 'Workemen to view it and get the same done', implying that he acted as more of an administrator or foreman, rather than a professional surveyor with any building expertise (HCA BRB.6, 60). This administration extended to the Town's storehouse of building materials when he was ordered to allow the 'ancient' tenant Mrs Hodgson a 'spare windowframe and some boards' towards the refurbishment of her shop (HCA BRB.6, 195). On two occasions Cawood directed the sale of goods confiscated from people engaging in conventicles, administered the sale of timber with the proceeds paying ale suppliers, and also sold and disbursed the possessions of Alice Parks 'who lately poisoned herself' (HCA BRB.6, 115, 166, 212 & 262). In terms of Hull's finances, Cawood would appear to have been charged with administering the town's 'deals, baulks and other small debts', for which he received money to settle them in September 1688 (HCA BRB.6, 216). This is in stark contrast with Matthew Hardy. Hardy had expended and dealt with large sums of money and had assumed the duties of the chamberlains with regard to the town's overall finances for a protracted period of time. In February 1684/85, an order to operate the system of sluices and dikes to 'lett in New water for preventing Ill smells and the Like' would suggest Cawood possessed a degree of water engineering proficiency (HCA BRB.6, 122). Hardy too had operated the supply of water to the town in April 1664 and during his short tenure as town husband, Tristram Berry had conducted a survey of the sewers, ditches and water supplies (HCA BRB.4, 578; BRB.5, 737). This demonstrates that one of the traditional responsibilities of the town husband appertained to the water supplies of the town; the significance of which is demonstrable through the Bench's recorded concerns about polluted water as a 'great dainger of infecting [diverse] of the inhabitants' in 1664 (HCA BRB.4, 578). Clearly water supplies were a continued concern for the civic authorities, and their maintenance was invested with the town husband as testament to the trust imparted to the office over such an important civic resource.

Curiously, the Bench Books record that on 26th September 1687 John Cawood 'made it his request to be disfranchised and the court for some reasons thought fit to disfranchise him and he is disfranchised' (HCA BRB.6, 191). No reference to the title of town husband is made, but if this did refer to John Cawood the town husband, the fact that he was advising on the position to build a new chimney on 10th November 1687 and subsequent works for several years, highlights that being disenfranchised had not been an impediment to his continued holding of civic office. The 'reasons' as to why he wished to be disenfranchised or why the Bench acquiesced are not elucidated, nor is there a record of his being refranchised. What is clear is that by October 1689 the annual salary of Cawood as the town husband had increased to 24 li. (HCA BRB.6, 248). Within the listing of Cawood's salary are eight other officials, including the mayor, with the record stipulating that they were to 'have noe more Annually paid them' than as set down. Cawood's salary was second only to the mayor, who received 80 li. annually. Many of the offices listed appear to be tied directly to the office of the mayor including the sword bearer, mace bearer, town clerk and cook, as well as a Margery Fell who was paid 4 li. to ring the church bell, among others. To include the town husband within the panoply of officials with associations to the mayor indicates that the office was personally answerable to the mayor, the highest form of civic office within Hull. The significant salary also demonstrates financially that the services of the town husband were highly valued and superseded those of other officials. Clearly the apparent financial supplements these offices were receiving amounted to a degree of financial irregularity, profligacy or negligence that required rectification, as well as the rescinding of livery uniform money paid 'to the Officers...as was Accustomed'. The same record also refers to a Mr Bewley as the 'Cash [Accountant]' on a salary of 5 li. Immediately after this recording of salaries within the Bench Books, the same Bewley was ordered to collect the arrears of the chamberlains rents. This would imply that following Hardy's death the responsibility to undertake the duties of negligent chamberlains had passed out of the remit of the town husband to a different official.

The last order for Cawood refers to the repair of defective causeways within the town in July 1691 (HCA BRB.6, 272). In September 1692 he was again referred to, but this time as 'late this Town's husband having reported that the Towne is indebted to him a Considerable sume of money' for which he was ordered to attend upon them with his accounts, no doubt to prove his claim (HCA BRB.6, 299). Although the alleged sum owed to Cawood is not stipulated, in September 1694 and owing to the fact that 'the townes husbands place [was] vacant by John Cawood['s] desertion', Robert Raikes was appointed to the office for the reduced salary of 16 li. (HCA BRB.6, 353). As part of this appointment, the Bench ordered Raikes to write to Cawood and demand the return of 'the Townes books and accounts otherwise they' would 'pceed at Law [against] him'. Cawood did not acquiesce nor was he reimbursed, for as late as March 1697/98 he was still petitioning to 'have the monies paid him' and the Bench was still requesting the return of the 'Bookes Notes and Papers' in his possession (HCA BRB.6, 426). This prolonged and apparently acrimonious state of affairs between Hull and its former town husband during the 1690's is not recorded as having ever been resolved. The delay in appointing Robert Raikes as the new town husband must have transpired owing to this protracted dispute. On the same day as the dispute is first recorded in September 1692, the record also states 'there hath been a Considerable sume of money expended in repairing the Brestworks at the Southend' and orders were made to 'preserve them as much as may be from decay for the future' under the direction of a Thomas Williamson. Williamson appears to have assumed the duties of town husband without formally being appointed (HCA BRB.6, 299).

It cannot be a coincidence that Cawood had undertaken work on the breastwork of the South End from June 1690, only for there to then be issues over payments to him and sums of money having been spent there in 1692. It may be inferred that Cawood had himself expended his own funds to pay toward this work, revealing the potential financial risks attached to the office of town husband and civic office in general, as well as the financial indifference exhibited by the Bench toward remitting him. There are no

recorded financial disputes for the earlier office of common officer or for previous town husbands being unable, or unwilling, to expend sums of money. However, the common officers had little to no financial authority and there were prolonged financial disputes with the chamberlains during the 1670's. It therefore seems plausible that Cawood had accumulated personal financial costs, compelling him to abandon his civic office, in spite of the fact that he might have been expected to incur financial losses or outlays in the performance of civic office. There is a perceptible lack of trust towards the integrity of Cawood's claims of money owed by the Bench seeking to acquire his account books, which would have been compounded by his unwillingness to relinquish them for investigation. Matthew Hardy had maintained his own account books, personally held them throughout his tenure without discord and there were no recorded disputes. Therefore personalities may have informed the interaction of civic offices and officials in their dealings with one another, which in the case of Cawood had markedly deteriorated. Certainly there may have been many occasions for the misappropriation of funds by officials, which in the case of the town husband was even more possible through the autonomy given to administer their own account books. Without evidence of an investigation or conclusion to this dispute, this is merely conjecture, though certainly possible.

Contemporaneously with this localised dispute was the disagreement between Hull and the state regarding the maintenance of the Citadel (See Chapter 3, p. 176). The letter addressed to William III, Mary II and their Privy Council on the 5th May 1693 from Hull's Bench was entitled: 'The State of the Case of the Maior and Burgesses of the Towne of Kingston upon Hull Relateing to the support and Repairs of the Jettys, Brestworks and Banks abutting upon the haven or harbour of the said Town commonly called Hull' (HCA BRB.6, 315-316). Within this address the town asserts that Edward VI had granted the Castle and Blockhouses to the town in perpetuity until: 'about the year [1641] when the unhappy Rebellion broke out, at wch time the forces of the then usurping Power, did forceably dispossess the said Maior and burgesses...without rendering any thing ...for the rent of the

ground, or any waies repairing the banks, or brestworks'. They also make reference to the 1685 clause of the Charter granted under James II & VII, partly negotiated by Matthew Hardy junior, obliging them to repair the banks and breastworks at a cost of 1,000 li. that necessitated the selling of 'a great part of the corporation Lands'; the clause was not rescinded following the 'Publiq Proclamation' of the 1685 Charter being 'declared null and voyd', meaning that they believed 'in Law or Equity' they had not been bound to maintain the banks of the new Citadel, citing that the revenues of the town or the selling of its assets would not cover the costs and that they had already 'run into very much debt' for the work (HCA BRB.6, 316). The Bench proposed that they would 'resigne and reconvey unto the Crown all their rights' pertaining to the site of the Citadel, as established by the grant of Edward VI, as well as wave reimbursements of 2900 li. if they would be released from the perceived illegal obligations to maintain the Citadel's earthworks.

An answer from the crown is not recorded within the Bench Books but following an order from the Commissioners of the Office of Ordinance for repairs to be carried out in April 1695, Hull responded that 'the Bench was resolved to defend their not repairing' the defences through their solicitor (HCA BRB.6, 372-373). A final meeting with the Surveyor General of the Ordinance, Mr Charlton, and the Chief Engineer of England and notably the designer of the Citadel, Sir Martin Beckman, occurred in October 1699 (HCA BRB.6, 455). The town now proposed that if the Citadel were returned to its ownership the civic authorities would make all necessary repairs, but if it were retained by the crown, then they would 'hope that they shall be Excused from repairing the same'. After the address of May 1693 and for the rest of the century, there are no further recorded instances of the Bench or the Town's Husband having undertaken any repairs upon the grounds of the Citadel. The dispute over the ownership of the Citadel and its land would not ultimately be resolved until the court case of 1861 and the demolition of the site in 1863 (Allison 1969, 417-418; Howes & Foreman 1999, 174). Work on Hull's defences was restricted to the medieval walls, such as the

drawbridges of the town gates in February 1692/93 and April 1697, the blocking up of a doorway inserted by Towers Wallis in the walls of the South End in 1693, and the removal of waste from Beverley and Myton Gates in December 1700 (HCA BRB.6, 312, 407, 320, 473). The denigration of the defences toward the end of the seventeenth century can be attested to from a particular incident in June 1694, again at the South End. The tenants of houses abutting the town walls had inserted waterspouts into their dwellings that were undermining the structural integrity of the breastworks, they had 'broke down doresteads through' the wall for access and also erected pinfolds for livestock (HCA BRB.6, 341). Thomas Williamson, the individual who had assumed many of the tasks of Cawood following his desertion as town husband, was ordered to remove the spouts, block the doors up and remove the pinfolds. For such a state of affairs to have been allowed to occur at the walls of the South End would indicate that financial concerns, the dispute between Hull and the state, compounded by wrangling with the former town husband and the delayed appointment of a successor, had led to a deterioration of the maintenance and administration of repairs to Hull's defences.

With tenants erecting waterspouts and puncturing doorways through the walls, they reveal the distinctly non-military concerns of those tenants and the delayed concern of the Bench to survey and maintain the defences through their previously established forms of civic offices. Earlier in April 1688, while Cawood was still the town husband, the carpenter George Cash was engaged directly by the Bench not only to work on the new drawbridge of Beverley Gate, the old one being 'much in decay', but he was also to 'finde all Workmanshipp and labourage' for a wage of 12 li. (HCA BRB.6, 204). Therefore, the traditional role of the town husband to have surveyed and directed workmen appears to have ceased. It can be inferred that there was a civic disinclination toward the maintenance of the defences until they were in such a state of decay or were collapsing that repairs were unavoidable, as had occurred with Beverley Gate's drawbridge and the walls and breastworks at the South End. In support of this, in July 1692 the 'parte

of the way under the' walls at Beverley Gate is described by the Bench as being 'soe very much out of reparaire that a horse can scarce pass without being laid fast', meaning either the gateway or its environs were impassable and dangerous (HCA BRB.6, 294). This part of the defences formed part of the medieval *enceinte* and was therefore under the jurisdiction of the town. However, the Bench Book records that the 'Governour be requested to grant leave to pass upon the Walls or line until the same be repaired'. The meaning of this is unclear but may have meant allowing people to pass over the walls or defensive earthworks. Whatever the intended solution was, the fact that the Bench felt obliged to consult and request the permission of the garrison's governor indicates that by the 1690's the governor's authority had seemingly extended beyond the Citadel to include Hull's medieval *enceinte*. Considering the disputes festering over repairs to the Citadel and the town's subsequent lack of repairs on the site, this may have accounted for the instances of decay and delayed maintenance on the *enceinte* that were motivated by jurisdictional quarrels and resentment in the latter part of the seventeenth century.

The last holder of the office of town husband during this period was Robert Raikes. Robert Raikes is recorded as having paid 50 li. to be exempted from the chamberlainship in 1674, later in 1675/76 reimbursed 10 li., and was referred to as master of the Woolhouse in February 1686/87 with a salary of 30 li. (HCA BRB.5, 384 & 452; BRB.6, 177). The record notes that 'the business of the Woollhouse was taken into Consideracon and by reason it was found that the charge of the managemt exceeds the yearly Income' and wages were formalised (HCA BRB.6, 177). The record also notes the staff of the Woolhouse as a clerk, two porters, two labourers, the crane keeper and a boatman. With such clear evidence of the appointment of an administrator, this would support the notion that the role of the town husband had been diminished. In October 1698 Raikes paid 3 li. 15 s. to supply coal 'for Gregshouse', was ordered to repair a house 'according to alderman Hydes View and Report', the following October seized the goods and property of James Houlder who had 'runne away and left 3 Children to the Towne', and

in June 1700 was selling stone dug from Hesse Cliff (HCA BRB.6, 436, 453, 463). Also in June a clearly ritualistic and civic function is alluded to: 'According to the Antient rights and priviledges of this Town', Raikes was 'to go to Sutton to draw the Nett over the fillings on Saturday next', which presumably referred to casting a fishing net and asserting the rights of Hull to the produce or a tax (HCA BRB.6, 464). Such a ritual is not recorded as being performed by any previous town husband, town officer or common officer, thereby concluding that the office was now assuming purely symbolic civic roles and that the individual occupying the office had decisively diverted from the remit of active surveying and building maintenance.

Conclusion

In analysing and seeking to reconstruct in detail, for the first time in the case of Hull, the systems of building maintenance and repair that were employed during the early modern period, it is clear that for the majority of that time there were multiple conduits and individuals by which such work was accomplished. Within Hull the exact remit and role of the common officers was indeterminate and subject to the definition of higher civic offices. At all times a perceptible prominence and primacy was afforded to the higher officials of the Bench, who had control and ultimately accountability for the finances of the town. A high degree of deference may account for this within the type of language used within the documentary evidence, such as according pre-eminence to the mayor or aldermen, but the prominence of certain individuals and offices would support the view that there was active engagement and a documented professionalization toward the maintenance of the town's defences and civic property throughout the corporation.

This was also strongly apparent within York's administration for repairs and building programmes. Removed from simply analysing those holding civic office, is the recorded evidence of the employment of professionals in conjunction with, or those who were eventually subsumed into, civic

arrangements. Figures such as Walmesley in York and the Catlin family in Hull demonstrate the potential longevity of these relationships at the upper levels of corporate government. No doubt other names and persons were just as well known to the citizens and officials of the respective city and town, but they were never recorded within the House Books or Bench Books. The formal evidence of concerted efforts and systems to maintain their defences, as well as other properties, must surely undermine the pervading historiographical argument that English defences were neglected, outmoded, and medieval antiquities worthy of derision during the early modern period (Colvin 1982, 381; Saunders 1989, 11-12; Crossley 1990, 109; Friedrichs 1995, 23; Reed 2000, 84; Harrington 2003a, 6 & 10; Bull 2008, 84). The apparent disinterest in exploring these systems of maintenance has heretofore overlooked in detail how it was that such defences could be used throughout the period, as well as furthering our understanding of such offices, officeholders and craftsmen, within the context of their early modern urban communities.

From the evidence examined both Hull and York's defences were continuously repaired and maintained within a complex and alternating system of civic office holding and responsibility. As Hartshorne (2004, 229) identifies in relation to York from 1476 to 1586, orders to repair crumbling and collapsed defences often give an overall impression that they were not considered a priority and were allowed to become dilapidated. Yet, she counters this impression by arguing that instances of repair reveal that they were in fact not neglected, as demonstrated through the very same orders for them to be repaired or maintained. The numerous examples of repairs could not in themselves numerically account for such large structures having survived throughout the period. Many stretches of walls, towers or defensive features are not referred to at all within the documentary material, but this does not preclude the judgement that both *enceintes* were maintained in their entirety. If they had not been then the two successfully defended sieges of Hull would not have been possible and in York only one breach, subsequently repelled, was made along the relatively small and

peripheral circuit of St Mary's Abbey. This testifies to the determined systems of maintenance propagated by these two corporations.

The individual rise of both Edmond Gyles and Matthew Hardy within the context of Civil War defensive preparations has been discussed above. In stark contrast to the annual, intermittent, civically orientated and often-ineffective office of their predecessors, the fact that both Gyles and Hardy retained their civic offices for substantial periods of time may be accounted for in their perceived competence and the increasing professionalization of civic offices during this period. A system of professionalization is evident throughout this period, as demonstrated by the gradual retention of both individuals and professionals, which ultimately culminated in the formalized figures of Gyles and Hardy in permanent and salaried civic offices. After tenures of 32 and 39 years respectively, their civic knowledge would have covered all of the tumults from the 1640's onwards, which when combined with their familiarity with the civic and political contexts, must have been unparalleled amongst their peers. In not achieving higher civic offices, such as elevation to an alderman and then ultimately the mayoralty, they were also separated officially from the ladder of civic promotion. This could lead to two distinct reasons as to why this was. First, owing to their practical building skills and knowledge, perhaps they were viewed as not laudable enough to merit civic elevation. It is noteworthy that it was Matthew Hardy junior, the town husband's son, who was able to progress firstly as a chamberlain, albeit somewhat negligently, through to the aldermanic Bench with seeming preferment. Henry Gyles did not attain civic office, if he indeed even coveted it at all, but a degree of preferment was bestowed upon him during and after Edmond Gyles' death. Secondly, it may have been that their experience and length of service was so uniquely bound up with them personally that any other office or civic role would have been detrimental to the perceived effectiveness of maintaining the respective defences and civic properties. The apparent diminishing of the responsibilities of their successors, and the greater involvement of higher civic offices once they had died, would attest to this. Certainly none of their successors were apparently

held in such high regard. Yet, the offices they occupied were maintained after their deaths as part of the professional makeup of York and Hull's civic authorities. The accrual of responsibility over the decades must have inevitably led to a necessary, albeit ad hoc, reapportioning of the duties that Gyles and Hardy had once executed.

Aside from the formally recognised civic officials, non-officials were also an integral aspect of urban communities maintaining their structural fabric, and they are particularly evident within the archival record of Hull. From a biographical approach the majority of the figures discussed were able to operate on a number of differing civic buildings and programmes that can be traced through the archival record. Catlin is known to have worked on the projects for the new Council House, a chapel, civic furnishings, architectural adornment, domestic dwellings, a guardhouse for soldiers and the large engineering works of the eastern defences, which clearly identifies him as a professional craftsman. Though perhaps differing in scale to European counterparts as discussed in Chapter 1, figures such as William Catlin, Matthew Hardy and Edmond Gyles, could similarly be lauded for their demonstrable adeptness across a wide variety of building projects, which included urban defences and historically recognised civic buildings, such as guildhalls, prisons, vernacular and ecclesiastical architecture. The emergence of such individuals from the archival record during the period is able to place them, and significantly the structures that they worked on, within the wider physical and socio-cultural local they operated within at both a local and national context (Mytum 2010, 244).

Hull's dispute with the state, as stated in their address of 1693 (See Chapter 3, p. 176 & Chapter 4, pp. 256-258), in conjunction with the lack of repairs carried out by its authorities on the Citadel subsequently, alludes to one such socio-cultural, political and national context of the defences at the end of this period. A consideration of earlier jurisdictional and commonplace uses of the town's defences, prior to such historiographically recognised disputes with the state in the second-half of the seventeenth century (See

Chapter 1, pp. 48-49), is necessary to understand how this set of circumstances was able to occur. Again the role of a biographical approach within the documentary evidence is harnessed. This enables the traditional utilisation and functions of the defences throughout the period, by non-civic and civic persons alike, to be considered at both sites and forms the basis of Chapter 5.

Chapter 5- The utilisation of urban defences

Introduction

The following chapter will seek to comprehend and extrapolate from the archival material the commonplace functions of York and Hull's *enceintes* to demonstrate how and why they were continuously harnessed, negotiated and utilised during the early modern period. This is founded on the hypothesis that urban governments created a symbiotic relationship with their citizens. Individual interests were interwoven with those of the wider communities that they served, as outlined in Chapter 1 (See pp. 47-48 & 52-53; Heijden 2012, 4). This chapter does not seek simply to describe the practical functions of the walls based on the analysis of the records. Rather it seeks to unpack how individual examples of civic disquiet reveal much deeper motivations, concerns and interests of citizens across the social strata. This concurs with Hindle's (2002, 238) assertion that such evidence is able to reveal not just simply what transpired, but why such measures may have been implemented (See Chapter 1, p. 63). Likewise, Mytum (2010, 244) stresses that such evidence is able to highlight the reactions of individuals and groups within and toward their landscape and its structures (See Chapter 1, pp. 66-67). This allows for a consideration of the functional utilisation of the defences, as well as recognising that they were not merely static structures within their urban settings and reflected wider social, civic and political concerns in the construction of civic identity.

The nature of the archival material inevitably leads to a distortion towards interpreting them as solely demonstrating the viewpoint and mentality of the civic governments who were responsible for the production of such documents (See Chapter 1, pp. 59-68). However, the surviving documentary evidence for the regulation of prescribed forms of civic behaviour allows for an understanding of the perceived ideal early modern life, which was often undermined by the reality, as highlighted through the recorded transgressions of individuals (Hartshorne 2004, 28). For the effective

administration of urban centres, particularly during periods of sustained crisis such as the plague, there was an onus on those governing and governed to subscribe and adhere to established forms of authority, which was ultimately dependent upon the actions of individuals supporting such moral and social parameters. Such considerations move the debate away from merely a matter of the state or local government and toward a holistic consideration of the interplay between all levels of society at a local and national level.

From the evidence the issues of urban life included the fear of non-citizens and strangers that might threaten the urban community should they circumvent the walls. This is particularly evident in relation to the poor who were a drain upon precious and limited resources, as well as significantly the moral failings and transgressions of those citizens already resident within an *enceinte*. In this regard urban defences provided a tangible symbol of a 'moral centre' when contrasted with the periphery and those who were outside of the walls (Sharpe 1999, 148; Hartshorne 2004, 224; See Chapter 1, pp. 53-54). Also central to the comprehension of urban defences are notions of ownership. Whilst the monarch or the state theoretically owned them, practically the walls and their environs were in turn the property of corporations and their urban community as a recognised social, political and cultural entity. They could also be intensely personal, familial or commercial holdings, with associations lasting several generations, as well as being highly contestable sites, as is demonstrated through legal disputes that were particularly prevalent during the seventeenth century, but also evident throughout 1550-1700. The notion of ownership below the corporate level is only comprehensible through the biographical approach espoused by Mytum (2010), which allows for the combination of the archival material to indicate the interactions of individuals or groups with physical structures. In so doing this thesis has been able to identify five themes that will be addressed in the following chapter: commonplace officialdom and established practices, the notion of undesirables, the 'resident disorderly', the plague, and ownership and leases. Combined with recognition of the

walls representing the physical embodiment of a corporation's independence and authority, within the wider civic historiography of the post-Reformation period (Withington 1998d, 162 & 165; See Chapter 1, pp. 46-58), this chapter seeks to counter the emphasis heretofore afforded to their military considerations and assert their significance within the early modern urban landscape. The chapter will now begin with establishing the levels of officialdom that were in operation and performed by those who were below the previously discussed upper echelons of civic governments.

Commonplace officialdom and established practices

In 1600, Exeter's city watchmen were described as those in whom 'the greatest trust [was] committed for the safe keeping of the gates and the preservation of the whole citie' (Stoyle 2003, 30). This assessment of those appointed to watch the defences would also hold true for York and Hull during the period. From 1550 to 1700 several national military threats saw the defences put in a state of readiness. Among these were Wyatt's Rebellion in 1554, the Rising of the Northern Earls in 1569, Spanish Armada in 1588, Bishops' War from 1638, the English Civil War, and the Dutch Wars of the 1660's, all of which compelled defensive preparations through various and well-established local measures (YALH B21, 31v; RCHME 1972, 37; Palliser 1979c, 55; Howes & Foreman 1999, 18, 26 & 47). In 1569 York's measures included: repairing its gates, ordinance and arms; establishing a continuous watch of 10 men at every bar; locking all of the posterns; preventing arms being taken out of the city; requiring inn-holders and alehouse keepers to 'gyve a diligent eare' for sedition, slander or dissention; conveying all boats within the city; engaging the citizens in 'comon day work' to repair the city walls and to ram earth against the gates; all citizens, ladders and tar were brought in from the suburbs; musters of the trained bands were held; the aldermen and members of the Twenty-Four were to assist in the watch; and earthen bulwarks were constructed by Lendal Tower (YALH B24, 161v, 162r, 166r, 167v, 167r, 173r, 173v & 174v).

Orders within Hull 'for the better [safety] of the towne and fforts' in February 1586/87, contemporaneous with the execution of Mary Queen of Scots, included: locking all but Beverley and North Gates; stationing two 'honest able and sufficient men' at each gate; the planks of the postern bridges were removed; watchmen were armed with calivers; gates were erected at the staiths; the chain was drawn across the haven; a general watch was kept within the town; aldermen were to watch at the North and South Blockhouses with 6 men; 'powder and shott' were provided; the local trained bands were ordered to have their arms in a state of readiness; and

hourglasses were used so that every hour a bell would be rung so the watchmen 'above shall goe down and other come upp in their place' (HCA BRB.2, 245v-246r). In accordance with early modern towns and cities being primarily responsible for their own defence, a feature only challenged with the establishment of permanent and professional state garrisons following the Civil War, these systems were therefore locally administered (Stoyle 2003, 29 & 98). During 1569 the Council of the North and contingents of state forces were made available in York, though authority was clearly demarcated between the city and the state: 'the L mayor and aldermen wardens shall have thordre and correction of the sayd citizens watchemen And the captaynes and marshalls of the soldiers' (YALH B24, 177r). Excluding the Civil War, none of these events induced active military engagements in either case study. Yet this does not preclude the fact that their corporations, through localised systems of defence, could put their *enceintes* into a state of readiness.

By 1450 York had salaried watchmen and it was customary for freemen to hold the custody of the respective gate keys (RCHME 1972, 38). These were administered at the mayoral and aldermanic level, or more conventionally by ward and parish, depending on the context and the perceived threat necessitating the supplement of regular watches (Withington 1998d, 170; Creighton & Higham 2005b, 186; Withington 2008a, 606). In 1552 the chambers of York's Bars were appropriated specifically for the four officers of the wards or their deputies to reside in at night (YALH B20, 124r & 127r; B22, 28v). They were ordered to lock the gates and posterns at 9 o'clock in the evening, reopen them at 5 o'clock in the morning, they were not to allow any 'suspeccouse persone to come in ne goe forth' before having them examined by the sheriff, they were not to 'take nothing for lettyngge owte or in any franchised man or their servants', implying that they could extort money from non-freemen, and from 1556 they were each to be paid 20 d. at Christmas. The locking and opening of the gates was also seasonal. In 1595 at York from 25th March to 29th September, Lady Day and Michaelmas respectively, the gates were locked at 10 o'clock in the evening and opened

at 3 o'clock in the morning, while conversely during the winter months they were locked at 9 o'clock in the evening and opened at 4 o'clock in the morning, with similar routines found at Hull (YALH B31, 114r; HCA BRB.2, 366v).

The keys to each gate or postern at York were assigned to individuals. In 1614 Peter Middleton was appointed to have the custody of the key at Skeldergate Postern and Richard Cooke was appointed the keeper of Monk Bar in 1637, to 'take charge of keeping the keys of the barr on the night tyme and be a watchman there on the day tyme there' (YALH B34, 47v; B35, 347r). Elizabeth Stockdale had constructed the house at Skeldergate Postern in 1641/42 and was known as its 'keeper' (YALH B36, 6r & 64v), with the implication being that for certain keepers they might only be responsible for administering entry, but not in a watch capacity. For example, the Council ordered that if any persons wished to leave the city through Monk Bar at night, they were to provide 'some reasonable satisfaction to the keeper of the barr for his paines in rising to let them in and out' (YALH B36, 14r). Not all keepers were expected to undertake the role of a watchman, but were expected to reside above or in close proximity to the gateway they administered. Thus, Elizabeth Stockdale was simply referred to as the keeper, whereas Richard Cooke was explicitly appointed to be both the keeper at night and a watchman during the day. Although no women performed the role of the watch and whilst the custodianship of the keys was overwhelmingly male, it was not strictly gender exclusive. Alongside Elizabeth Stockdale, there is also a reference in 1655 to Meredith Morgan, who received 5 s. in 1655 for having kept the keys of Castlegate Postern during the previous year (YALH B37, 73r), and Jane Lund is similarly mentioned during the 1640's and 1650's (Withington 2008a, 606). Such arrangements could be overridden or altered, such as in 1618 when the constables of the respective wards were to keep the keys of Bootham Bar for that winter, while in 1648 the keys of North Street and Layerthorpe Posterns were assigned to the custody of individual aldermen (YALH B34, 157r; B36, 219v). By 1656 this system was formalised with the appointment

of a single keeper for each of the four Bars, who additionally were paid 20 s. for opening, locking and holding the keys of the posterns within their individual wards (YALH B37, 90r). By concentrating the custodianship of respective keys with one individual, this practice diverted from previously established conventions that had co-opted several citizens within each ward as keepers or key holders. Throughout the majority of this period there were multiple officially-maintained civic offices, conducted by the citizens of York, for the administration of the gates and posterns. This should be recognised as a distinct feature of corporate governance for the practical regulation of entry and egress.

The oath sworn by the keeper of Monk Bar in 1602 refers to the locking and opening of the gates, as well as specifically suffering none to enter once they were locked, particularly those 'suspecte to be of Lewd behaviour' (RCHME 1972, 38). However, the actions of keepers were subject to scrutiny by the Council. In January 1606/07 a John Ibson complained to York's Council that his servant arrived at Bootham Bar during the night seeking a midwife to tend to Ibson's wife who was 'in great dainger'. However, the custodian of Bootham Bar's keys, the baker Thomas Hudson, had said that he 'cold not answere' the request to open the gate. Although Hudson claimed ignorance of the servant's request for a midwife, this was countered by the testimony of witnesses, possibly the watchmen on active duty that evening (YALH B33, 49v-50r). It is not clear whether Ibson's wife or child had died during labour, but for his 'offence' Hudson was committed to the prison at Monk Bar 'ther to remayne for one whole daie' (YALH B33, 50r). In failing to open the Bar for a legitimate reason, Hudson was judged to have failed in discharging his duties. This event further reinforces the idea that although the keeper held the keys, they were not compelled to be on active duty at the gate itself. That responsibility fell instead to the watchmen. As the keeper and holder of civic office, Hudson was publicly humiliated in the most symbolic way through his imprisonment, even if only for a single day, within one of York's other gates, Monk Bar.

Within Hull there was only a single keeper, or porter, as they were also known. Their duties pertained to the locking and opening of all the town's gates and posterns at prescribed times, dressing Beverley Gate and its bridge. By 1605/06 they were to receive an annual wage of 40 s. and were assigned 'one lowe room under Beverley gaitte' and 'another little roome wth a chimney in it above the gresings' (HCA BRB.2, 366v). There was an emphasis on the primacy afforded to Beverley Gate, which was also evident within its architecture and the multiple leases, both domestic and guild, as discussed in Chapter 3. Aside from the regular locking and opening of the gates, the porter was also charged to lock them on the Sabbath days. In 1605/06 they were to be locked 'at the last peale before mornynge and evenynge prayer', then the porter was to receive a Mr Whincopp at North Gate, possibly a preacher, then was 'imedyatelie to bringe the keyes to mr maior or to stand neare his [presence]' (HCA BRB.2, 366v). This was intended to ensure the attendance of Hull's citizens at religious services, as 'for neither neede nor favour nor rewarde' or without a mayoral licence, was the porter to allow any person to leave the town during services. In having to bring the keys to the temporary custody of the mayor, this was a display of civic authority and religious enforcement. The porter was also to attend upon the mayor every Thursday 'at the hall', further highlighting the civic association between the Bench and the official of Hull's gates (HCA BRB.2, 366v). As well as the porter, there were also the keepers of the North and South Blockhouses and the staith keepers from at least 1650/51 (HCA BRB.2, 304v; BRB.4, 14). As discussed in the previous chapters, all of these were salaried and officially lesser civic offices, with potentially a multiplicity of duties, whose roles often incorporated residence or the provision of housing within or in close proximity to the defences.

In the performance of their duty these civic officials could be subjected to potential abuses, both verbal and physical. In 1620 the Hull citizen George Carleton was fined 3 li. 6 s. 8 d. for threatening 'to breake open the porters doore of the towne gaitts...sayinge he wold take the keyes...And used manie evill and undecent words against mr maior and others'. Immediately

following this within the Bench Book, James Marmaduke, a ropemaker and alehouse keeper, is noted as having brought his wife before the Bench 'for abusing the watch in the night tyme', which as her husband he was fined 5 s. (HCA BRB.3, 84). In York, the keeper of Bootham Bar, the baker William Lund, was recompensed 4 li. by the Council in August 1660 towards the 'great damage' and unspecified losses he sustained 'by the late watch' at Bootham Bar (YALH B37. 141V). The high monetary value implies that Lund had suffered material damages or had been injured sufficiently badly to prevent him working. In 1603, 1615/16, 1631 and 1633 the House Books record the 'assalte' and 'beate' meted out to the watchmen, often resulting from the offenders being 'over taken in drinke', with the possibility that many instances were recorded elsewhere in other court records (YALH B32, 281r; B34, 89r; B35, 126r & 216v). As an office, the role of keepers and porters was to perform a practical function, but one that meant they were potentially vulnerable to personal bodily harm. However, as a salaried position it can be argued that they were suitably remunerated and even on occasion compensated, thereby incentivising the fulfilment of them by the citizenry. Yet, at the same time they were also performing and partaking within a recognised form of civic duty.

Withington (2008a, 606) has identified the professions of York's keepers during the 1640's and 1650's as 'essentially middling artisans and craftsmen', which included tailors, bakers, joiners, tanners and weavers, who, whilst being unlikely to serve in high civic office, were actively engaging in one of the civic institutions open to them. References to the keepers as an 'office' and the administration of an oath upon their appointment (RCHME 1972, 38) would have inculcated a formal and civic dimension to the role. The keepers of Hull's North and South Blockhouses were similarly of these middling professions, with reference to joiners, carpenters and artificers as well as merchants and gunners (HCA BRB.3, 342, 73; BRB.2, 311r). However, what of those citizens operating below these levels of civic office, far removed from the machinations of the Council or Bench and salaried positions? Withington (1998d, 170) also notes that at

the parochial level of the watches and watchmen, the constables would have had a pool of regular persons from the neighbourhood to draw from, notably poorer persons and apprentices, and through a system known as the house row, every citizen could potentially be inducted. If the idea of civic duty can be applied to a corporation office holder, then it could also be applied to the general population in their role as watchmen and more generally as citizens in the effective regulation of their urban environment. For example, when one of Hull's Sergeants was attacked 'wth great violence' by Joshua Dewley in 1620, it was noted that he had not only displayed 'great contempt for Justice', but also by his conduct 'his oth made when he was admitted burgesse of the towne' (HCA BRB.3, 71). By assaulting an official of the civic administration Dewley was considered to have undermined and attacked the corporation itself, with the implication that any form of deviation from prescribed civic behaviour demanded suitable castigation for the preservation of civic society. Therefore, every recorded order tending to the closure of the gates, the manning of the defences, the restrictions placed on persons entering or leaving, the administration of the town and the general response to crises, all serve to help reconstruct the integral nature of the defences to the negotiation and ordering of that civic duty. Heijden (2012, 4) argues that early modern urban governments sought to co-opt their citizens to develop a system whereby the interests of the individual were also interwoven with those of the wider community they served. This chapter will now turn to consider how, through the utilisation of urban defences, the citizenry, civic offices and their associated remits and structures were actively deployed to serve those interests.

Undesirables

Much of the historical writing on the early modern period supports the idea of endemic social and political instability resulting from demographic pressures, economic stagnation, failed harvests, trade disruption, social problems, poverty and plague (Clark 2000, 8; Sharpe 1999, 142). Within this context, there is a recognition that urban defences may have provided both a

functional form of defence but also that they offered corporations a physical, symbolic 'controllable filter system' (Creighton & Higham 2005b, 37) for the collection of tolls and for the exclusion of perceived undesirable persons (Palliser 1979c, 25; Friedrichs 1995, 23; Hartshorne 2004, 217). During the 1530's Hull lobbied the state - and was granted - the right for its citizens and merchants to be accorded legal primacy for the purchase of imported merchandise, to the exclusion of 'any stranger or foreigner' within the town, except on market days (Gurnham 2011, 30-31). It is notable that at this time the term foreigner or stranger was liberally applied to denote anybody not belonging to the town or city, even to persons who may have lived within close proximity. The legal privilege to enact this would have required the officials of Hull's gates, staiths and blockhouses, as well as Hull's citizens, to play a crucial regulatory role in safeguarding that right through the administration of entry, egress and oversight of non-locals and locals alike. By February 1591/92 the Bench recognised that the tolls 'levyed and taken of straingers bringing goods and mchandizes to this towne' at the gates and port was acting as a deterrent for trade and was a 'great [prejudice] of the comon wealth' (BRB.2, 269r-269v). All tolls were thereafter to 'cease and be noe more exacted' from strangers, with the loss of revenue to be exacted from Hull's citizens, in light of the anticipated expansion of trade, by 4 d. for every 20 s. worth of goods. The oversight of officials would therefore have turned notably away from strangers and towards focussing primarily on Hull's own citizens.

Combined with economic discrimination against non-locals, as well as oversight of local traders, there was also an acute awareness of perceived social and civic threats, which were reflected within contemporaneous texts and discourses that sort to codify, structure and define social relationships and status. One such text was the clergyman William Harrison's 1577 *The Description of England*, which was intended to chronicle the land and peoples of Elizabethan England (Edelen 1994, xv & xviii). Harrison identified 14 varieties to describe the 'several disorders and degrees amongst our vile vagabonds', including: rufflers, rogues, wild rogues, priggers, palliards,

abrams, whipjacks, dummerers, drunken tinkers and jarkmen, among others. He also reserved a separate itemisation 'of womenkind', such as bawdy baskets, doxies, dells and kinchin mortis (Edelen 1994, 185). The terms may today be unfamiliar, but they all tend to the misdemeanours of thievery, begging, fraud, forgery, prostitution, vagrancy and general deceit, and highlight a discourse of criminality and undesirability. In December 1563 Hull's Bench recorded that for a 'well ordered comon welth' the principal charge was to establish laws to 'redresse supplant or plucke uppe [the] greate infeccions' of drunkenness, riot, wantonness, idleness, scolding, blasphemy, adultery and fornication, and for those offending to be 'punished and maide an example to all others' (HCA BRB.2, 50r). Throughout this period there are multiple references to the corrective measures and preventative actions taken by corporations against both citizens and non-citizens. In times of crises these concerns became even more pronounced and coalesced around the systems to combat them, which included the utilisation of the defences. As Hartshorne argues (2004, 228), walls allowed for an articulation of the beliefs and identity of urban centres through the enforcement of economic, social and political boundaries.

In 1559 the Bench instituted an annual search of Hull's wards for all the poor people 'suffered to beg' to assess whether they were able to work, with those judged able bodied to be either 'constrayned to worke or ells to be banyshed' (HCA BRB.2, 25r). By 1591 reference to the 'usuall repayre of the [poor] sorte of people' coming to reside within Hull 'to gayne such accustomed reliefe' resulted in the restriction of citizens leasing property to persons that were not approved of by the Bench. In April 1615 'the dailie resort of straingers...of some small abilitie' instituted the need for those people to provide sureties upon bonds of 20 li. that they would not be a burden to the town or were to leave within a month (HCA BRB.2, 268r; BRB.3, 42). Watches at the gates and within the wards were ordered in July 1623 to ensure that the 'great sorts of poore oute of the countree' did not enter on account of the dearth of employment available for the harvest, with any that had circumvented the gates to be 'conveyed out againe' (HCA

BRB.3, 115). The itinerant nature of those 'oute of the countree' did not mean only those residing within the environs of the town or even within Yorkshire, for by definition vagrants were geographically mobile (Sharpe 1999, 148). In 1577 the vagrant Thomas Murrion was 'whipped aboute' York then removed to Hampshire, and in 1629 John Strangues was whipped from the Council House in Hull to Beverley Gate as a 'vagrant wandring and disordered' person and provided with a pass to return to 'Chesterfeild the place where he last dwelt', over 72 miles away by modern road (HCA BRB.3, 202). Having been unable to give an account of 'his manner of lyvinge' and having 'travailed by a Counterfeit passe', James Anderson was whipped out of Hull as a wandering rogue to be sent back to Leith in Scotland in 1632 (HCA BRB.3, 297). By January 1661/62 poor 'straingers' had increased in Hull, 'getting habitacon in the back lanes', on account of the negligence of the constables to conduct monthly searches, leading the Bench to order that two aldermen would henceforth conduct the searches and report to 'the Justices' for the 'speedy removall' of those poor strangers (HCA BRB.4, 408). The Bench Book notes that in May 1690 Hull was 'at a very low ebb and much moneys [had] beene lately raised and paid by Assessments', a situation compounded by the unjustified relief being paid to strangers who had claimed settlement, resulting in increased taxes for citizens and the diverting of funds away from 'such as [were] Really poore' (HCA BRB.6, 258). As with earlier measures emphasis was placed on the conduct of searches and removing those persons out of the town back to their 'Last Lawfull Residence'.

Giles (2003, 334) argues that the treatment of the poor during the sixteenth century was not simply a direct result of the rise of Protestantism, but part of a long-term process of social, political and economic ideological change, resulting in the poor being regarded as a social threat and financial burden, rather than part of the civic community's spiritual and charitable functions. Gurnham (2011, 46 & 51-52) notes the correlation of poverty and sin within Hull's Puritan community that led to a distinction being drawn between the deserving and underserving poor. The phrase 'From Hull, Hell, and Halifax,

Good Lord deliver us' was first recorded in 1594 and highlights the attitude of civic governments toward vagrancy, with Hull garnering a particularly unforgiving reputation. Tittler (2001d, 154) argues that Puritanism should be understood, within the urban context, as a cultural construct that sought to provide effective civic order in response to challenges of the period, including the poor. Within Hull's records there is a distinction drawn between those who were able to work and those who could not, and so were deserving of charity, as well as not being a burden to its citizens through assessments (HCA BRB.6, 258). Sharpe (1999, 251-252) states that there was a criminalization of the poor during this period, leading to their transition 'from being God's poor to being the Devil's'. Yet civic indignation could also be shown towards those unwilling to pay towards poor relief within the town. In 1672 William Gauthorpe, a shop-owning burgess, threatened 'that if any came to distrain him' for a poor relief assessment he 'would cut off[f] their Leggs' and when threatened with imprisonment quipped 'if you comitt mee to Prison I shall sitt rent free' (HCA BRB.5, 312). Hindle & Kümin (2009, 168) describe each parish during this period as its own 'welfare republic', with individuals at a parochial level, as well as the corporate, playing a key role in the administration of the poor and local administration. In this sense the physical regulation of undesirables entering through the physical thresholds of the town or city into the parishes became essential for civic attempts to combat perceived economic and social pressures and threats (Hindle & Kümin 2009, 171-172).

Civic attempts to provide employment for the poor and so relieve the citizens of assessments were pursued throughout the period. These included York's St Anthony's Guild Hall being established as a house of correction for the poor in 1567 to spin linen (Giles, 2003, 335) and in the 1590's, Hull established the Charity Hall 'for the better maintenance, bringing up and setting on worke' to decrease the numbers of people begging (HCA BRB.2, 287r). In the 1570's Hull sought outside expertise through the engagement of two women from Doncaster 'to teach and instruct the poore...in knittinge', with the justification founded upon the duality of the poor being 'kept from

Idelnes and in tyme thinhabitantes thereby eased of some weakly charge' (HCA BRB.2, 179v). Later in 1631 the Bench negotiated with the woolcomber Peter Whittaker from Norwich 'about setting the poore in the Charity hall on worke', though having relocated to Hull he was discharged from that place in March 1633/34 and paid 10 li. in July 1634 for him and his family to 'quietly leave' and 'depte the towne' (HCA BRB.3, 254-256, 337 & 344). Within York a system of licensing beggars or 'badged and betokened paupers', allowed them to beg publicly for alms, but they were also significantly co-opted into performing watches (Giles 2003, 335). During the time of plague in June 1551 the master beggars of Micklegate Ward were to watch Ouse Bridge and ensure 'no beggars nor vysyted ffolke' crossed it, while in April 1557 they were to prevent begging and watch at the bars and posterns 'soo that no vacabonds or poore enter in' (YALH B20, 59r; B22, 60r). The last reference to a Head Beggar occurs in July 1569 when Simon Wedderell was dismissed from his position, and from henceforth only honest and substantial citizens were to be watchmen (YALH B24, 147r). The record notes that this was in response to the 'articles of Instruccions for that purpose latly sent frome the Quene an hir counsell', indicating a state-led reformation that was also contemporaneous with the increase of localised measures to dissuade begging and idleness. However, in their role as sanctioned master or head beggars those individuals would have been considered as operating a form of civic office (Hartshorne 2004, 228).

The rescinding of their civic roles implies a hardening of attitudes and a desire not to legitimise the poor through civic functions and quasi-officialdom. Yet, these persons had been charged to perform watches, safeguard the city and to regulate the perceived notions of economic, social and political boundaries through the defences. By April 1603, under the auspices of orders from the Privy Council, warrants were made 'to take up all Rogues and vagabonds and other idle masterles fellowes' and convey them to Hull to then be sent to fight in the 'lowe Countryes', for which 15 men were supplied from York in May of that year (YALH B32, 269v & 272r). Whilst beggars would no longer be permitted to guard the boundaries of the

city, clearly by 1603 they were regarded as a means of supplementing troop numbers, whilst helpfully reducing the burden on corporations to support undesirables. At Hull in January 1598/1599 several men were imprisoned during one of the habitual suppressions of the number of alehouses within the town (HCA BRB.2, 319r). Being burgesses of the town 'they had refused to give over alehouse keeping' and 'obstinately denied to become bound as law required'. After some time in prison they were called before the Bench and implored to yield, but stated that without their alehouses 'they could not lyve' and 'would rather lyve in prison then be at libtie to begg'. Those individuals clearly felt that incarceration was preferable to the civic retribution that was likely to have been meted out to them as beggars. The Bench acquiesced to their further imprisonment so as not to lessen the perceived willingness of the civic authorities to reprimand either the poor or lawbreakers.

The 'resident disorderly'

Hartshorne (2004, 217, 224 & 228) argues that the primary function of urban walls and gates was not to keep people in, but rather to explicitly deny entry to those who did not belong within them and affirm notions of a 'moral centre and the otherness of the margin'. Yet within the walls there were also 'the resident disorderly' (Sharpe 1999, 148) who could be considered undesirable and whose actions required corrective and public pillorying (Peters 2014, 104). The most public form this shaming could take was through the carting and whipping of individuals through the town and city. Within York the Council ordered in 1570 that 'the little carte...whiche was made for whipping of vacabonds' was to be permanently placed at Ouse Bridge, 'there to remayne for that purpose' (YALH B24, 218r). Ouse Bridge was the only means of crossing the River Ouse by land. It was the location of the Council Chamber in which the lord mayor and aldermen would convene, and attached to it was St William's Chapel, the civic prison, as well as numerous dwellings and shops, creating a focal point for local government, commerce and communication within the city (Mee & Wilson 2002b, 7, 49,

& 51-52). The bridge was demolished between 1810-18 (Mee & Wilson 2002b, 1), with Francis Place's 1703 drawing (Figure 106) providing the most reliable depiction of its appearance following its rebuilding during the sixteenth century (YALH B24, 44r-44v). To the right of the drawing is the Council House itself, and it is surrounded by multiple-storeyed and jettied buildings. Although today the area is unremarkable, in the later seventeenth century it was the centre of corporate power within the city. If the walls served to define the parameters of a defined moral centre, then it was in the Council House on Ouse Bridge that those morals were propagated and reinforced at the corporate level.

In May 1555 the offence perpetrated by William Hosyar and others tended to the security of the city and warranted the attention of the Privy Council (YALH B21, 91r-91v). Hosyar had been born in Lincoln but relocated to York 'to seeke service and inhabite' and had married the widow Agnes Watson. On the 11th May he had been 'makyng mery and drynkyng' with several persons and a servant at the house of Tristram Lytstor in the centre of the city. Around 9 o'clock in the evening two of his companions decided to fetch a 'gyderon', possibly a form of game derived from 'giddy gaddy' (<http://www.oed.com/>), from a house outside of the walls near Layerthorpe Postern. Finding the postern locked they went to Monk Bar that was also locked but unmanned, and 'see yng a light in an hows went through an entrie and there ffounde all the watchemen aslepe and [possessing] the keyes of the barres there toke theym away'. Having unlocked the gate and let themselves out to retrieve the 'gyderon' they then returned via Stonegate and Coney Street back to the house. Subsequently there was then a dispute as to what to do with the stolen keys of the bars, with Hosyar coming to be singled out as 'the principall procurer of theym to goe forth abrode that night' once brought before the Council. The seriousness of the offence is demonstrated by the punishment being referred to the Recorder, as the city's legal advisor (Forster 1969, 125-126), who 'wold move it first to the kinge and quenes consell'. Hosyar's status as a non-freeman is likely to have contributed to his solely carrying the blame, thereby providing a scapegoat

and absolving York's citizens and thereby the Council for negligence, for it was he who was to be treated as a vagabond, 'wypped [about] the towne at a cart ars, And banasshed'. The public nature of Hosyar's whipping and carting would have sought to deter such actions in the future. For the Recorder to have recourse to consult with the Privy Council highlights the seriousness afforded to the custodianship of the keys. However, the dereliction of the watch in allowing themselves to be hoodwinked and the ease with which the defences could be made permeable also reveals the more common mind-set of some York citizens that they felt it acceptable and possible to circumvent the locking of the gates. No doubt these citizens would have been familiar to those on watch and with the administration of the gates, allowing for the defences to be understood as an integral and everyday aspect of York's urban population.

The perambulation of York's cartings and the imposition of public castigation upon the main civic spaces of the city was outlined in 1561 for the punishment of John Jackson and his mistress, he being a 'maryed man and keyng a drabbe besyds his honest wif...taken in adultery to the great displeasure of almighty god and evell example of lyke disposed psones' (YALH B23, 13v). The processional route of the cart began in the south of the city at The Priory Church of the Holy Trinity, then along the major thoroughfare of Micklegate, over Ouse Bridge past the Council House, along Coney Street, Stonegate and west to Bootham Bar, turning eastwards along Petergate to the Pavement, over Foss Bridge to Walmgate Bar, at which point the 'drabbe' was expelled from the city and Jackson was conveyed back to prison, all the while two men were 'to goe before the carte ryngyng twoe basyngs' (YALH B23, 13v). This route served to ensure that all of the major civic spaces of the city would be traversed for their public shaming, as well as the perceived contrast of the moral centre and dubious edges of the city, as defined by its gates (Hartshore 2004, 224). Gowing (2000, 141) argues that while involving men and women, this form of public shaming was 'a typically female progress of dishonour', requiring women to often be naked and carrying symbols or items to denote their offence. Within York

there are no references to women being naked, while the use of whippings and cartings does not appear to have been disproportionately applied to women. A concentration of whippings and cartings are noted to have occurred between May 1580 and July 1582, primarily tending toward 'petie bribery' and adultery, again with an emphasis on the peripheral edges of the city being at the bars (YALH B27, 236v, 264r; B28, 7v, 15r & 56v).

In December 1586 several persons were to be whipped 'about the Cittye' for theft and then to be tied to manacles that were set at the bars (YALH B29, 153v-154r). An emphasis on sexual transgressions and theft requiring correction by whipping and carting continues intermittently throughout the period (YALH B30, 300r; B32, 150v, 375r; B33, 64v; B35, 33r, 35v, 36r, 49v, 50v, 72r, 80v, 86v), as well as for drunkenness and slander (YALH B33, 161r, 310v). The last recorded carting occurred in June 1631 and largely adhered to the previously established route when Alice Busbre, 'for her off[ence] in playing the who[r]e', was led from the Kidcote prison on Ouse Bridge to Bootham Bar and then over to Walmgate Bar (YALH B35, 109v). In 1635/36 two vagabonds of Hull were apprehended, but notably they were 'whipt privately' within the House of Correction and were to return to Hull, while two beggars of Richmond were publicly whipped at Bootham Bar and expelled (YALH B35, 294v). The relative preferment bestowed on the beggars of Hull infers a respect toward Hull's citizenry, and by proxy their corporation, which was not accorded to other non-citizens. The Bench in Hull was also able to differentiate between its own citizens and non-citizens. In June 1565 Isabelle West and her husband Thomas were found guilty of extorting money from the London merchant Francis Showerde, by means of a well practiced routine (HCA BRB.2, 55r, 55v & 59r). Isabelle had 'nouwghtylie and most dishonestlie' enticed Showerde back to her house on the pretext her husband would not be there, when in fact he was hiding 'behinde a painted clothe in there bedde chamber' and once Isabelle and Showerde were in bed Thomas proceeded to threaten the unsuspecting Showerde with a dagger, who 'was forced for avoiding the hurt of his bodie' to surrender 3 li. 4 s. The Bench adjudged that the Wests were 'no fit

members to dwell and remaine in any well ordered [common] welthe' so were disenfranchised, imprisoned and were to be carted through the town with paper hats on their heads and banished. The severity of the punishment meted out by the Bench is testament to their determination that such actions be 'rowted owt' as if 'weades' (HCA BRB.2, 55r). The Londoner and victim Showerde, for having consented to the advances of Isabelle, was imprisoned for two days and ordered to relinquish 26 s. 8 d. for the use of the poor, but was at least spared a public reprimand, which a citizen of Hull he would otherwise have had to submit to. Likewise in March 1628/29 the Londoner and miner Robert Cosens was excused from a carting for fornication with a 'notorious Queane' owing to 'he being but a stranger' (HCA BRB.3, 194).

Compared to York there are far fewer recorded instances of the Bench ordering public cartings within Hull at the aldermanic level. Of those recorded, such as the West's in 1565, there is likewise an emphasis on sexual transgressions, as when in November 1620 four unidentified women who had 'ben faltie for basterds' were to be 'caryed in carte aboute the towne' and within their wards 'duncked in the water for their [faults]' (HCA BRB.3, 83). Two instances of illegitimate children in 1578 had resulted in the Bench simply fining the fathers 40 s. and 20 s. respectively, with no form of public chastisement and emphasis clearly on the male transgressors (HCA BRB.2, 192r & 202v). Yet, in the same year the glazier Edmond Thompson had conceived a child with his unnamed 'woman servant', the record noting that she had committed the offence 'by his allowement and great [enticement]' (HCA BRB.2, 191r). In promising to raise the child and paying the mother 3 li. for the 'greate hurte' Thompson had done her, the Bench would spare him being whipped but would order him to 'ride in a carte abowte [the] towne'. However, by the May of that year Thompson had reneged on his promises and was committed to prison until he had fulfilled the Bench's orders, though it is not recorded if he ever did so (HCA BRB.2, 191v). For the same offence three years later in January 1581/82, the Bench did not order a fine to be paid but rather sought to induce moral and social

correction. The reputed father, Henry Wakewood, was to provide 10 d. a week toward the child's mother and absolve the ward of any relief, with the added caveat that if he were to marry the mother this punishment would be 'deffered', with failure to do so resulting in being whipped on the market day (HCA BRB.2, 226v). Peters (2014, 84-85) argues that often the fathers of illegitimate children were not identified during this period, resulting in a gendered imbalance of prosecutions within the records. Yet, within Hull at least there is a strong moral castigation against those fathers at the corporate level within the Bench Books. There was no prescribed form of punishment, with the Bench holding discretionary powers to deter immoral behaviour, a feature that was aided by the devolvement of authority from the state church.

Gurnham (2011, 48) argues that in 1574 the Archbishop of York, Edmund Grindall, had written to the Bench supporting their efforts against 'abominable and heinous crimes', in what would otherwise have been matters reserved to the church courts. Under two subsequent Archbishops in 1582 and 1599, the Bench and its magistrates were granted and delegated the powers of an ecclesiastical commission to combat 'the gross immoralities of the times' (Gurnham 2011, 48). This would accord with the generally increasing delegation of civic autonomy and additional regulatory powers to be enforced at a local level during the early modern period (Tittler 2007b, 97-101; Harding 2000, 263; Hindle & Kümin 2009, 153 & 168). Undoubtedly this would also have been felt throughout the Church of England's Province of York and not been confined to Hull. Yet, given that the Archbishop had written to the Bench in 1574 to commend their efforts, this allows for the inference that civic authorities were already pursuing their own moralistic agendas by that time. Therefore, the ecclesiastical authorities may have been attempting to align themselves with the moral regulatory activities of corporations (Peters 2014, 84). In conjunction with corporations, ecclesiastical courts and the panoply of other forms of justice, were the Assize Courts and Quarter Sessions. The Assizes were constituted by two commissioned judges of the superior courts of common law

conducting bi-annual circuits around the country. Their remit encompassed enforcing central government regulations, supervision of local government, trials of regulatory offences, presentments from local law officials and capital punishment (Sharpe 1999, 32 & 33). The Quarter Sessions were primarily concerned with petty offences, misdemeanours and regulatory offences (Sharpe 1999, 33) and often the Council or Bench will note that an individual was 'to appear at next Sessions' (HCA BRB.3, 292). Courts and institutions below the level of the state, the church and corporations included the Wardmote Courts, whose remit pertained to enforcing regulations at a ward level and would also have pursued this moralistic agenda. Hartshorne's (2004, 11 & 23) research on the Wardmote Courts of York, during the late medieval and early modern period, reveals their concerns toward the enforcement of social and physical issues of the community's environment; how the streets were used, their maintenance, citizen's behaviour and issues of nuisance, as judged by a panel of local jurors.

One example would tend to the issue of domestic violence by a spouse within a neighbourhood, highlighting that it was a public rather than a private matter (Gowing 2000, 134). In February 1612/13 John Rauke was imprisoned for beating his wife 'to the disquieties and disturbance of his neighbours' in Hull (HCA BRB.3, 29). Records of such instances within the supra-urban Bench and House Books reinforce this notion of public rather than private concerns, which at times could necessitate the involvement of higher civic offices and the enforcement of castigation outside of locally convened institutions. Edward Macham's attack upon his wife in Hull with a rapier in February 1633/34 highlights this (HCA BRB.3, 335). Whilst the attack on his wife merited reprimanding he had also, in the course of being restrained, attempted to stab a constable, 'hurt dyvers other men who were called in aide of the Constables', as well as having claimed that the then mayor would have been hung several years ago 'had it not bene but for the said Machams father'. Not only had he abused his wife but also by physically attacking civic officials and insulting the mayor, he had thereby undermined

civic authority. This had also been evident with the actions of Joshua Dewley in 1620 with reference to his oath as a burgess (HCA BRB.3, 71). George Brathwate had abused his wife and insulted the aldermen of York through 'lewde behaviour and speches' in August 1598 (YALH B31, 373v). On this occasion the Council sought not only to castigate Brathwate but also ordered that 'he shall not passé away his lease nor goods from his wif and children', lest they then become destitute and the responsibility of the city to maintain, nor that he be allowed to resort to alehouses. Encapsulated within these examples are the issues and negotiation of violence, alcoholism, destitution, poor relief and civic authority. This thesis has concentrated on the actions of corporations from the archival record, but the verdicts passed by the Council and Bench during this period did not operate within a vacuum. It is important to recognise that they were part of a hierarchy of constituted courts for the enforcement of law (Sharpe 1999, 39) and prescribed forms of civic behaviour.

In the pursuit of the law and apprehending offenders, a system known as Hue and Cry could be enacted. Though seldom recorded within either Hull or York's Bench or House Books, it would appear to have been a widely recognised means for the pursuit and capture of a criminal. In November 1575 York's bailiff was to 'prosecute hewe and crye' following the credible report of a murder 'nere the water of Ouse' (YALH B26, 41r). As part of this order the wardens and aldermen of the four wards were to collect from all of the inns the names of those in residence the night before. Later in November 1580 the physical utilisation of the defences during a Hue and Cry are revealed. On this occasion the posterns were to be locked and four watchmen were set at each bar while a search for three felons in grey cloaks was conducted (YALH B27, 260r). The city was put into a state of lockdown, potentially inconveniencing the local population and relying on their cooperation and information to help apprehend such individuals. The apprehension of Michael Hatherwicke by Hue and Cry in 1633, within the walled town of Beverley, resulted in that town's authorities sending him to York Castle for trial (HCA BRB.3, 313). Following an inquest by the Coroner

that had found Hatherwicke guilty of a murder within Hull, the Bench was seeking a writ for him to be conveyed back to Hull for trial. This highlights the corporation's desire to pursue and assert its own jurisdictional powers of justice, as well as the convention for walled towns and cities to utilise their defences for the apprehension of criminals. No doubt this practice was put into execution far more regularly than is attested to within the Bench or House Books.

As well as harnessing urban defences for the practical and urgent apprehension of criminals, the pre-emptive measures taken by corporations against their citizens was alluded to previously by the duties of Hull's porter on Sabbath days (HCA BRB.2, 366v). In June 1607 York's Council instituted a stricter watch to prevent 'wandring and rogueishly idle psons' entering the city, yet also ordered that at prescribed times on the Sabbath days the watch was not to allow any citizens to leave the city into the suburbs around the town, in the same vein as Hull (YALH B33, 75r). However, by April 1615 the Council was explicit in identifying 'the meaner sort of people' who, rather than attend divine service, were frequenting alehouses outside of the city (YALH B34, 58r). In response, watches were posted at all of the bars and Layerthorpe Postern, with the remaining posterns locked, and no one was to be permitted to leave the city 'but upon earnest occasion'. By February 1615/16 this policy had failed as it was noted that the 'Shutting in of the gaits did not at all restrayne the worsor sort of the cittye for goeing abroad...to ailhowses' and had inconvenienced visitors to York (YALH B34, 87r-87v). In spite of the seemingly endemic failure to prevent citizens leaving during services, it was resolved that the 'act should remayn' in force and that further watches were to be posted during Lent according to House Row. In 1593 Hull correlated the proliferation of alehouses as directly contributing to 'dyvers disorders' in which citizens were 'wholy betaken...to that idle kinde of lyving alluring and drawing others to passe their time...in play and drinking' (HCA BRB.2, 283r). This was argued to have led to the abandonment of trades and the 'impoverishing of manie and to the great increase and maintenance of Idlenes, disorder and offences and sundrie and

manie other inconveniences' incurring the ire of the 'preachers of the word of god'.

Issues related to the excesses of alcohol permeate throughout this period. In 1593 the Bench ordered that all alehouses were to be assessed and those deemed unfit were to be closed, with any persons disobeying the order to have 'their signes pulled downe', be imprisoned and fined 'wthout any [mitigation] or favour' (HCA BRB.2, 283r). Young men and apprentices were noted to 'keepe evill rule' at alehouses in 1658, with the same form of intemperate language applied when the Bench sought to prohibit its citizens from attending 'ungodlie and wicked' plays with threats of fining in 1599 (HCA BRB.4, 278; BRB.2, 325v) and the Christmas festivities of 1573 (Gurnham 2011, 47). Hartshorne (2004, 28) argues that such orders and surviving documentary evidence tending to the regulation of public space, and thereby behaviour, provide a perception of early modern life, rather than the reality. In this regard there was a civically-driven perception that citizens should abstain from the alehouse, the viewing of plays and were to attend divine services. Clearly the reality was that some sections of society circumvented prescribed forms of civic behaviour, duty and the practical measures instituted by the civic authorities, such as locking the gates. Sharpe (1999, 207) writes of the law during this period as an ideology that was harnessed for 'curbing humankind's disorderly passions and thus preserving the body politic', the success of which was predicated upon the majority of the population subscribing to that ideology and the authority of civic governments. Heijden's (2012, 179) argument for the notion of civic activism within the administration of early modern governance, primarily tending to official offices, can also be applied across the civic strata of the population in adhering to and reinforcing that administration and prescribed forms of behaviour. At no time was this more apparent than during the frequent outbreaks of the plague and the pivotal role that urban defences played at these times.

The plague

Throughout the early modern period the plague, or simply the threat thereof, was the most common form of mortality (Healy 2001, 54). By this period it is argued that it had become largely an 'urban scourge' (Clark 2000, 7) and one that could be considered a local rather than a national experience (Rawcliffe 2013, 3 & 67). The epidemic of 1603/05 is estimated to have reduced York's population, thought to have fluctuated between 8,000 and 12,000 over the period (Palliser 1982a, 78), by up to 40% (Mee & Wilson 2005a, 23). At the corporate level in 1625/26 the Council had derived over 55% of its rental income from the leasing of tenements (Figure 114). Yet during the outbreaks of plague for the years 1631/32 and 1634/35 this had dropped to 29% and 31% (Figures 115-116), inferring the decline in a source of revenue from a declining population. With such high mortality rates it is unsurprising that corporations attempted to enact local measures to combat the plague, with urban defences deployed as a physical bulwark against infection.

Healy (2001, 3) argues that beyond economic and mortality considerations, the plague also engendered political responses and provided an opportunity for the 'intervention into the lives of others' and 'for the re-ordering of bodies'. Healy's hypothesis works on the rationale that urban society or a corporation functioned as a single organic body, whereby the prosperity, health and moral fortitude of individuals could directly impact upon the wider citizenry, merging the concerns of personal and public 'seamlessly in one simple physiological metaphor' (Rawcliffe 2013, 52). In 1543 the Privy Council stated that rather than simply 'corruption of the air', infection was further spread by the failure of individuals and corporations to impose personal discipline upon themselves and provide charity; Healy (2001, 54) argues that this represented a Protestant mind-set that emphasised the need for individual bodily discipline to then symbiotically protect the corporate body. Within the previously addressed concerns of undesirables entering a town or city and unruly citizens residing within, the effectiveness

of the law required the majority of the populace to subscribe and adhere to ideology and authority. At times of crisis and pandemics this was even more pronounced for the effective safeguarding of the urban body, dependent as it was upon the actions of individuals as both civic office holders and citizens. It also served to heighten pre-existing tensions that coalesced around the measures to be implemented (Gurnham 2011, 51).

The measures instituted by York's Council, from July 1563 through to 1564, typify those that were undertaken to combat the plague. These included: banning the lodging of persons from places known to be infected with a fine of 10 li. or banishment for contravention; an increased watch at the bars to oversee the ban on importing 'any clothe or wares', punishable by imprisonment; the watch was not to allow any 'stranger or vacabund' to enter the city without assurances that they had not come from an infected area; as well as the constables of the wards were to ensure that the streets and channels were 'cleane swepte and censed wth watir' and that all refuse was to be removed twice a week, with failure again resulting in imprisonment (YALH B23, 106r, 120v & 145r). Near identical orders were made in October 1588, with the added restriction placed upon citizens that they were not to attend a fair at the market town of Howden (YALH B30, 347v-348r). Just as there was a generalised attempt during this period to regulate the entry of the poor and undesirables, at times of plague there was an equation drawn between restricting persons from infected places and all rogues vagabonds, beggars and even 'soldyers' in 1598, presumably in light of the perceived itinerancy of such persons (YALH, B31, 336v). During an outbreak of plague at Hull in November 1575 and the danger and peril it posed to the town's commonwealth, specific orders were made to restrict the movement of 'ye poore people in the stretes' and prohibiting them going 'ffrom doore to doore begginge' (HCA BRB.2, 138v). Any persons found begging were to be imprisoned and would lose their 'weekely aide or benevolence', with the assessments made for the relief of the poor and infected to be used to sustain them within their own homes. This measure

would have served to relieve the sick and also limit the likelihood of the infection spreading.

Clearly on this occasion Hull's precautions and walls had not prevented the plague from entering the town. Yet once known to be evident within the walls, attempts were made to quarantine the sickness within specific areas. 'ffor ye better saiftie and preservacon of the bodie' of the town it was ordered that at either end of Blackfriar Gate street two gates or doors were to be erected and an honest and discreet keeper appointed to man them (HCA BRB.2, 139r-140v). Rawcliffe (2013, 33) argues that such examples of quarantines created social division, were commercially disruptive and difficult to enforce. The efficacy of a single individual, Richard Long, as keeper of the street is doubtful. Five ordinances were stipulated for his duties, such as manning the gates at all times, to forbear any infected persons from attending any 'comon assembly' or remove bedding and to assist in the bi-weekly removal of the residents refuse (HCA BRB.2, 140r-140v). However, he was also to allow non-infected residents to leave and return if they had 'necessary occasion', to unlock the gates for them to remove or receive large items such as beer barrels, all the while deporting 'him selfe towardses them wth [courteous] and gentle words and [behaviour]'. The potential social implications of quarantine are inferred by the ordinance that any persons contravening the measures 'for the saiftie of the hole towne', by either word or deed, would be made known to the Bench for punishment. It was clearly recognised that the attempted confinement of an entire street may well have led to the fraying of civic relations.

A petition from September 1605 for recompense by a resident of St Marygate suburb outside of Bootham Bar provides one such example (YALH B32, 372v). Margaret Owthwaite and her neighbours had congregated around the Bar during the 'late vistacon' of the plague for some form of relief, yet the record notes that the inhabitants of St Marygate 'were verie disorderous and wold not be kepte in by the watchmen when the same street was sore infected'. Within the walls the residents of Bootham Ward,

‘greatlie trobled and putt in great feare’ by the assembly of potentially infected persons, petitioned the lord mayor that they be subdued, for which the ‘statute for ordering psons infected’ was read aloud to the congregating suburbanites. Continuing to be ‘disorderous’ and with the watch and constables calling for assistance, Leonard Baits, a servant to alderman Jackson, arrived with a loaded gun and proceeded to discharge it into the air to frighten and disperse them. The shot in fact hit Margaret Owthwaite in the head and she ‘had her [senses] perished’. The Council found that Baits was in no way liable to recompense the injuries she sustained, but in light of her poverty the Council would provide her with relief from the town’s funds; whether or not this was fulfilled may be gleaned by the fact that the sum to be accorded Owthwaite was notably left blank within the House Books. Whilst the record notes that the incident was disordered, it could more appropriately be deemed a riot and had socially and physically divided the city between those within and without the walls.

Hartshorne (2004, 222-223) notes that the measures enacted to combat the spread of infection physically designated the walls as the first line of defence and demarcated the public space that was to be protected. At these times those suburbs and citizens outside of the city walls were physically and perceptibly excluded during moments of crisis from those within. Eight measures were ordered and detailed in July 1603 when the plague was noted to be prevalent in London, Westminster and Newcastle upon Tyne (YALH B32, 279r), and it was not until August 1605, when the infection appears to have sufficiently abated, that the supplementary watches at the bars were withdrawn (YALH B32, 369v). Therefore for almost two years York’s Council and citizenry had attempted to combat infection and protect the civic body, which in this instance justified the exclusion of those residents without the walls, such as Margaret Owthwaite, for the preservation of the majority. Even if walls had been unable to prevent plague from entering the city, as had occurred likewise at Hull in 1575, they still provided a tangible, proactive and palliative means to focus efforts and rally civic motivations. In the same month as Owthwaite’s petition, two

watchmen of Monk Bar lobbied for wages owing to them 'before the late visitacon' that should have been paid from the customary means of parish collections. However, 'the constables who shold have gathered the same [were] nowe dead', presumably from the plague, and it was impossible to ascertain what funds had been collected (YALH B32, 373v). The Council agreed to pay 10 s., with the remainder to be collected 'of such [parishes] and of suche psons as are of right to paye the same'. These two watchmen may have continued their duty to watch in spite of receiving no payment, whilst with the death of civic officers in the line of duty York had also lost integral links within its systems of administration. Clearly following two years of high mortality rates, quarantine and civic agitation, features applicable to the aftermath of any period of infection or crisis, corporations needed to recommence traditional forms of civic governance. Rawcliffe (2013, 70) notes that incidents of plague would have left indelible 'scars upon the collective psyche'. At the first sign of intelligence for the presence of plague at other locales in January 1606/07 and July 1610 (YALH B33, 47r & 206r) and thereafter, as historically they had always had recourse to do, the Council firstly set about strengthening the walls through increased watches at the defined perimeter of the bars and posterns.

Contemporaneously Hull appears to have been unscathed by the outbreak of 1603 to 1605, though York's Council did stipulate in August 1603 that any citizen going to Hull would be denied re-entry for a period of twenty days, intimating at least the perceived threat of infection (YALH B32, 283r). July 1603 appears to have engendered an opportunity (Healy 2001, 3) for a moral, as well as a precautionary response from the Bench. Watches at the gates were increased by 'eight sufficient howseholders' to prohibit the entry of those from infected places and the usual 'Idle psons and vagrants' (HCA BRB.2, 348v). Yet the overriding emphasis is upon the banning of citizens, of whatever status and including servants and apprentices, from attending the 'pernicious' multitude of alehouses and the likelihood of any infection spreading by the 'assemblies and companies of others...to the hurte and infecting of the whole inhabitantes'. The fine for contravention was set at 2

s. 6 d. with non-payment resulting in imprisonment, whilst for servants and apprentices they would be specifically incarcerated for six days and nights. However, only a month later and in light of increased danger, the measures undertaken by the Bench were widened to include the potentially economically ruinous prohibition of receiving goods, except soap, oil, iron and steel and only if they had first been aired and washed outside of the town for twenty-four hours (HCA BRB.2, 349v-350r). For non-citizens and citizens alike the fine for violating the order was 40 li., with default of payment for the former demanding the sequestration of their goods and imprisonment for six months, while the latter could result in an individual being imprisoned and disenfranchised.

The exorbitant level of the fine, coupled with the threat of disenfranchisement, highlights the Bench's desire to convey the seriousness of endangering the civic populace for individual advantage. Instances of plague prevention are not further recorded within the Bench Books until September 1624, with the population of 5,000 to 6,000 witnessing steady growth (Gurnham 2011, 56), but the collective memory of the town in 1603 would have recalled the outbreak of the 1570's. Following the abatement of that outbreak the Bench conspired to manipulate the market and price of wheat and rye in November 1577, when prices were expected to be 'very deare' (HCA BRB.2, 178r). Owing to the town's funds being depleted following the plague, individual aldermen were 'required to lende' money for the purchase of corn, explicitly so that '[death] may be avoided and the [scarcity] pvided for'. Instances of civic unrest, as had occurred at York during the plague of 1603 to 1605, are likely to have made corporations ever watchful and civically motivated to ameliorate the repercussions of plague outbreaks. In 1577 the personal resources of Hull's aldermen facilitated this amelioration and were indicative of a benevolent elite, conscious of the potential threats to their citizenry, as well as potentially to civic order and authority.

Yet, the conduct of civic officials and citizens during outbreaks of the plague undermined notions of a civically minded society in which personal and public concerns were interwoven. This was particularly evident in York during 1603 to 1605, as well as at both case studies when protracted outbreaks occurred during the 1630's. At York from June to July 1604 and in May 1631 (YALH B32, 339r-341r; B35, 107v), letters were written to aldermen who had fled the city and they reveal the sense of crisis, even panic, which gripped civic governments:

'the infection doth so greatlie increase in this cittye that unlesse we the Magistrates have great care and do take paines in the governing and ruling of this Cittye and in takeinge order for the releivyng of them, the poore sorte will not be ruled, which wilbe a great discredit unto us' (YALH B32, 340r)

In the same month it was noted that the majority of the sheriffs and:

'most of the Chamberlaynes and Constables...are gone forth of the Cittye abrode into the contrie in this time of visitacon and by reason of ther office and place ought most especiallie above all others here remayne and abide and to doe suche things as belonge unto ther severall offics and placs for the good government of this Cittye in this time of visitacon...[they] shall make there presente repaire to the citty and to remayne' (YALH B32, 340v)

If appeals to civic duty would not induce the office-holders to return then financial penalties ranging from 100 li. to 20 li. were established for each negligent office. The lord mayor wrote to alderman Besson in May 1631 and likewise sought to appeal to his sense of duty, noting that 'wee should have had yow heare psent to have borne your part which seeing yow have hitherto forborne to doe', with the lord mayor imploring him 'to make [his] repaire hither to ease us of som part of the burthen' (YALH B35, 107v). Unspecified actions to constrain him to return were reluctantly warned of, though it was hoped that the letter would be sufficient to compound Besson to do 'what is required'. The severity of this outbreak engendered the intervention of the President of the Council in the North and Earl of Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, with eleven measures for the Council to

enact (YALH B35, 116r). In practice these measures reiterated the precautions that the Council traditionally enacted, though with added restrictions placed on the movements of citizens, whippings to be propagated for disobedience and the establishment of structures on the outskirts of the city for 'the meaner sort of people and those suspected of being sick'. Whilst offering condolences that 'the sicknesse hath sett foote within the walles', the President made it clear to the Council that failure to act would not only offend 'god and the publique, but [that] the blood of these men be required at your hands wch yow shall suffer thorow your retchesnesse' (YALH B35, 117r). In December 1637 it was noted that Hull's mayor had succumbed to the plague, thus necessitating and providing an opportunity for letters to be written to three absconded aldermen 'now beinge in the Countrey to desire them to make present repaire' for the election of a new mayor; clearly aldermanic desertion at times of crisis was a common feature of civic administration. Significantly during this outbreak, the Bench Books reveal that the aldermen who remained had removed themselves from within the medieval walls and taken refuge within the Henrician Castle, thereby for a time the Henrician Castle was the epicentre of civic government (HCA BRB.3, 441). The location of the Bench on the other side of the River Hull, removed from its traditional siting, would surely not have gone unnoticed by Hull's citizens, particularly considering the concomitant construction of the New Council House within the centre of town.

Significantly during the majority of the 1630's, with the ever present and documented threat of plague outbreaks, the Bench continued to fund the work of the new Council House from March 1632 under John Catlin (HCA BRB.3, 279, 304 & 313-314). Yet by June 1638 and following the latest outbreak of the plague, the records note that 'tradinge wthin [the] Towne was soe decayed and soe small or noe implymt for laborers' that 2,500 persons, perhaps almost half of the population, 'had fallen to [penury]' and the Bench was requesting aid, contributions and 'voluntary benevolences' from persons and corporations within Yorkshire (HCA BRB.3, 475). Tittler

(2001d, 60-61; 2007b, 105) identifies that from 1540-1640 almost half of all English towns either converted or newly built civic common halls, whose construction was often related to the acquisition of a charter or greater powers. Commensurate with the construction of Hull's new Council House and the outbreaks of plague was the suit brought by the state in 1634 against the town for its perceived neglect in maintaining the fortifications, which was only rescinded in 1639 (Forster 1969 100; Allison 1969, 415). Tittler (1998c, 256-257) further argues that during this period there is no correlation between the availability of a corporations monetary resources and their decision to implement large-scale civic building projects. The Bench's desire to finish building work in October 1636 (HCA BRB.3, 374), in spite of the threat of plague and evident financial predicaments, was a tacit rebuttal to the state's suit, wrought through the physical construction of the Council House for the projection and legitimization of its civic authority (Tittler 2007b, 105-106). However, locally and within a context of economic privation and plague, the expending of large sums on the aggrandisement of the Council House may have undermined Hull's citizens' deference and acquiescence toward the project.

The emphasis on the culpability of corporations at these times was demonstrated in York when a Richard Atkinson had received 'one of mr Alder[man] Lawnes' into his home in September 1631; two of Lawnes' children were also received into the house of a fellow alderman, Mr Greenburg, with them having entered from the suburbs outside of Walmgate Bar where plague was present (YALH B35, 117v-118r). As aldermen both Lawnes and Greenburg would have taken part in directing efforts to contain the outbreak as members of the Council. With the upper echelons of the corporation contravening efforts to implement regulations for the safety of those not infected, it is easy to comprehend how the whole Council's moral and civic authority could be compromised. Atkinson even chastised the lord mayor and those remaining aldermen within the city when brought before them, exclaiming 'that they had brought a great scandal of the citty and that he could governe as well as any of them and that he could have done

wiselyer himselfe' (YALH B35, 118r). That same month and lower down the rung of civic offices, the constable of Micklegate, Francis Cotton, was subjected to abuse in the course of trying to keep residents in at night, when Francis Laycock stated 'he cared not for him a fart...and also bidd a fart for my Lord maior and his brethren an yf he meddled wth him he wold thrust his knife in him' (YALH B35, 118v). Clearly civic disquiet could be levelled at all levels of the administration with unashamed candour, a reflection of both the poor and powerful being subjected to castigation, such as through the Wardmote Court presentments in which aldermen were amongst the most prolific offenders (Hartshorne 2004, 76 & 251). This public form of castigation was therefore applicable across the social spectrum within the myriad of differing court systems, including the aldermanic court of the Council, regardless of rank in the pursuance and reinforcement of prescribed forms of civic behaviour and duty.

The responsibility for preventing infection from entering the city was placed on the ability of those charged to watch the gates. By 1597 the Council stipulated that only 'substanciall psons' were to watch in the stead of 'such simple watchemen as heretofor' had been (YALH B31, 277r). If any of these more substantial, 'sufficient and discreet' persons were to refuse to watch or found to be negligent, they were to either be fined or imprisoned (YALH B31, 277r & 283v). In Hull the qualities required of the watchmen in September 1631 included persons who could 'both write and read' and were of 'good discrecon' (HCA BRB.3, 263). The ability to read and write reflected the convention of providing certificates testifying that a person had travelled from a place free of infection, the administration of which was outlined in June 1638 (HCA BRB.3, 479). In March 1638/39 the Recorder of York was to be consulted about how to proceed against soldiers who had been counterfeiting 'false passes' (YALH B36, 6r), which may provide one means as to how people evaded gate restrictions. For Hug (2009, 225 & 229) evidence of forged documents during this period reveals the nebulous nature of officialdom, to the extent forged papers were in and of themselves able to bestow legitimate authority and allowed for the manipulation of

institutional practices. In September 1631 Anthony Kyrle had been able to persuade the watchmen to allow three persons within the town without such certificates to the 'Contempt of the government' (HCA BRB.3, 264). As with alderman Lawnes' family at York and Kyrle in Hull, they had possibly colluded with the watchmen to circumvent their respective gates and urban defences.

Once plague was manifest within the city, either by the failure of precautionary measures or simply misfortune, the Council published and affixed to the city gates and other central locations, in 'view of all Citizens and other passingers', medicines and detailed remedies 'pscribed by learned and approved phisicians' to combat the infection (YALH B31, 120r-120v). Clearly the gates provided a public means of ensuring that such practical medicinal advice and prescriptions, however likely or not to provide a cure, would be seen by as many persons as possible and publicly testify that the Council was aware of the plight of its citizens. Between 1486 and 1604 twenty-three self-help guides to treat the plague had been published (Healy 2001, 54). It is possible the Council had recourse to harness such a publication for the provision of a literary bulwark to its citizens against the plague.

Those performing watches were often not professionally employed, unlike Hull's porter or York's Bar keepers, but rather participated as part of their prescribed civic duty. In Hull every householder was to watch within their ward 'as his turne shall fall out...in there owne psons', with those unable or refusing to then be obliged to pay for another in there stead, which in 1631 was levelled at 2 s; this had decreased to 6 d. by January 1632/33 and when the watch was ceased in January 1634/35, with the plague having abated, it was noted that 'the Inhabitants thinke themselves much burdened' through watching (HCA BRB.3, 259-260 & 303). Earlier in 1596 the Bench had proclamations read aloud at parish churches reaffirming the duty of citizens to watch 'to the ende no one may [pretend] ignorance' (HCA BRB.2, 303r). Within York a threat of a 5 li. fine was threatened for those refusing to

watch, while those who were performing the watch were to be restrained from 'excessive drinking at the barrs' (YALH B35, 306v). Unlike York, Hull's Bench repeatedly reiterated within the Bench Books that citizens were to either watch in person or 'pay [for] the hyre of a watchmen', with those refusing to be imprisoned and a fine taken by means of a distress of their possessions (HCA BRB.3, 28, 259-260 & 303; BRB.2, 317v). Several examples brought before the Bench attest to citizens refusing to fulfil their expected duties that often included abuse being meted out to officials (HCA BRB.3, 28, 292, 701).

In December 1645 Helen Meering had refused to pay 6 d. for a watchman to replace her husband (HCA BRB.3, 701). Given the context of the Civil War, the two earlier sieges of the town and the prevalence of the plague that year, she responded to the constable when threatened to be brought before the mayor: 'mr Maior and you are all one, you may collegue together and doe what you will...you had best come againe and take a stresse for [the fine], and then you will be right Cavalleers'. All these instances involved either the verbal or physical abuse of officials, and by proxy the Bench itself, or as with Meering's Royalist slur the questioning of the corporation's integrity, thus warranting the attention of the Bench. Given the proclivity of reiterating the right of constables to distress peoples' goods, no doubt this convention was often implemented at the local level, and conversely many citizens most likely conducted their civic duty without incident. What counted was that watches were conducted and that the Bench was seen to publicly admonish those who contradicted civic duty. In August 1631 York's citizens were, according to 'antient forme', to nominate two men from every parish to oversee that the constables were 'not slack in pforming' their administering of the watch (YALH B35, 112v). Such an order would have apportioned responsibility throughout the civic population to account for the conduct of their fellow citizens, family, friends and neighbours, compelling them to uphold the civic regulations. By co-opting them into the oversight of officials it would also have conferred on them a degree of quasi-officialdom, the boundaries of which 'were far more blurred than today' (Hug 2009, 228).

In February 1636/37 the watchman of Skeldergate Postern was dismissed for his 'sundry abuses and misdemeanours' following several complaints to the Council, indicating that errant watchmen were subject to scrutiny by the citizenry (YALH B35, 322r). In 1603 the permeability of York's walls and the honour of its watchmen was laid bare through the smuggling of merchandise and produce into the city during the time of plague, testifying to the economic and personal privation of such times that overrode public considerations. In September 1603 William Morton, a mercer, had conveyed to York large quantities of cloth from London, then currently infected with the plague (YALH B32, 290r); imported cloth was a recognised means of spreading infection (Healy 2001, 52). In August of that year the city's Bellman had proclaimed the ban on receiving goods 'upon payne of [imprisonment] and [a] great fyne' by the discretion of the Council (YALH B32, 282r). Aided by the cordwainer Thomas Walton, Morton 'gott the [merchandise] over the walls on the left hand at Monckbarr as men come to this Cittie'. Morton received an initial fine of 40 li. that was to be respited and further considered upon 'at the same court or at some other court then after'. While Walton admitted to aiding Morton, he claimed no knowledge of what he was smuggling over the walls but was duly imprisoned 'ther to remaine dureinge [the] Lord Maiors pleasure' (YALH B32, 290r). The recklessness of individual citizens therefore may have mortally endangered the welfare of the entire city, but exactly how they were practically able to thwart the walls and watch is not elucidated, nor is how their actions were discovered.

An incident from October of the same year reveals one means of evading the walls (YALH B32, 292V). On this occasion 'grocerye waires' from Hull were trafficked by the apprentice Robert Ellis into York with the connivance of the watchman of Walmgate Bar, Robert Jackson. Ellis had asked to be allowed to bring them in at the Bar, with Jackson replying 'I dare not let yow bringe in anie waires...for some will see and compleyne and said if yow will come in the night I will helpe to get yow them on the walls'. This again

reiterates the role of citizens, as well as apprentices who technically were not enfranchised citizens, in their own regulation, with Jackson well aware that his actions would be challenged and worthy of punishment through public castigation. It also reveals the likelihood that fellow citizens, concerned for the public's and their own welfare, betrayed them to the Council. Ellis was imprisoned but released upon the payment of a fine of 20 s. by his master, the widow Claire Smith, 'who hath the benefit of the saide waires' that had clearly been sold by that time otherwise one might expect them to have been confiscated (YALH B32, 293v). The oath-breaking Jackson was imprisoned 'untill forther order be taken by this Court for his ponishmt', though the form of that punishment was never in fact recorded within the House Books and may have been administered by another court. References to people contravening orders not to climb over the walls or enter the city by 'the riverside or by boate in the night tyme' (YALH B35, 112r; B38, 21v), further highlights the potential permeability of the city's defences. This was compounded by the potential for citizens, watchmen and civic officials to transgress from their civic duty. Regulation relied upon the duty of individuals to adhere to prescribed forms of civic behaviour and commands.

In 1603 Robert Myers was one of seven York citizens complaining to the Council of slanderous rumours that they had brought wares into the city from London, contrary to the order restricting importing goods during the plague and was 'desirous to be cleared...either by [oath] or by [proof]' and swore his innocence in open court (YALH B32, 288v). A desire for public confirmation of Myers' innocence indicates the consequences of rumour and suspicion upon those believed to have served their personal needs, above those of the city, with an individual's reputation crucial for the maintenance of their credit and standing within the community. Supposition can be made that they would have been publicly castigated and reproached by their fellow citizens, thus requiring corporate exoneration of their innocence to stem the tide of maltreatment. Above the level of ordinary citizens, in August 1645 Hull's mayor earned the ire of the watchman of Beverley Gate, Robert

Leggat, when he appears to have sought to overrule their detaining at the gate a consignment of red cloth from the village of Birstall, located six miles south-west of Leeds (HCA BRB.3, 675-676). Leggat stated 'in a scornefull way That it is in vaine for us (meaning himself and fellow warders) to stand here' and alledged that 'it may be mr Mayor might have some by ends in it'. By this date the garrison had been established in April of that year (HCA BRB.3, 721-725) and rather than adhere to the mayor's decision, Leggat instead sent a letter to the governor who countermanded that the cloth would not be allowed in (HCA BRB.3, 676). The Bench viewed this as an attempt to 'sowe dissention betwixt mr Mayor and ye Governor' and Leggat was brought before them for 'his false charging...approbrious speeches' and 'evill behaviour' toward the mayor. Before the Bench Leggat maintained that the mayor did have cloth sent to the town, a 'false and scandalous' slur, but could [produceth] noe author who gave him ye information' and so was imprisoned, was to provide sureties and appear at the 'next Session'. Notably following this episode, in which the mayor was publicly admonished by a citizen, three packs of cloth belonging to a Richard Wood were not to be allowed within the town for twenty days, for they too had come from the very same village of Birstall. This would undermine the declaration of the mayor that he had no personal interest in the disputed imported cloth. However, for Myers in 1603 and Hull's mayor in 1645, they both resorted to public confirmation of their innocence. Yet by 1645 the Bench and mayor were no longer the only authority within the locale and the garrison provided a means of countering the corporation, something the Bench was patently aware of through the use of the term 'dissention'. With the establishment of the garrison the ability of Hull's Bench to administer the town's defences was evidently placed in doubt from the perspectives of the Bench, citizens and governor alike.

Ownership and leases

Clearly the day-to-day ownership and administration of a town or city's defences, as well as other properties, belonged to an incorporated government. However, this was operated legally under royal authority by the granting of a charter of incorporation from the crown (Tittler 2001d, 23-24). The crown's theoretical and legal ownership of the defences was tested in Hull on several occasions prior to the 1640's. Allison argues that suits were brought against the corporation in 1583, 1588, 1601 and 1634, the latter of which was only dropped in 1639 with the imperative of conflict looming (Allison 1969a, 415). An earlier suit from 1576 to 1577 (HCA BRB.2, 150v, 154v-155r, 156r) included commissioners being appointed to inspect the defences and then report to the Privy Council and Lord President of the Council of the North; by May 1577 the Bench prevailed and was 'eased and disburdened of a great suspicion...yt the castle and fortes were decaied by [negligent] looking to and because their was no coste bestowed upon theme' (HCA BRB.2, 165r). It is evident from the Bench Books that the Bench was well versed in the law and willing to assert its rights. Repeated references were made to the documents and charters proving their 'custody and government of the castle and Blockhouses', as granted by Edward VI, which were made available for the suits and then returned to be stored 'upp againe in their former places', such as 'Chest boxe no: 3' (HCA BRB.3, 326, 328, 338, 339, 341, 349, 374, 381, 415). The authority of the Bench to administer the defences was not in doubt, but rather their capabilities to do so, with the legacy of Edward VI's grant of ownership in 1552 (Allison 1969, 415) and the Charter of Incorporation providing the pretext and legal right for the state's continuing involvement.

Removed from the context of suits being enacted, the exemplar of relations between corporations and the state, in which the delegation of ownership and authority was demonstrated and reinforced, was through Royal ceremonial entrances. Hull had received Henry VIII twice in 1541, a time when he had inspected the town's defences that preceded the construction

of the new Henrician works, but would not greet another reigning monarch at its gates until Charles I in April 1639 and September 1640, although it was rumoured that Elizabeth I would arrive in early 1575 (Forster 1969, 92-93; HCA BRB.3, 503 & 532-533; BRB.2, 124r). York had also received Henry VIII, as well as later James I/VI in April 1603 and 1617, Queen Anne, Prince Henry and Princess Margaret in June 1603, Charles I in June 1633 and early 1638, Queen Henrietta-Maria in February 1642/43 and the Duke of York in April 1642 and later in August 1665 (YALH B32, 249r-249v, 255r-256r, 396v-399v, 400v-402r; B34, 118v-120r; B35, 208v; B36, 84r & 71v; B38, 18r).

The account written of James I/VI's visit to York in 1617 reflects the ritualised, almost standardised, progression of these greetings that were also observed at Hull on such occasions (YALH B34, 116v-120r). The gates of the city had been newly painted, waites were playing atop the bars, the Council and one hundred citizens in their finest clothes assembled, and a platform was erected for the delivery of a speech by the mayor who also presented: 'the keyes of your (the King's) cittyes gates assureinge our selves never to be more saife and happye then when we are under yor gracious [protection] whose ingresse [progress] and regresse we allwayes praye maye ever be [prosperous]'. In 1633 the house Book records that 'the keyes of the Citty gates [were] faire burnished upp and lyed on a handsome string [prepared] for that purpose to surrender and yield upp then also to his [Majesty]' (YALH B35, 201v). When the King 'redelivered the keys of the gaites...unto the...Lord maior' (YALH B34, 119r) this was a physical metaphor of the authority derived from the crown, as codified by the city's Charter (Withington 1998d, 164-165). Hartshorne (2004, 220) argues that such occasions demonstrated deference toward the monarch and the political reality of the power relations, but for corporations they also symbolised their own authority and the practical and political ability to control access within its walls (Mann, 2006, 80). The ability to control this access, in contravention of historical, cultural and legal precedence, was definitively illustrated against Charles I at Hull's Beverley Gate on 23rd April

1642, as discussed in Chapter 3 (Howes & Foreman 1999, 27; Hopper 2007, 24; Gurnham 2011, 62). Only three years previously Charles I had been greeted at Hull with all due respect, deference and requisite custom, the keys having been tied up with a ribbon, (HCA BRB.3, 503), the memories of which no doubt underscored the potency of the events of April 1642.

As the monarch's representative and effective proxy based within the King's Manor at York, York's Council also accorded the Lord President of the Council of North, as well as other dignitaries, ceremonial greetings that followed similar precedents, such as convening at the city's gates for an arrival. The first during the period of this thesis was recorded in February 1556/57 for the 5th Earl of Shrewsbury, Francis Talbot, and lastly for the Earl of Newcastle in December 1642 (YALH B22, 49r; B24, 117r & 216v; B25, 29r; B27, 265r; B29, 121v & 124v-125r; B31, 82r; B32, 43r, 210v & 283r; B34, 68r; B35, 87v, 307v; B36, 71v). This was the same Earl who had earlier in 1641 been appointed governor of Hull by Charles I concomitantly with Parliament appointing Sir John Hotham (Cooke 2011, 10). In bestowing similar conventions of ceremony upon such persons, the Council would have reinforced those same claims of authority as when a reigning monarch was received.

Whilst York was the dominant centre of several administrations within Yorkshire, both local and national in remit (Withington 1998d, 88), Hull's relatively isolated geographical location and eclipsing by York appears to have marginalised the town from performing regular greetings of dignitaries. However, in what has until now been historically unrecognised, from July 1630 through to November 1641, Hull's Bench Books regularly note that artillery fire was discharged from the Henrician Castle and Blockhouses when the town greeted dignitaries, including the perambulating Assize judges arriving and also to commemorate the deliverance from the Gunpowder Plot (HCA BRB.3, 224, 315, 354, 359, 364, 382, 385, 438 & 547-548). Sharpe (1999, 33) argues that during this period and into the eighteenth century the Assizes became a prominent social

event. The judges often arrived by ship and disembarked in the Haven, reiterating Hull's location and role as a major port. In July 1633 the ceremonial greeting required the ship itself to fire five shots, 'att [there] landing three piece from the blockhowse and fower from the ffort att the Southend and att his [departure] of the Towne Chambers att the gaits out of wch he depts' (HCA BRB.3, 315). The use of artillery salutes had precedence, with James I/VI firing the artillery at Berwick-upon-Tweed during his progress south upon his accession (Walker 2008, 76), being greeted at London with salutes from the Tower of London, as well as commemorating the birth of Prince Charles in 1630, during the funeral of Oliver Cromwell and upon the Restoration of Charles II (Bull, 2008, 35 & 37); the legacy of this is testified by the continuing practice for modern day state occasions. Therefore Hull's civic authorities actively deployed the capabilities of its *enceinte*, including the Henrician defences, for the greeting of dignitaries, celebrating events of national significance and for the projection of its own authority. Notably incidents of greetings at both York and Hull dissipate after 1641 in conjunction with the establishment of permanent state garrisons and their appropriation of the respective defences (Withington 1998d, 162 & 165; HCA BRB.6, 315-316).

By transcribing the extant account rolls of the bridgemasters and receivers for a single year of every decade, from the 1550's to the 1680's, it is possible to identify the typology of York corporation's property portfolio and quantify these and their corresponding totals as a percentage of annual rental income (Figures 107-121). Civic rental incomes are argued to have provided the largest source of revenue for the city's coffers, which were augmented by other revenue streams, such as fines for exoneration from civic office and loans (Tillott 1961, 184). In September 1562 the Council noted its plan to sell large portions of its properties that were decayed and ameliorate the city's finances; the yearly maintenance did 'eate up and consume more than the full yerely rents as the same doo amounte unto' (YALH B23, 63r). The House Book records that the four Bars, moats, civic lands, Common Hall and the buildings upon Ouse and Foss Bridges were

explicitly excluded from any sales. A similar order had been made in February 1552/53 for the sale of property (YALH B21 Cr), but complete account rolls only survive after that date. However, comparing Figures 107 to 108 reveals that income had decreased in a decade from 105 li. 5 s. 3 d. down to 66 li. 10 s. 0 d. and the overall number of leases had reduced from 289 to 200; this was largely by a reduction in the number of tenements and tenements with adjoining land, down from 169 to 83. This indicates that the order of 1562 had indeed been enacted, with the reduction in income ameliorated by the reduction in maintenance costs. Of note is the static number of land and mural leases, these being the two forms of civic property explicitly safeguarded by the previous order, whose percentages as a total of rental income had increased as a result.

The 1570's (Figure 109) saw further reductions in the number of tenements but a rise in the number of shops leased, which would suggest that efforts were made to acquire new premises or convert existing properties. However, the number of shops never increased above the number in 1573/74 and actually decreased, revealing that York's authorities never furthered their stake in commercial property. From the high of 169 tenements in 1553 to 1555, it was not until the 1630's and 1640's (Figures 115-117) that the number of tenements again surpassed 100, only to markedly reduce again from the 1650's onwards and remain static for the rest of the seventeenth century (Figures 118-121). As a percentage of rental income tenements had accounted for almost 70% and in quantity almost 60% the number of leases in the 1550's, which by the 1570's had drastically been reduced to nearer 40% and 35% respectively. Yet, from the 1580's to the 1620's, with the number of tenements accounting for 30-35% of the total number of leases, the Council was able to derive from them between 50-60% of its total rental income (Figures 110-114). This was achieved by increasing rents over time but more importantly through efforts to manage the stock of civic properties more efficiently (Tillott 1961, 184), as well as avoiding overburdening itself with properties it could not afford to maintain.

Civic wages at the end of the sixteenth century have been estimated at £180 (Palliser 1979c, 86-87), meaning that the income of the defences alone would only have contributed 21 li. 5 s. 8 d. in 1593/94 (Figure 111). Tillott (1961, 185-186) estimates the expenditure of York at the beginning of the seventeenth century to have been between £450-£550, which was supported by an income of £500-£600, with both expenditure and income roughly doubling by the end of the century. Rental revenues correlate to this assertion with 138 li. 6 s. 0 d. raised in 1607/08 and 723 li. 16 s. 8 d. in 1681/82 (Figures 112 & 121). Of these totals the mural defences of the moats, towers and associated tenements yielded 21 li. 3 s. 4 d. and 105 li. 7 s. 10 d. respectively. The repair by Edmond Gyles of the Old Baile walls, following the siege of 1644, was estimated to cost 48 li. (YALH B36, 126r). The revenues of the mural defences during that year, encompassing 36 separate leases and totalling 38 li. 7 s. 8 d. (Figure 117), would not have funded even that single repair. Throughout the early modern period the figures for York's mural leases remained comparatively static and the percentage of their total was often relatively proportionate to their income generation. In this regard they afforded York and its citizens a consistent source of revenue (RCHME 1972, 35), even if the defences' revenues were not self-sustaining for their maintenance. Yet, through the corporations leasing the defences to citizens for personal economic advantage and compelling the maintenance of them, the corporation and citizens were participating in a duty that was able to interweave public, civic and private considerations to maintain the city's urban defences. This system operated within a historical convention whose antecedents were medieval, yet were relevant within the early modern context and the recognisable panoply of functions for which the defences were utilized (Withington 2008a, 605; 1998d, 171; Mann 2006, 78).

The leases of parts of the respective *enceintes* by the corporations to private citizens, also known as mural leases, have been referenced throughout this thesis. They reveal the underappreciated utilisation of the defences by

citizens in a personal capacity within the wider context of their corporate and civic functions. The most prolific leases for parts of the defences within York's House Books were for the moats of the city. An example from 19th January 1554/55 typifies the customary leases for moats: 'agreed by the saied psens that John Clerck shall have in [lease] of all that part of the common moat ligheng wthowte Northstreet postern of the sayd citie...To have from the fest of Pentecost next ensewyng unto thende of xxxi yeres yeldyng to the comon use vi s. viii d.', with the added clause of 'doyng no acts to hurt or [enfeebling] of the citie walls [adjoining]' (YALH B21, 70v). Another dated 23rd March 1562/63, leases 'a pece of gronde...called St Leonards moat wthin the walles' for 21 years to Henry Saville for 4 s. per annum, with an added clause 'reservyng to the mayor and comonaltie libertie wth free enter and egresse for viewing reparyng and defending the walles' (YALH B23, 93r). 21 years was a typical length of tenancy, though they could vary, as seen with John Clerck's thirty-one year lease. In February 1580/81 a tenant even claimed to hold a two thousand year lease for part of a moat, which the Council swiftly ordered to be recovered 'by dewe order of lawe' (YALH B27, 272v). The longevity of the leases conducted during the early modern period can retain legality even to this day. Lendal Tower and the adjacent houses of the former Yorkshire Water Works Company (RCHME 1972, 109) are still subject to the five hundred year lease contracted with a Mr Whistler in the 1670's, following his proposals for 'a waterworke to be erected in the water house at Lendall' (YALH B38, 98v-99r & 135v), with the properties returning to the ownership of York's authorities upon its expiration.

Details regarding the size of plots or structures are not recorded within the leases and neither is the intended utilisation or exact location. Orders were repeatedly issued prohibiting tenants to 'putt or kepe or suffer to be putt or kept in any of the same moates any iiii footed best or cattell' upon a fine of 4 d. a foot (YALH B24, 197v), suggesting this was in fact a common occurrence. The same order from 1570 also refers to the tenants maintaining the water within the moats and maintaining their depth

‘necessary for the pservacon of the citie walles and defens of the citie’, though the vast majority of the moats were in fact not supplied with water. In 1580 a fine of 2 li. 10 s. and forfeiture of the lease would be executed for failure to maintain the moats (YALH B28, 130r). With the Council’s emphasis in the leases toward defence, their physical maintenance and the limitations in their use, there is no discernible reason why citizens should seek to lease the moats. However, in May 1580 the Council came back into the direct ownership of a moat and allowed a butcher, Roger Horner, to fell all of the trees growing within it, excluding apple trees, paying to the Council 5 li. 6 s. 8 d. (YALH B27, 238v). Contrasted with the value of the trees and the typical value of the moat’s rent, a clear economic value in the growing of produce on them can be gleaned and provide one definitive reason for their leasing.

There are three recorded incidents of widowed wives seeking to claim the tenancy of their spouses’ former moats. In 1602 Agnes Brighthouse sought - and was granted - the title of a moat to the east of Micklegate Bar upon the proviso that neither she nor her children would seek relief from the city or sell or sub-let the moat to anybody (YALH B32, 209v), thus encapsulating the civic concerns of poverty, strangers and its defence. In 1614 Magdalene Mowlam sought to continue as tenant of a moat without Monk Bar in her own right, for it was ‘the greatest help for her maintenance and relief in this her old yeres’. She must have been advanced in age, for whilst she was granted the tenancy for 31 years at 20 s. per annum, the scribe wrote ‘(if she live so longe)’ (YALH B34, 41r). The lease to Leonard Robinson, a tanner, in January 1603/04 was granted on the basis that he had married a widow whose husband had bequeathed her a moat in his will (YALH B32, 305v). Robinson’s occupation as a tanner implies he may have sought to graze cattle there, in contravention of the Council’s order, again implying an economic benefit to the leasing of moats.

Tanners were regularly noted as leasing moats in the area of North Street from the 1550’s to 1570’s, with subsequently only the tenants name and not

their occupation recorded (YALH C90:2; C91:3; C93:1). In 1554/55 Miles Middleton leased a moat for 20 s., in 1566/67 Thomas Middleton the younger leased ground at North Street Church yard for 16d., while William Lamb and William Wharton leased a moat for 6 d. All were identified as tanners and by 1573/74 the account simply notes 'Item of the Tanners for a mote' at 7 s., which suggests a form of collective renting for the profession or guild. Swanson's (1980b, 457-458) research of the wills of tanners in the late medieval period found that half of them resided in North Street, with this trend clearly continuing into the early modern period. The location of North Street provided access to the river for water supplies and adjacent moats through North Street Postern, as well as being in a corner of the city that might have reduced the perceived nuisance of 'their noxious trade' (Swanson 1980b, 95). The Company of Merchant Taylors, whose guildhall was located next to the city wall east of Monk Bar, also leased a moat throughout this period; in 1554/55 the rent was 2 s. 6 d., by 1671/72 the 'moate behind St John Hill' had increased to 5 s. and in 1681/82 it is recorded that the 'Marchant Taylors' paid 'for a garden' 10 s. (YALH C90:2; C75:4, C77:4). The cases discussed affirm that a system of revenue could be derived from a moat, one that was able to sustain or augment an individual, a family and professions or crafts, thus accounting for the desire to retain and acquire ownership.

A protracted negotiation with the Archbishop of York in the 1560's over the leasing of a stretch of moat reiterates the priorities of the Council toward the city's defences and their ambivalence toward leasing to a non-citizen, even one of considerable ecclesiastical stature. The Archbishop had requested a stretch of the moat between Bootham and Monk Bar, abutting the jurisdiction of St Peter's, in perpetuity for him and his successors. The Council instead offered a lease for the term of his life only for the 'accustomed rent', with a clause of forfeiture for the non-payment of rent. The lease was sealed in 1565 after the consent of the Common Council was sought and stipulated cattle were not to be grazed, access was to be allowed for surveys, watchmen and repairs of the city walls and to maintain the moat

and not allow '[any]thing to be done or comytted ther shall be cause of infebbling the sayd citie walles' (YALH B23, 156v, 157v, 158r, 159v, 161v; B24, 10v, 11r). The Council had been unwilling to grant the moat for perpetuity to a non-citizen, yet it had appeased the Archbishop, acquired revenue, provisos for the repair of the moats, protection for the city walls and attached a clause of forfeiture for restoration of the moat to the Council. In January 1583/84 the Council applied the clause of forfeiture against the executors of the now deceased Archbishop, citing the proviso of non-payment, recording 'that the advantage of the said lease shalbe taken' (YALH B28, 122r). Through its civic records the city's officials had been able to apply the forfeiture clause and assert their rights of ownership over the defences. The harnessing of civic records was also evident through Hull's dispute with the state over the condition of the Henrician defences throughout this period.

The tenant displaced by the Archbishop in the 1560's was the currier John Stock (YALH B23, 159R-159V), whose first identified lease began in 1552/53 for a 'pcell of moat purchased from the archbishop' for the annual rent of 16s. (YALH C90:1). During the Middle Ages the moat had clearly been part of the archiepiscopal palace precinct and the desire to acquire a perpetual lease for it in the 1560's is interesting. Stock was 'hymself moche contrariant' to being displaced in 1564 and in consideration, was granted a new lease of his house and the retention of a much reduced portion of the moat, 'for onely iiii d. by yere' and 'the sayd Stcoke repelling and maynteynyng the sayd hows' (YALH B23, 159r). In 1558/59 the accounts first reference his tenement and in 1564/65, the year he was displaced, he was also leasing part of an additional moat (C90:3; C91:1) Two years later his record in the accounts states 'Item of john Stoke Curryer for a tente at bowthome barr by indenture for divers consederacons__iiii d.', which continued until 1582/83, the year of the forfeiture from the estate of the Archbishop (YALH C91:3) The following year a James Stock, undoubtedly a relation of John, was recorded as leasing a tenement and moat at Bootham Bar for the increased rent of 26 s. 8 d., indicating that the Council had

restored the moat to the Stock family once it had been reclaimed (YALH C94:2). The minutiae of these records reveal the level of consistency between the Council and its citizen tenants over a twenty-year period. Likewise with the tanners at North Street, as a currier John and James Stock would also have been engaged with the process of tanning and the treating of skins, (Swanson 1980b, 98-99) allowing for the inference that the lease of a moat was also for commercial and domestic purposes.

The year after the conclusion of the 1565 lease of the Archbishop, a lease was recorded in the Ouse Bridge Accounts of 1566/67 for a 'howse of ease laityly beylded of a pte of the comon mote at Bowthome barr belonging to a prebend in the mynster garth' for 6 d. annually and again in 1573/74 (YALH C91:3 & C93:1). The Archbishop's lease of the moat had also included an established public latrine or latrines, referenced in 1554/55 as leased to 'doctor dawbarr...nigh bowthome barre' for 6 d. and in 1558/59 as 'a pcell of ground of the mote at Monke barr where a prevay standeth', whose income was then apportioned to support the Minster's activities. This is the only reference to a privy at Monk Bar, but the rent was the same amount and within the accounts the area around Monk Bar fell under the title of Bootham, making a precise geographical location inexact. The affordability of certain rents can be gleaned by the fact that in 1560 in York the average daily wage for a craftsman was 8 d., therefore an annual rent of 6 d. and higher would have been easily viable for many and represented only a small proportion of their income (Woodward 1995, 235-236)

Yet, with the forfeiture of the Archbishops' moat the Council gained ownership of the house of ease and it was then leased to a Mr Cowton for the same rent of 6 d. (YALH C94:2). From 1593/94 and over the following five decades, until at least 1644/45, the moat and privy were leased for the same rent of 6 d., to a Mr Stanhope, recorded as Sir Edward Stanhope from 1631/32 (YALH C95:1, C97:2, C98:2, C66:8 & C68:3). Other privies were located on the north side of Ouse Bridge and as part of Richard Swale's lease of a tenement for 10 s., he was also engaged for 'kepinge clen the houses of

ease' (YALH C95:1). Edward Stanhope (1543-1603) was the nephew of the Protector and Duke of Somerset, Edward Seymour. He served as an MP three times, was knighted in 1601, was well known to the Cecil family and died in 1603 (<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/>). His will left lands, including the house of ease within the moat at Bootham Bar, to his eldest son Edward Stanhope (1579-1646), who served as an MP for Scarborough and as the sheriff of Yorkshire in 1615-16, dying in 1646. Although he lived primarily at Doncaster and gradually disposed of much of his estate during the course of his life, it is significant that he retained his father's lease of the public latrines located in York. It once again attests to the significance of land associated with the city walls – even if it was used primarily for public amenities. Throughout this period the archives reveal important evidence of how the city utilised the urban defences for economic, commercial, domestic and distinctly non-defensive purposes.

Records of the Council directly granting leases of moats during the seventeenth century reduce significantly, with the final reference within the House Books being noted in 1636 (YALH B35, 305v). As with the professionalization of the role of muremasters, the collection of the city's rental income was also subject to reform. At the beginning of this period two pairs of annually appointed bridgemasters collected rents from properties assigned according to their geographical vicinity to either the Ouse or Foss Bridge, whose names designated the separate offices and account rolls. Surviving account rolls demonstrate that this was maintained until at least 1567 (YALH C91:3). By 1573/74 these distinct offices had been amalgamated, the number of officials reduced to two and a single account roll was produced (YALH C93:1). As the muremasters were in the 1570's (YALH B27, 84r), in January 1626/27 the bridgemasters were likewise denigrated for their negligence and summarily abolished (YALH B35, 29v). From henceforth one individual would 'collect the same rents and all such [arrears]' and notably was granted an annual salary (YALH B35, 29v) as the city's '[general] Receiver of the Rents for the Lands and Tenemts belonging to the Maior and Commonality' of York (YALH C67:1). Nearly fifty years

separated the abolition of the muremasters and bridgemasters, yet in both instances the Council followed the same discernible pattern of abolishing ineffectual civic offices whose duties and remits were professionalised through salaried individuals. The proficiency of those individuals to deal with matters explains why leases being granted at the aldermanic level steadily declined within the House Books during the seventeenth century. Subsequent references are often limited to the Council's involvement through resolving or instigating disputes with tenants.

In December 1653 Percival Levitt was the lessee of several moats and a house attached within and without the walls of the city, held under the proviso that if he were to sublease them it would only be to freemen of York. Levitt had sought the permission of the Council to sell his interest in the lease to a non-freeman, which they provisionally granted (YALH B37, 50v). However, the decision was referred to the Common Council (YALH B37, 55v) that refused the request 'inregards the said house doth stand upon the ramp of the said citty and is passed to a strainger may become [prejudicial] to the Citty' (YALH B37, 58v-59r). Instead it was decided to negotiate with Levitt for his lease, eventually reaching an agreement to purchase it for 400 li., paying 150 li. immediately and staggering further payments over the following three years. The significant cost of the purchase would have been far beyond what could be recouped through subsequent leasing of the building and moats. To account for the price paid to Levitt, it must have been calculated on what he would have yielded from the sale of his interest in the lease and the projected income the demised land was able to yield during the course of the tenancy. This reflects an active reclamation policy by the Council to remove the threat of subleasing to non-citizens, their willingness to expend vast sums of money on this policy, and more widely, the potential economic and commercial capacity of the urban defensive landscape.

The disagreement with Levett followed that of Richard Dossie, which ran from February 1648/49 to September 1651 following his insertion of a 'dower steade and windowes in the citty wall or countermure adioyninge

on the streete' and resulted in his eviction being pursued (YALH B36, 223v; B37, 19v & 21v-22r). He was not merely an errant tenant undermining the structural integrity of the city's walls near Bootham and the King's Manor. Withington (1998d, 173) identifies that Dossie had also overseen the dismantling of York Minster's interior in the later 1640's. Most likely this was in his role as a Sequestrator for Parliament within York, with his specific actions taken against General Richard Elmhurst being relevant to this thesis. The details of this episode were outlined by Sir George Wentworth in his statement as the sole surviving trustee of the estate of the attainted and executed former President of the Council of the North and Earl of Strafford, Thomas Wentworth (YALH G42:2, 1-22), as a prelude to the convening of a Commission from the Court of Chancery on 20th August 1653; the Commission met at the house of the widow Elizabeth Foster in Stonegate 'for the examinacon of Witnesses in a Cause there pending Between Sr Geo. Wentworth [knight] and...the maior and Comonaltie of yorke and Richard [Dossie]', concerning the disputed occupancy of Dossie's moat (YALH G41:1).

In 1628 Charles I had appointed Thomas Wentworth as the President of the Council of the North and Lord Lieutenant of Yorkshire, positions he would subsequently hold until his impeachment and eventual execution over the course of 1640/41 (Pogson 1997, 185-186, 194-195 & 197). Pogson (1997, 185 & 197) describes Wentworth as the last effective Lord President, despite his physical absence in Ireland as Lord Deputy from 1633 to 1639 and precluding his ultimate military and political failures preceding the Civil War; the Council of the North was itself abolished soon after his execution in mid-1641. On 30th October 1633 Wentworth contracted with the Council a sixty year lease of a moat for an annual rent of 10 s. Whilst the lease was for his 'Benefitt' and he 'tooke and received the Rentes issues and profits thereof...whilst he lived', upon 'the expresse nomination...[and]...direcons' of Wentworth George Radcliffe, who unlike the Earl was a freeman of York, had his name inserted into the lease. Radcliffe occupied the moat and premises and in Wentworth's name all of the covenants and rental payments

were adhered to and paid (YALH G42:2, 1-5). The properties or land of the city were 'not usually or accustomedly letten or demised...to any persone or persons who [were] not freemen', which in the statement to the Commissioners was argued had provided no impediment to the lease being granted to Wentworth. Historically, however, non-freemen had leased moats, such as the Archbishop from 1565 so there was certainly historical precedence, even if the Council had been reluctant to grant it.

In 1634/35 and 1644/45 George Radcliffe is duly recorded within the leasing accounts as paying 10 s. 'for a tenement and a moate without the Barr' (YALH C67:1; C68:3). Following Wentworth's attainder and execution the King had on 4th June 1641 granted 'all and singular the goods chattels...and all the personal estate whatsoever' to several trustees, including Sir George Wentworth, who became 'rightfully possessed and Interessed' of the estate, with Radcliffe still recorded as occupying the moat and premises (YALH G42:2, 5-8). In 1644 General Richard Elmhurst, who had 'formerly bin a Servante to the sayd Earle', was tasked by the trustees to occupy the moat, fulfil the covenants, pay the rent for 1645 and 'to keepe the possession thereof' (YALH G42:2, 9-10). However, Elmhurst's estate was ordered to be sequestered, he being 'in question for [delinquency] against the present parliament', with that task falling to the city's Sequestrator Richard Dossie. Through 'plotting' and upon 'untrue pretenses', Dossie connived to equate Elmhurst's temporary guardianship of the moat to denote that it was his property and therefore appropriated it in 1645 (YALH G42:2, 10-12). The case brought before the Commission of Chancery by the Earl of Strafford's trustee in 1653, who ought to have 'peaceably and quietly' held the demised premises, arraigned Dossie for dispossessing and retaining the premises that he had 'no manner of right or estate thereunto either in lawe or equity', for his deriving the 'rentes and profits thereof to his owne use never [bringing] the lawe to his [account]' and refusing to relinquish custody of the moat (YALH G42:2, 9 & 12-13).

Dossie and the Council were accused of retrospectively exploiting the status of the Earl as a non-citizen by arguing that it was only Radcliffe's freeman status that had allowed the Earl to hold the premises in trust, thus legally allowing the original lease to be forfeited upon his death (YALH G42:2, 13 & 18). The statement by the trustee also questions the trustworthiness of the claims that documents pertaining to the Earl's original 1633 lease had been 'lost or mislaid' on account of 'the late tymes of war and troubles' (YALH G42:2, 16). Sir George Wentworth had pursued the matter through the 'Comon lawe for recovery' and had no other means of 'helpe or reliefe' but by the justice of the Commissioners of Chancery, in the hope that they would compel both Dossie and the Council to 'deliver upp the possession of the premises' (YALH G42:2, 17 & 20-21). The Court of Chancery arbitrated the disputes arising from the courts of common-law 'upon rules of equity and conscience', a function today that is exercised by the Court of Appeal (<http://www.oed.com/>). In the pursuit of this case over a period of eight years, Sir George Wentworth clearly felt justified in his attempts to take repossession and legal ownership of a moat that formed part of York's urban defences. The rental accounts reveal that Wentworth was vindicated as George Radcliffe was once again recorded as the tenant of the tenement and moat in 1657/58 (YALH C72:3). In 1653 it was stated that because of the Civil War Radcliffe was 'in remote parts beyond the seas' and could not be located to provide evidence (YALH G42:2, 16-17), but seemingly he had returned and was deriving his livelihood from the moat, in accord with Thomas Wentworth's original instructions from 1633 and the trustees of his estate subsequently.

Considering that the Council had been pursuing their own dispute with Dossie over his utilisation of the moat, it would seem inexplicable that they would have colluded with him to thwart its recovery by Thomas Wentworth's trustees. However, for the year 1664/65 the rental accounts record that Richard Dossie had been granted a new lease for the very same moat that the court of Chancery had compelled him and the Council to relinquish (YALH C74:2). Withington (2008a, 587 & 600) argues that the

funeral of Thomas Wentworth's daughter-in-law, in January 1686/87 at York Minster, represented an occasion that aroused historical antagonisms between the city's support for the parliamentary cause in contrast to the royalist local gentry in the 1640's, within the context of the attempted exclusion of the Duke of York from the succession. The perceived legacy of Thomas Wentworth's 'erosion of civic privileges during his reign as Lord President' (Withington 2008a, 600) is argued to have been a salient spectre of the day's riotous proceedings in conjunction with the post-Restoration attack by the state upon civic autonomy through the city's garrison and its appropriation of the urban defences (Withington 1998d, 162 & 165), a salient feature also present at Hull. Within this context it is possible to comprehend how York's Council may have considered it unpalatable that non-freemen and those loyal to the deceased Thomas Wentworth should continue to claim right of tenancy and ownership over a section of its urban defences. Notably the resolve to buy the interest in Levett's lease came only four months after the Court of Chancery had convened and found against them, with their purchase of the lease in December 1653 representative of a determination not to be subject to the legal ownership and rights of non-freemen in the future.

The same level of quantitative data relating to Hull's leasing of its defences and general civic holdings is as yet not available, though further research could yield similar levels of evidence. As with other corporations Hull was in possession of multiple holdings of property and land, within and without its walls, which are noted as being contracted during this period within the Bench Books and have been referenced throughout the thesis. Unlike York, the moats of Hull were not leased as they were entirely water-filled and therefore impractical for commercial or private utilisation by lessees. In November 1634 the Bench ordered that all of the tenants 'wch have their dwelling upon the Townes Walls, shal have the same Chardge given them for dressing the walls and informing...upon' any persons who did 'bring and lye soile or dirt upon the same, [or] take anie stones from of the said walls' (HCA BRB.3, 355-356). Although the number of tenants and leases are not

quantified, these properties and lands would have been located along the internal perimeter of the *enceinte*, either physically abutted onto or in close proximity to it, thus forming part of the demised lease and accounting for individuals being co-opted toward their upkeep.

Following the permanent establishment of the garrison in July 1646, Hull ceased to exercise any formal or practical authority over the eastern defences that it had legally owned since 1552 (HCA BRB.3, 721-725; Allison 1969a, 415). The River Hull provided a natural demarcation between these defences and those surrounding the town proper on the west. Yet only four months later the authority of the garrison's governor, Sir Thomas Fairfax, was encroaching upon Hull's medieval town walls also. 'Upon the Governors complaint of the great neglect...of the guard at the Southend...by ye Townesmen...and upon [the Governor's] mocon for the better assisting thereof for the future', on 4th November 1646 the Bench agreed that the fort at the South End would be relinquished to the custodianship of 'a Guard of Soldiers', while the town's watchmen would be ejected and henceforth were only to have 'guard of the South end without the ffort' (HCA BRB.3, 741). By 9th November the Bench recorded that their now displaced watchmen would require the 'orders of the Governor for liberty to walke the round' at the South End (HCA BRB.3, 743). Having acquired the acquiescence of the Bench to encroach upon the town walls and occupy the South End fort, along with the associated postern gateway, Fairfax moved swiftly to further reinforce this through his deputy governor, Colonel 'Manlyberer', who was empowered to act of his own volition in regard what Fairfax 'his excellency himself might or [would] do if he were psonally present' (HCA BRB.3, 743). Within the Council House at the convening of the Bench on 11th November the keys of the South End fort were laid upon the table, whereupon the deputy governor came before the assembled aldermen and 'demanded to have delivered to him the keys', notably with no noted courtesy and 'tooke them upp in his owne keeping', with the Bench never regaining the keys custodianship.

From henceforth the establishment of the garrison enabled the intervention of the state's representative into the affairs of the town and the Bench's deferment to that authority, even over seemingly trifling matters. In 1648 the deputy governor, Colonel Overton, complained of the regular resort and 'Abuse' of people 'easing themselves' on Hull's walls, presumably not the urban defences but within the town, 'to the [annoyance] of the Inhabitants'. As a result the town bellman was to announce that any citizen or soldier found relieving themselves would be fined 12 d. and it is tellingly recorded that the 'Maior and Governor [were] to joyne in the execucon of this Order'. This duality of authority within the town is further noted in the documents following reports of the plague in France and the likelihood of ships returning to the port from there in September 1668, which posed a threat to both the 'Towne And his [Majesty's] Garrison here' (HCA BRB.5, 141). The Bench books reveal that there was clear distinction drawn between the civic and military bodies present within Hull's defences. Ships and their crews were to remain within the haven for quarantine, which was a well-established measure. However, the Bench was to acquaint the governor with the order in the hope that he would order the soldiers at the South End fort to assist in restraining any ships company from coming ashore. As has been observed in both York and Hull, the ability of their corporation and citizens to institute a watch at the gates of the city was the foremost precaution it could take for the defence of its own civic body during times of crisis and for general civic administration. By 1668 the Bench was barred from exercising authority over sections of the defences and was required to seek the assistance of non-freemen, thus demonstrating that the town's historical means of safeguarding itself had been appropriated.

In 1569 Elizabeth I had directly corresponded with York and other corporations to combat the threat of the Rising of the Northern Earls (YALH B24, 145v). However, at the commencement of the Monmouth Rebellion in June 1685 and prior to the 'entire defeat of the Rebels' in that July (HCA BRB.6, 132), James II/VII diverted from previous conventions that had served to reinforce the personal link between monarch and corporation.

Rather than addressing the mayor and aldermen of Hull directly, he instead had written to the garrison, and a Captain Copley thereafter informed the Bench that he had received orders 'to secure the Ports and Gates about' the town (HCA BRB.6, 131). Within a culture of respectful deference and courtesy (Withington 2010b, 187-188) in which precedence was upheld, the Bench must have taken umbrage in being merely the recipient of instructions, rather than being shown the due respect it deserved as a constituted governing body. Captain Copley compounded this by itemising the defects within the town's walls that demanded immediate rectification.

After the Glorious Revolution York's Charter had been restored in November 1688 by the King and Queen and the garrison based at York Castle was disbanded (YALH B38, 254v). Particularly apparent under the last governor of York, Sir John Reresby, was the practice of the garrison's soldiers parading each day from the Minster Yard to then disseminate and take up positions at the Castle, the Bars and the Posterns, directly supplanting the city's authority to exercise its traditional civic offices and participation through the administration of its defences (Mee & Wilson 2005a, 21; Withington 2008a, 607 & 609). This was bound up with the custodianship of the city's keys that was only settled when Reresby was brought before the Council and publicly 'did there upon deliver up to the Lord maior 14 keys and two hang locks belonging to the Cities Gates' (YALH B38, 254v). In contrast, the Bench's address to William III and Mary II in May 1693 provides striking parallels to that made by Thomas Wentworth's trustees in 1653 (HCA BRB.6, 315-316; YALH G42:2). Both presented themselves as aggrieved tenants whose rights of ownership had been illegally sequestered in violation of both law and equity. Whilst the trustees in 1653 had been able to resort to the Court of Chancery for justice, the Bench had no means of recourse but to the embodiment of the state and justice itself, the monarch. Even after the Glorious Revolution the legacy of the Civil War, which did 'forceably dispossess' the town of the eastern defences, had decisively not been resolved but became more entrenched as it became clear Hull's grievance would not be corrected by the new regime. For a brief

period in mid-1689, the mayor of Hull and Bench once again exercised governance over the garrison and 'appointed Guard to be kept by the Inhabitants' (HCA BRB.6, 244). However, this was a temporary measure on account of the previously stationed regiment having been sent to Scotland and the delay in it being replenished by the 'Batallion of the right honble Viscount Castleton'. In October 1699, at the end of the time period of this thesis, the Bench was resolute in asserting that 'the Blockhouses and Castle and all the Ground of the Garrison side...of Right belongs to the Mayor and Burgesses by a grant from King Edward the Sixth to them and their Successors for Ever' (HCA BRB.6, 455).

Conclusion

Through reconstructing the multiple lesser civic offices and roles whose remits pertained to the utilisation of urban defences, this chapter demonstrates that the walls of York and Hull were not irrelevant and static structures removed from the methods of governance at both a corporate and local level. Recognisable civic and quasi-civic offices, such as the Bar keepers, Blockhouse keepers, porters, custodians of the gate keys and watchmen, were distinctive and salient features of early modern governance. Their responsibilities and duties were accordingly maintained, reformed, expanded, abolished or alternatively appropriated within the emerging social and political contexts of the corporations and citizenry that they served. Urban governments repeatedly sought to deploy such officers and modes of enforcement throughout the period, which testifies to their perceived effectiveness. Indelibly bound up with these were the material and practical capabilities of the walls that were able to define a sphere of influence and parameters of incorporated power. The repeated use of cartings, whose perambulations purposefully encompassed the major thoroughfares and gates of a town or city, powerfully delineated not only the limits of the civic landscape, but also the public castigation that would be meted out to those who transgressed. The House and Bench Books do not provide a totalising archival record for every aspect of the early modern period, particularly when it is recognised that corporations were only one form of constituted authority, but they can provide the most cogent evidence of the perceived duty, function and efficacy of civic governments and the biography of individuals and groups.

The perceptibility of their authority reveals that they considered themselves to be the moral and social propagators for their citizenry, which adheres to notions of increased regulatory and moralistic power being accrued during this period (Harding 2000, 263; Tittler 2007b, 97-101; Hindle & Kümin 2009, 153 & 168). In all of these aspects the administration of a corporation was reliant upon the support, willingness, endorsement and the active

participation of its citizens for effective regulatory governance. This chapter emphasised the prevalence and relevance of the plague during the early modern period because it succinctly encapsulates the role of urban defences and the co-option of citizens within a non-military context. As noted above, at times of infection pre-existing tensions over undesirables, strangers and foreigners, as well as the omnipresent threat of the poor, were all exacerbated and coalesced around the need to defend a corporation's perimeter. The transgressions of officials and citizens alike at these times have revealed the potency of the walls as a practical and palliative mechanism, but also their potential to foster and physically demarcate social division and exclusion.

This chapter argues that urban defences were not, nor should they intellectually be considered, exclusively and historically bound to either the machinations of respective governing bodies, a single homogenous urban population, or to the state. There is historiographical recognition that the state's appropriation of urban defences in the seventeenth century represented a direct attack upon the independence and integrity of urban corporations. However, contemporaneous with this assessment, the rental accounts for York reveal that there were 37 individually identifiable mural leases encompassing the *enceinte* from 1681-82 (Figure 121). Attached to each of these would have been the particular considerations of the lessees as individuals, families, craft fraternities, as well as the corporation and representatives of the state as they all sought to harness and negotiate the defences for their own purposes. Within a population of between 8,000-12,000, only a very small number of persons therefore leased the defences. However, in conjunction with previous considerations, this should not preclude the recognition that every citizen was able to have an inherent interest in the walls being maintained, either as a tenant or more broadly as a citizen, within the social, economic and political contexts of the period.

The interplay between personal, local, corporate and national was most evident within the dispute between Thomas Wentworth's trustees and

York's Council in 1653 and the address of Hull's corporation in 1693. In both instances the parties sought recourse through a determination and understanding of the law; the irony being that York's Council would be subjected to the appropriation of its legal ownership and authority to administer the *enceinte* in its entirety, while it had perhaps knowingly connived with the sequestration of a single legally contracted stretch of moat. The longevity of individual connections with demised leases, often over several decades and intergenerational, was attested to through the examination of York's leases and no doubt this would also be evident at Hull and other cities within England and across Europe. Hull's unresolved dispute highlights the political realities and limitations of a corporation's authority once an outside authority, the state, had become administratively entrenched. The mutual conviction and intransigence of Hull and the state over ownership of the Henrician defences and Citadel remained intractable until the court case of 1861 and levelling of the site in 1863 (Allison 417-418). This length of time testifies to the potential legacy of early modern urban defences over their legitimate authority and ownership, whose effects were evident well into the nineteenth century.

Chapter 6- Conclusion

This chapter will now return to the original aims of this thesis, as established in the Introduction and Chapter 1. The thesis sought to consider the scope and historical value of both surviving and demolished early modern urban defences, hypothesising that they were an integral instrument for the administration of urban centres, the projection of civic authority, formed part of a recognisable and developing civic bureaucracy and were uniquely bound up with notions of civic identity. In order to achieve this, the thesis has sought to bring together the surviving and reconstructed defensive architecture utilising a large body of archival evidence and visual analysis. In so doing it pursues an interdisciplinary methodology. The detailed analysis of how the respective *enceintes* were configured within their individual geographical locations has been produced from the archaeological analysis of their construction and development before, during and after the time period, which forms the focus of the thesis. This has been combined with the painstaking transcription and analysis of numerous forms of original civic records and Antiquarian accounts, and the art historical interpretation of contemporary and later cartographic and pictorial sources. When combined, this methodology has revealed civic defences to be both a symbolic reflection of, and the material mechanism by which, incorporated government was structured and reproduced throughout the early modern period. This approach has therefore contributed to historical archaeology's wider aim to understand the post-medieval built environment through the integration and analysis of extant remains, the reconstruction of now lost forms, archival research and available art historical resources (Hicks & Beaudry 2006, 7).

Four questions informed and underpinned the conduct and research of this body of work: what was the architectural legacy of medieval walls and how was this developed and maintained during the early modern period? How were the walls administered and what can this reveal about the professionalization of office holders and the corporations they served? What

were the uses and meanings of urban defences pertaining to defensive, economic, social and political considerations? And how were the walls able to reflect and inform the aspirations and mentality of incorporated governments as an already established and continually developing social and political entity? Considering that York and Hull's walls are archaeological examples of medieval construction, the research of the thesis is seeking to establish a methodological agenda that moves medieval defences into the remit of the post-medieval period. This thesis has posited them as active agents of civic infrastructure within discussions of the early modern urban environment, which is reinforced through the historical and historical-archaeological methodology of the primary civic documentary evidence. This practice is able to transcend disciplinary and chronological boundaries for the study of complex historical structures.

The perceived military legacy of medieval walls within the post-medieval period is influenced by the historiography of early modern European urban defences. Chapter 1 of this thesis argued that the majority of such works are inadequate, reductive and have unduly influenced the perception of English examples as retrograde and European sites as superior. Scholars such as Pollak (2010a) and Johnson (2002) attach a primacy to the very existence of a *trace Italienne* bastion as epitomising a process of state formation and absolutism on the European continent during the seventeenth century. The merits of such designs, in spite of the fact that the entirety of a bastioned design was indiscernible from the ground, are acclaimed to the extent that towns or cities that did not possess them were worthy of contempt and derision. This thesis does not dispute the superior military capabilities of bastions, and acknowledges that within England it was the chosen design when new works were constructed, as at Hull in the sixteenth and seventeenth-centuries. Yet it does reject the primacy of design being the determining factor in the significance of an early modern *enceinte*.

The limited number of bastioned constructions within England, when compared to the European continent, combined with the retention of

medieval urban defences, has wrongly detached their interpretation from recognisable forms of early modern civic, administrative, commercial, cultural and institutional building typologies. Similarly, the emphasis in existing scholarship on the military and early modern design merits within the European debate has led to a dearth of localised English studies. The methodology of this thesis and assessment of the historiography has demonstrated the merit of localised studies to enable a balanced interpretation of the wider uses and meanings of urban defences, particularly their domestic and non-defensive functions. It raises important questions about the potential for comparative European studies to move beyond military-centred and national or pan-European debate, and generate wider discussions about the multiple meanings of medieval and early modern urban *enceintes*. The scope for this kind of collaborative research is potentially vast and international in significance, given the ubiquity of surviving defensive circuits and corresponding archival sources.

Within Chapter 2 the archaeological and architectural analysis of York's surviving city walls revealed the extent to which the *enceinte* had remained relatively intact until the restoration phases of the nineteenth century. The application of systematic architectural description and stratigraphic analysis was able to refine and develop existing understanding of the nature and purpose of Victorian 'restoration' of the walls. Specifically, this thesis has shown how the removal and demolition of previously existing domestic dwellings, such as those abutting Walmgate Bar (Figure 33), was a concerted effort to de-domesticize and re-militarize the appearance of the walls. This was furthered by the harmonization of many of the walls' features, including the levelling of its height, the insertion of crenellations, the removal of chimneys from within towers and the construction of the wall walk platform for perambulating tourists. Nineteenth century archival material attests to the continuing demising of moats for leasing and indicates that the Council had also lost ownership over properties abutting the city's defences. For example, in November 1875 the Council considered it desirable to bid at auction for three cottages adjoining the moats 'for the

protection of the Rampart against the erection of unsightly buildings fronting the City Walls' (YALH B15, 340). Future research of the nineteenth century restoration could yield detailed evidence of what structures were cleared away, which may have been contemporaneous with the time frame of the thesis, and reveal the rationale of presenting the walls as an exemplar of medieval defensive architecture, in spite of the historically sustained non-defensive occupation and utilisation of the walls and their environs. Further research may also reveal how typical this Victorian restoration was of provincial English towns and cities, reflecting profound shifts in the symbolic perception and structural reality of the industrial urban community.

The approach adopted in York has demonstrated the possibility of recording and assembling a biography of ownership for individual sections of city walls, such as Barker Tower, North Street Postern. Close analysis of the city's House Books revealed how individual disputes, such as that between the Council and the Wharton family, who had leased the Tower and associated ferry for several generations, could illuminate wider practices and tensions; the longevity of familial associations; the active use of the area for domestic and commercial purposes; the difficulty of displacing persons that had a legally demised right of ownership over the defences; and mechanisms of resistance. The thesis has revealed the value of archival research in reconstructing structures cleared from the walls, such as Elizabeth Stockdale's house at Skeldergate Postern. Such reconstructions inevitably also reveal relationships and practices marginalised within conventional narratives, such as Elizabeth Stockdale's role as keeper. The early modern use and leasing of the defences at York is no longer evident along most of the circuit, with the exception of sections along St Mary's Abbey precinct walls that reveal exposed joist holes and instances of continued occupation. This thesis has shown that the integration of this evidence with accounts for the demise of the land of the Whether's by Marygate Tower, from 1573-93, demonstrate the duality of the walls' use for both commercial and domestic purposes. The displacement of widow

Whether in 1593 in the name of the Queen alludes to the potential relevance of even peripheral structures abutting the defences, for both the Council and agents of the state.

The analysis of York has yielded powerful evidence for the interplay between the jurisdictions of these two authorities, as was demonstrated at the end of the sixteenth century, notwithstanding later issues during the seventeenth century. The attempted piecemeal demolition of Clifford's Tower aroused the ire of the Council on the grounds that the Tower was a defining architectural attribute of the city's urban environment, with little consideration accorded to the potential demise of its defensive capabilities (YALH B31, 190r-192r & 315r). As it was under the jurisdiction of the state as part of York Castle the Council had no authority, yet demonstrated a keen interest in its preservation. The architectural and archaeological analysis of York's surviving city walls enables the comprehension of their scale and materiality, whose form and function during the early modern period can not only be recreated but also further advanced by the kind of approach advocated in this research.

The architectural analysis of Hull's urban defences within Chapter 3 represents a new recreation of the entire circuit, whose demolition in the eighteenth century has impeded the perceived consideration of the entirety of its structural form. The detailed rendering of the town by Hollar from 1640 (Figure 69) is one key means of appreciating the physical, geographical and spatial dynamics of the systems of defences that existed during the early modern period, as well as recognising their medieval antecedents and subsequent developments. Excluding the earthen defences of the seventeenth century, no full-scale redevelopment of the walls surrounding the town-proper occurred. However, using Hollar's engraving of the town it is possible to observe potential campaigns of construction and building within the circuit during this period, combined with the limited archaeological data from excavations. Anomalous round towers were identified concentrated on stretches of the walls furthest away from the

River Hull and Humber, which appear incongruous with the predominantly square towers of the remaining circuit. Chapter 3 suggests that they represent the earliest form of the medieval defences that were not included as part of an as-yet-undated redevelopment of the medieval *enceinte*. The rendering of the gates shows that where they were bonded together and that the original height of the wall was much higher. This informs the hypothesis that a large-scale redesign of the defences had occurred, which had reduced the height of the walls, constructed uniform square towers and enlarged the gates at either end of the circuit. Archival evidence for the location of fresh water systems that ran along and within the defences into the town reveal a sophisticated structure that accommodated both defensive and civic needs. These were designed to release large volumes of water via sluices to flood the land surrounding the town during the 1640's, again highlighting the capabilities of the now demolished structures and underlining this thesis's argument that early modern English defences were not retrograde.

Although the section of the town abutting the River Hull was not walled, this thesis has revealed that a system of gates had been erected, from at least the 1580's, which were able to close off access to the town from the staiths and pathways leading into the town. As a result, these then engendered a new form of quasi-civic office in the form of staith keepers who held the custody of the keys for individual or several gates that could be utilized for defence, yet more regularly in the commonplace governance and navigation of the town. This informs interpretations of an increase in bureaucracy, officialdom and the co-option of citizens within urban administration, a feature that was also apparent with the granting of the Henrician defences to the town from 1552. The instituting of salaried Blockhouse keepers is known, but their residential attachment to the defences has presumed that they solely tended to their administration. Research has conclusively demonstrated that whilst being tasked with administrative duties, the Blockhouse keepers were simultaneously able to utilise their occupation of the structures for domestic and commercial or professional activities. The

concentrated activities of these individuals and their families were even considered to have undermined the structural integrity of the fortifications by the 1630's. This also underlines that beyond the military exigency of the Henrician fortifications in the 1540-50's, they were subsequently adapted and harnessed for a multiplicity of non-military uses by individuals and the Bench alike. This was also evident across the circuit, but only through the evidence transcribed from the town's civic records.

Hollar appears to have provided a realistic and accurate rendering of the core structures of the defences, as they existed in the mid-seventeenth century. However, he clearly omitted discernible features of the walls and their environs in 1640 that pertained to their utilisation, such as the location of the shipwright facilities outside of North Gate and the dwellings that would have abutted the walls internally. In this regard the pictorial evidence for Hull is similar to the surviving city walls of York. Both provide the ability to analyse the structural form of their respective defences, but they cannot elucidate upon the utilisation of them within the context of the early modern period. Compounded by the history of Hull's un-walling during the course of the eighteenth century for industrial and commercial development, this has led to a historical underrating and disregarding of the viability of researching its complex systems of medieval and post-medieval fortifications. This would certainly account for the dearth of related research on Hull during this period in spite of the well-conserved civic records. The methodology piloted within the thesis is transferable to other more widely recognised civic building types of the early modern period, such as ecclesiastical, vernacular, commercial and civic buildings, which like Hull's defences have now largely disappeared. Discussion of the evidence available for the local building crafts within Chapter 4 would be particularly relevant. This would allow for a holistic consideration of the town's urban defences within their wider urban context, which is an avenue of research that lies beyond the scope of the present research. It is also likely that future research could extend the methodologies successfully pioneered in York and Hull, to facilitate the analysis and reconstruction of other partially-

preserved and demolished defensive *enceintes* of other provincial towns and cities in early modern England.

Chapter 2 and 3 were able to establish the material legacy of York and Hull's respective medieval urban defences and their early modern developments. In order to comprehend how such vast structures were maintained and counter notions that they were neglected during this period, Chapter 4 reconstructed the civic offices and networks of administration for each corporation and the perceived professionalization of their civic offices. This enabled a process of professionalization and rationalization to become evident within the records of both case studies. Within York the specific office of the muremasters represented an antiquated office that was bound up with notions of civic advancement and evidently became difficult to find willing occupants. This warranted the imposition of the office upon unwilling citizens and professions, such as the cordwainers. The implication of this and the office's eventual abolishment in the 1570's did not, however, represent a disinterest in the maintenance of its defences. It can instead be understood that the Council recognised the merits of engaging professionals and individuals over prolonged periods of time and accruing expertise, rather than simply annually rotating appointments. This process of professionalization would eventually result in the appointment of Edmond Gyles, but prior to this the thesis has catalogued the multiple efforts taken to reform its civic processes for the more effective maintenance of its stock of city-wide properties.

Whereas the role of the muremasters and city husbands has been alluded to limitedly within other historical works, the systems of maintenance executed by the Bench in Hull are entirely absent. The common officer is cursorily noted within the Victoria County History (Allison 1969) as a recognisable civic office that was later renamed the town husband, but no discussion is afforded to that office and the professionals who were engaged with for the maintenance of the defences and civic buildings. The thesis has demonstrated that the instituting of the town husband was not in fact

representative of the common officer being subsumed within a new title, but was in fact an entirely new creation that retained the former common officer as well. Therefore the development of this civic office is entirely new within the recognised history of early modern Hull. In spite of recognisable civic offices that pertained to the defences and wider civic buildings, the central role that is accorded within the civic records towards the involvement of the corporations upper echelons is irrefutable. This may reflect the context in which the minute books were created for the recording of aldermanic deliberations for both York and Hull as their constituted governments. Yet, the repeated reference to particular aldermen conducting surveys, deliberating and approving expenditure and instigating building works infers an active engagement and comprehension of their urban environments and civic buildings. The evidence for repairs within the House and Bench Books could not in themselves account for the maintenance of either *enceinte* throughout the period. Therefore other systems were clearly in operation below the upper tiers of civic government that were not recorded within the House and Bench Books.

The primacy of Edmond Gyles at York and Matthew Hardy within Hull cannot be separated from their dominance in the records, which began either immediately prior to or during the course of, the Civil War. The active military engagement of the defences during this period inevitably created a heightened emphasis on the maintenance of the defences, but this does not preclude the fact that they had consistently been maintained prior to this historical flashpoint. Their respective tenures are characterised by an increasing remit of responsibility and autonomy subsequent to the Civil War that has been charted within the thesis. The fact that neither achieved higher civic office and remained within their posts for several decades, attests to the professionalization of civic governance and reform of their systems of maintenance when contrasted with earlier conventions. This has also been observed within Chapter 5 regarding York's systems of leasing that abolished and replaced a well-established civic office within the remit of a single and salaried individual. Therefore the changing nature of the

identifiable officials that had responsibility for their urban defences can also inform upon the development and priorities of the civic governments they served. It is only by the painstaking and meticulous research of the records of both cities, over a 150-year period, that such patterns of reform and reorganisation can be fully recognised.

A central theme to emerge from the archival material was the integral and prevalent role of non-officials and professionals within the make-up of York and Hull's maintenance of their structural fabrics. Within York this has been observed with the rebuilding work of Ouse Bridge in the sixteenth century as a causal factor for the eventual abolition of the muremasters, while within Hull it is possible to trace the involvement of certain building professionals and their families across decades. The Catlin family in Hull served the Bench of Hull on numerous building projects, both civic and military. This reveals the possibilities and imperative of further research that could impart a greater understanding of building practices of the period, such as the use of models in the devising of building schemes. It is not an exaggeration to equate figures such as William Catlin as proto-architects and the ability to trace his career, as well as unsuccessful civic advancement, also informs upon the mentality of early modern corporations who did not seek to co-opt such persons into their governing ranks.

The biographical and thematic structure of Chapter 5 is testament to the viability of urban defences as a means of researching and comprehending their differing uses and functions for their respective urban governments, citizens and the state, from c.1550-1700. This thesis subscribes to the prevalent argument that this period witnessed the increasing development of regulatory and moralistic power by incorporated governments, in accordance with the demands wrought by the changing religious, social and political contexts of the times (Clark 2000). Within these developments the military function of the walls and their medieval and military exigency can be understood as having been resoundingly appropriated for non-military purposes by their respective corporations. This was of course overridden

and interrupted by the immediacy and threatening times of the Civil War, which is a period that merits its own separate considerations.

It was always the intention of the thesis not to concentrate on such a time-specific, complex and historically loaded period that would have distorted the holistic nature of the research. However, within Hull the potential for further research in the build up to and outbreak of the Civil War requires further consideration within the specificity of its context and the interplay of local political tensions and personalities. In terms of York and Hull's defences, the Civil War certainly engendered a lasting and damaging legacy that distorted and ruptured the previously maintained equilibrium between the authority of the state and the independence of incorporated civic governments. One means of exemplifying this was writ large through the appropriation of urban defences. The function of the walls for the regulation of entry and egress did not alter and continued throughout this period; what had altered was the authority by which the defences were now administered. The state had usurped and appropriated the corporations' administrative ability to regulate and define the perception and propagation of their moral and civic power, as well as their historically constructed and reinforcing forms of identity and civic prominence.

A central tenet of the thesis is the co-option of a corporation's citizenry within a symbiotic system of administration, one that fused civic duty with personal and public interests (Heijden 2012). This was expressed through those formally recognised and instituted offices that permeated throughout the civic administrative strata and included: the mayor and aldermen, the watchmen, the custodian of a postern key, the citizens when charged to oversee the constables in their performance of the watch during plague, the man ringing a bell before the cart carrying adulterers as it perambulated the streets from Bar to Bar, or even the master beggar preventing the entry of vagabonds through the gates. Therefore, within discussions of the appropriation of defences away from corporations and toward the state, it must be recognised that traditional conduits by which citizens had been able

to participate in systems of administration and regulation were also suspended or abolished.

The significant feature of York and Hull's walls, as is evident through the archival material, is the concept of ownership. The thesis has unequivocally demonstrated the prevalence and significance of leasing the defences. The cases of Thomas Wentworth's trustees and Hull's address in 1693 reveal that the same legalistic terms of reference and discourse were applied to notions of law and equity within their proprietorship disputes at both the individual and corporate level. The meticulously transcribed accounts of York leases during the period provide an invaluable amount of quantitative data applicable to various disciplines and research questions. This data would enable a systematic recreation of biographical ownership for the entire defensive circuit. It could then reveal if discernible patterns of distribution were made according to social status or profession and highlight the legacy and continuous use of the defences and their environs (See Item 12, ownership of a moat outside of Bootham Bar). The continuous convention of leasing exemplifies that their utilisation was not simply a matter between the respective corporations and the state, but also the legitimate rights and interests of individuals as citizens and tenants.

The material legacy of York's walls is still an important attribute in defining the city's sense of identity and uniqueness, while also continuing to determine the physical navigation of entry and egress. Within Hull there is little evidence that the town had once possessed medieval and early modern urban defences, and anecdotally many people are unaware of the fact. Where they have survived, such as Berwick upon Tweed, Chester and Exeter, or European examples such as Lucca, they remain an inescapable and integral aspect of the urban environment that is actively maintained, conserved and presented for public engagement. Notably, those English cities identified are among some of the most often cited and researched examples of English urban defences, with the extant survival of their defences surely influencing their perceived viability for study. The

interdisciplinary methodology of this thesis has successfully repositioned urban defences within the post-medieval built environment through the integration and analysis of extant remains, the reconstruction of now lost forms, archival research and available art historical resources and proved their continued significance and utilisation throughout the period 1550-1700. With an established methodological framework, future research could soon be in a strong enough position to enable the enquiry: what was the architectural legacy of early modern walls within industrial society post-1700?

Bibliography

Manuscript primary sources

Kingston-upon-Hull: Hull City Archives (HCA)

Bench Books (HCA- Item 1)

- BRB.2, 1555-1609
- BRB.3, 1609-1650
- BRB.4, 1650-1667
- BRB.5, 1664-1682
- BRB.6, 1682-1741

Miscellaneous Documents (HCA- Item 2)

- DX 130/3- Report by Major Martin Beckman on the Northern Garrisons fit to be fortified for his Majesties Service (Negative Copy)
- DX 130/5- Report by Martin Beckman on Hull defences (Negative Copy)

York: York Archives & Local History (YALH)

House Books First Series 1476-1835 (YALH- Item 3)

- B20, 1549-1552
- B21, 1552-1555
- B22, 1556-1560
- B23, 1560-1565
- B24, 1565-1572
- B25, 1572-1574
- B26, 1574-1577
- B27, 1577-1580
- B28, 1580-1585
- B29, 1585-1587
- B30, 1587-1592 (Transcribed by Margaret Elsworth YALH researcher & volunteer)

- B31, 1592-1598 (Transcribed by Margaret Elsworth YALH researcher & volunteer)
- B31, 1592-1598 (f.230r onwards)
- B32, 1598-1605
- B33, 1605-1612
- B34, 1613-1625
- B35, 1625-1637
- B36, 1637-1650
- B37, 1650-1663
- B38, 1663-1688
- B39, 1688-1700
- B50, 1827-1835

House Books Second Series 1835-1908 (YALH- Item 4)

- B15, 1875-1876
- B16, 1876-1877
- B17, 1877-1879

Ouse Bridge Account Rolls (YALH- Item 5)

- C90:1, 1552-1553
- C90:2, 1554-1555
- C91:3, 1566-1567

Foss Bridge Account Rolls (YALH- Item 6)

- C81:7, 1553-1554
- C81:11, 1563-1564

Ouse & Foss Bridge Account Rolls (YALH- Item 7)

- C93:1, 1573-1574
- C94:2, 1583-1584
- C95:1, 1593-1594
- C96:5, 1607-1608
- C97:2, 1617-1618

- C98:2, 1625-1626

Receivers' Account Rolls (YALH- Item 8)

- C66:8, 1631-1632
- C67:1, 1634-1635
- C68:3, 1644-1645
- C70:1, 1648-1649
- C72:3, 1657-1658
- C72:4, 1658-1659
- C73:1, 1660-1661
- C74:2, 1664-1665
- C74:3, 1665-1666
- C74:4, 1666-1667
- C75:1, 1668-1669
- C75:4, 1671-1672
- C76:2, 1674-1675
- C77:4, 1681-1682

Miscellaneous Documents (YALH- Item 9)

- G42: 1-2, Wentworth against mayor of York 1652/53
- K20, City bars & walls: cases & opinions 1810
- K23, Papers connected with and information to compel the repair of the city walls and prevent their removal 1812
- K24: 1-2, Rampart or moat without Skeldergate Postern: cases & opinions 1831
- K28:E, Memorial from the committee for the restoration of the city walls, Feb. 3rd 1832

Printed primary sources

- Browning, A (ed) (1991) *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby: the complete text and a selection from his letters*. London: Royal Historical Society
- Georges Edelen (ed) (1994) *William Harrison The Description of England: The Classic Contemporary Account of Tudor Social Life* (London and New York, 1994). New York: Dover Publications
- Rogers P (ed) (1971) *Daniel Defoe: A tour through the whole island of Great Britain*. London: Penguin Books

Published secondary sources

- Allison, K J (1969a) 'Fortifications' in K J Allison (ed), *A History of the County of York Volume I: the city of Kingston upon Hull*, 412-418. London: Oxford University Press
- Allison, K J (1969b) 'Medieval Hull' in K J Allison (ed), *A History of the County of York Volume I: the city of Kingston upon Hull*, 11-89. London: Oxford University Press
- Allison, K J & Tillott, P M (1969) 'The city of Kingston upon Hull' in K J Allison (ed), *A History of the County of York Volume I: the city of Kingston upon Hull*, 1-10. London: Oxford University Press
- Archer, J A (2000) 'Politics and government 1540-1700' in P Clark (ed), *The Cambridge urban history of Britain: volume II 1540-1840*, 235-262. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Austin, D (ed) (2007) *Acts of perception: a study of Barnard Castle in Teesdale*. Durham: English Heritage and The Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland
- Booth, R K (1990) *York: the history and heritage of a city*. London: Barrie and Jenkins
- Borsay, P (1989) *The English urban renaissance: culture and society in the provincial town, 1660-1770*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Braddick, M J (2000) *State formation in early modern England c.1550-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Brown, P B (2012) *Views of York: portrait of a city 1610 to present day*. York: York Civic Trust
- Bull, S (2008) *'The furie of the ordnance': artillery in the English Civil Wars*, Woodbridge: Boydell Press
- Chatrand, R (2005) *French fortresses in North America 1535-1763: Quebec, Montreal, Louisbourg and New Orleans*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing
- Clark, P (2000) 'Introduction' in P Clark (ed) *The Cambridge urban history of Britain: volume II 1540-1840*, 1-24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Clark, P & Slack, P (1972) 'Introduction' in P Clark and P Slack (ed), *Crisis and order in English towns, 1500-1700*, 1-56. Abingdon: Routledge
- Coad, J (1997) 'Defending the realm: the changing technology of warfare' in D Gaimster and P Stamper (eds) *The age of transition: the archaeology of English culture 1400-1600*, 157-169. Oxford: Oxbow Books
- Colvin, H M (1982) *The history of the king's works, Volume 4, 1485-1660*. London: H. M. S. O.
- Cooke, D (2011) *Yorkshire sieges of the civil wars*. Barnsley: Pen and Sword Family History
- Creighton, O H (2002a) *Castles and landscapes: power, community and fortification in Medieval England*. London: Continuum
- Creighton, O H and Higham, R (2005b) *Medieval town walls: an archaeology and social history of urban defence*. Stroud: Tempus
- Creighton, O H & Liddiard, R (2008) 'Fighting yesterday's battle: beyond war or status in castle studies', *Medieval Archaeology* 52, 161-169
- Croix, H de la (1972) *Military considerations in city planning: fortifications*. New York: G. Braziller
- Falkner, J (2011) *Marshal Vauban and the defence of Louis XIV's France*. Barnsley: Pen & Sword Books Ltd

- Foreman, M (1988) *Hull Citadel 1988*. Beverley: Humberside County Council
- Forster, G C F (1969) 'Hull in the 16th and 17th centuries' in K J Allison (ed), *A History of the County of York Volume I: the city of Kingston upon Hull*, 90-173. London: Oxford University Press
- Friedrichs, C R (1995) *The Early Modern city 1450-1750*. Harlow: Longman
- Giles, K (2003) 'Reforming corporate charity: guilds and fraternities in pre-and post-Reformation York' in D Gaimster and R Gilchrist (eds) *The archaeology of reformation 1480-1580*, 325-340. Leeds: Maney
- Gee, E A (1979) *The Architecture of York*. York: Cerialis Press
- Gowing, L (2000) 'The freedom of the streets': women and social space, 1560-1640' in P Griffiths & M S R Jenner (eds) *Londinopolis: essays in the cultural and social history of early modern London*, 130-151. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press
- Griffiths, A (1998) *The print in Stuart Britain, 1603-1689*. London: British Museum Press
- Griffiths, P (2006) *The Vauban fortifications of France*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing
- Grove, D (1999) *Berwick Barracks and Fortifications*. London: English Heritage
- Gurnham, R (2011) *The story of Hull*. Andover: Phillimore
- Hale, J R (1983) *Renaissance War Studies*. London: Hambledon
- Halliday, P D (1998) *Dismembering the body politics: partisan politics in England's towns, 1650-1730*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Harding, V (2000) 'Reformation and culture 1540-1700' in P Clark (ed), *The Cambridge urban history of Britain: volume II 1540-1840*, 263-288. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Harrington, P (2003a) *English Civil War fortifications 1642-51*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing

- Harrington, P (2007b) *The castles of Henry VIII*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing
- Healy, M (2001) *Fictions of disease in early modern England: bodies, plagues and politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave
- Heijden, M van der (2012) *Civic duty: public services in the early modern Low Countries*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing
- Hicks, D & Beaudry, M C (2006) 'Introduction: the place of historical archaeology' in D Hicks & M C Beaudry (eds), *The Cambridge companion to historical archaeology*, 1-9. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hill, P & Wileman, J (2002) *Landscapes of war: the archaeology of aggression and defence*. Stroud: Tempus Publishing Ltd
- Hindle, S (2002) *The state and social change in early modern England, 1550-1640*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Hindle, S & Kümin, B (2009) 'The spatial dynamics of parish politics: topographies of tension in English communities, c. 1350-1640' in B Kümin (ed) *Political space in pre-industrial Europe*, 151-173. Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate Publishing
- Hopper, A (2007) *'Black Tom': Sir Thomas Fairfax and the English revolution*. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press
- Howes, A & Foreman, M (1999) *Town and gun: the 17th century defences of Hull*. Kingston-Upon-Hull: Kingston Press
- Hug, T B (2009) 'Outwitting power: bogus kings and officials in Early Modern England' in B Kümin (ed) *Political space in pre-industrial Europe*, 215-230. Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate
- Hull City Council (1987) *The archaeology of the Beverley Gate, Hull: interim report*. Beverley/Kingston-upon-Hull: Hull City Council/Humberside County Council
- Jenner, M S R (2000) 'From conduit community to commercial network? Water in London, 1500-1725 in P Griffiths & M S R Jenner (eds) *Londinopolis: essays in the cultural and social history of early*

- modern London*, 250-272. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press
- Johnson, M (2002) *Behind the castle gate: from Medieval to Renaissance*. London and New York: Routledge
 - Kemp, R L (1996) *The archaeology of York, the medieval defences and suburbs: the church and gilbertine priory of St Andrew, Fishergate, Vol 11*. York: York Archaeological Trust
 - Liddiard, R (2005) *Castles in context: power, symbolism and landscape, 1066 to 1500*. Macclesfield: Windgather Press
 - Lucas, G (2006) 'Historical archaeology and time' in D Hicks & M C Beaudry (eds), *The Cambridge companion to historical archaeology*, 34-47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
 - Mann, E (2006) 'In defence of the city: the gates of London and Temple Bar in the seventeenth century', *Architectural History* 49, 75-99
 - Mee, F & Wilson, B (2005a) *The city walls and castles of York: the pictorial evidence*. York: York Archaeological Trust
 - Mee, F & Wilson, B (2002b) *'The fairest arch in England': old Ouse Bridge, York, and its buildings, the pictorial evidence*. York: York Archaeological Trust
 - Mytum, H (2010) 'Ways of writing in post-medieval and historical archaeology: introducing biography', *Post-medieval archaeology*, 44 (2), 237-254
 - O'Keefe, T & Yamin, R (2006) 'Urban historical archaeology' in D Hicks & M C Beaudry (eds), *The Cambridge companion to historical archaeology*, 87-103. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
 - Palliser, D M (1978b) 'A crisis in English towns? the case of York', *Northern History*, 14, 108-125
 - Palliser, D M (1979c) *Tudor York*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
 - Perbellini, G (2000) 'City walls and their symbolic significance: introduction' in G Perbellini (ed), *The town walls in the Middle Ages*, 7-18. The Hague: Europa Nostra

- Peters, C (2014) *Women in early modern Britain, 1450-1640*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Platt, C (2007) 'Revisionism in castle studies: a caution', *Medieval Archaeology* 51, 83-102
- Pogson, F (1997) 'Wentworth as president of the Council of the North, 1628-41' in J C Appleby & P Dalton (eds) *Government, religion and society in northern England 1000-1700*, 185-198. Stroud: Sutton Publishing
- Pollak, M (2010a) *Cities at war in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Pollak, M D (1991b) *Military architecture, cartography and the representation of the Early Modern city: a checklist of treatises on fortification in the Newberry Library*. Chicago: Newberry Library
- Rawcliffe, C (2013) *Urban bodies: communal health in late medieval English towns and cities*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press
- Reckitt, B N (1988) *Charles the first and Hull, 1639-1645*. Howden: Mr Pye Books
- Reed, M (2000) 'The urban landscape 1540-1700' in P Clark (ed), *The Cambridge urban history of Britain: volume II 1540-1840*, 289-313. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Reyerson, K L (2000) 'Medieval walled space: urban development vs. defense' in J D Tracy (ed), *City walls: the urban enceinte in global perspective*, 89-116. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Royal Commission on Historical Monuments of England (1972) *An inventory of the historical monuments in the city of York, vol II: the defences*. London: H. M. S. O.
- Samson, R (1992) 'Knowledge, constraint, and power in inaction: the defenceless medieval wall', *Historical Archaeology* 26 (3), 26-44
- Saunders, A (1989) *Fortress Britain: artillery fortification in the British Isles and Ireland*. Liphook: Beaufort
- Sharpe, J A (1999) *Crime in early modern England, 1550-1750*. London & New York: Longman

- Stoye, M (2003) *Circled with stone: Exeter's city walls 1485-1660*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press
- Swanson, H (1983a) *Building craftsmen in late medieval*. York: Borthwick Papers
- Tillott, P M (ed) (1961) *The Victoria History of the County of York: the city of York*. London: Oxford University Press
- Tittler, R (1991a) *Architecture and power: the town hall and the English urban community c. 1500-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Tittler, R (2007b) *The face of the city: civic portraiture and civic identity in early modern England*. Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press
- Tittler, R (1998c) *The Reformation and the towns in England: politics and political culture, c. 1540-1640* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)
- Tittler, R, (2001d) *Townsppeople and nation: English urban experiences, 1540-1640*. Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Tracy, J D (2000) 'Introduction' in J D Tracy (ed), *City walls: the urban enceinte in global perspective*, 1-15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Turnbull, S (2006) *The art of renaissance warfare: from the fall of Constantinople to the Thirty Years War*. London: Greenhill
- Verhaeghe, F (1997) 'The archaeology of transition: a Continental view' in D Gaimster and P Stamper (eds) *The age of transition: the archaeology of English culture 1400-1600*, 25-44. Oxford: Oxbow Books
- Walker, J (2008) *Berwick upon Tweed*. Stroud: The History Press
- Wallace, W E (1987) "Dal disegno allo spazio": Michelangelo's drawings for the fortifications of Florence', *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 46 (2), 119-134
- Walton, J K (2000) 'North' in P Clark (ed), *The Cambridge urban history of Britain: volume II 1540-1840*, 111-131. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Wenham, P (1970) *The great and close siege of York, 1644*. York: Roundwood Press
- Wilki, L A (2006) 'Documentary archaeology' in D Hicks and MC Beaudry (eds.), *The Cambridge companion to historical archaeology*, 13-33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Withington, P (2008a) 'Citizens, soldiers and urban culture in Restoration England', *English Historical Review*, 502, 587-610
- Withington, P (2010b) *Society in early modern England: the vernacular origins of some powerful ideas*. Cambridge & Malden: Polity Press
- Withington, P (2005c) *The politics of commonwealth: citizens and freemen in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Wood, A (2013) *The memory of the people: custom and popular sense of the past in early modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Woodward, D (1995) *Men at work: labourers and building craftsmen in the towns of northern England, 1450-1750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Zeune, J (2000) 'German town walls: functionalism and symbolism' in G Perbellini (ed), *The town walls in the middle ages*, 39-42. The Hague: Europa Nostra

Unpublished Theses

- Brighton, J T (1978) *The Enamel Glass-Painters of York: 1585-1795*', unpublished DPhil thesis, University of York
- Hartshorne, P B (2004) 'The street and the perception of public space in York, 1476-1586', unpublished DPhil thesis, University of York
- Mallagh, C (1981) 'Science, warfare and society in the Renaissance: with particular reference to fortification theory', unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Leeds

- Swanson, H C (1980b) 'Craftsmen and industry in late medieval York', unpublished DPhil thesis, University of York
- Wheatley, A M (2001) 'The idea of the castle in medieval England', unpublished DPhil thesis, University of York
- Withington, P (1998d) 'Urban political culture in later seventeenth century England York, 1649-1688', unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Cambridge

Online resources

- The British Museum- Collection Online:
http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/search.aspx
- English Heritage Thesauri, <http://thesaurus.english-heritage.org.uk/>
- Fernes Art Gallery, Kingston-upon-Hull:
<http://www.bbc.co.uk/arts/yourpaintings/paintings/charles-i-demanding-entrance-at-the-beverley-gate-hull-23-78270>
- The Hepworth Wakefield- The Gott Collection:
<http://www.hepworthwakefield.org/collection/the-gott-collection/>
- The History of Parliament:
<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/>
- Hull History Centre (HHC anon, 2010), List of Mayors and Lord Mayors of Hull, 1331-2012:
<http://www.hullhistorycentre.org.uk/discover/pdf/HullMayors%202013.pdf>
- The National Archives, Currency Converter:
<http://apps.nationalarchives.gov.uk/currency/default0.asp#mid>
- The Oxford English Dictionary: <http://www.oed.com/>