Aspects of archaeology, history, landscape, material culture and structures of bishops' houses in the English dioceses of Carlisle and Durham, and the Scots dioceses of Glasgow and St Andrews c1450-1660

SMITH, CAROLINE,ELIZABETH,HARRIE

Aspects of archaeology, history, landscape, material culture and structures of bishops' houses in the English dioceses of Carlisle and Durham, and the Scots dioceses of Glasgow and St Andrews c1450-1660

Caroline Elizabeth Harriet Smith

Volume 1 of 2

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Departments of History and Archaeology

Durham University

2019

ABSTRACT

Caroline Smith

Aspects of archaeology, history, landscape, material culture and structures of bishops' houses in the English dioceses of Carlisle and Durham, and the Scots dioceses of Glasgow and St Andrews c1450-1660.

Using historical and archaeological datasets, this PhD explores how bishop's palaces reflect the differing needs and ambitions of their residents between 1450 and 1660. These two centuries witnessed both great religious transformation during the English and Scottish Reformations and political upheaval during the English Civil War and the period of the Commonwealth. Yet the episcopacy was central throughout as bishops, preoccupied with their judicial and spiritual responsibilities, continued to manage their large and dispersed estates.

The last major study of bishop's palaces was published in 1998 by Michael Thompson, more than 20 years ago. Few have been analysed since and little has been done to place results into their wider political, social and regional context. This doctoral thesis redresses that imbalance with an analysis of the four bishoprics of Durham, Carlisle, Glasgow and St. Andrews. The diversity of their fortunes and geography maximises opportunities for comparison and contrast. Durham was one of the wealthiest bishoprics, Carlisle one of the poorest while the inclusion of Glasgow and St. Andrews spans the Anglo-Scottish border. How did the changing political and religious setting affect the function of these sites and how might these changes be reflected in the archaeological record?

Four major themes are addressed: household and family, hospitality, bishop's houses and their landscapes, and what became of their houses when the bishops were no longer present. The approach is interdisciplinary, combining archaeological and historical data including unpublished 'grey literature', historic documents, cartography and illustrations as well as evidence from the most recent archaeological excavations. Finally, there are strong strategic and academic reasons to view this PhD as timely. The topic aligns with the AHRC funded-initiative 'Religion and Society', as well as a major new permanent exhibition exploring the history of faith in Britain which is to be housed in a new national museum at Bishop Auckland, a favoured residence of the Bishops of Durham.

CONTENTS

VOLUME 1 - TEXT

VOLUME 2 – FIGURES AND APPENDICES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CAC: Carlisle Archive Centre

CCB: Church Commissioners' Box (Special Collections, Durham University)

CCC: Carlisle County Council

DCC: Durham County Council

HER: Historic Environment Record

LMA: London Metropolitan Archive

MS/S: Mickleton and Spearman manuscripts (Special Collections, Durham University)

Mss: Machell manuscripts (Carlisle Archive Centre)

NA: National Archives, Kew

NRS: National Records of Scotland (Edinburgh)

Tanner MSS: Tanner Manuscripts (Special Collections, Durham University)

ODNB: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very grateful to the Isabel Fleck Fund in History and Archaeology at Durham University (2016-18) for sponsoring my doctoral research. Also to those institutions who provided their facilities so generously: Ancram Local Archaeology Society, The Auckland Project, Carlisle Archive Centre, DigVentures, Durham University Archaeological Services, Durham University Special Collections, Edinburgh City Archives, Historic England, Historic Environment Scotland, London Metropolitan Archive, Melbourne Hall, the Monimail Project, National Archives of Scotland (NAS), Rose Castle Trust.

I owe a great debt to all those who have helped me in the course of my research and would especially like to thank Richard Annis, Jamie Armstrong, Peter Carne, John Castling, Penny Dransart, Linda Drury, Andrew Ferrera, Francis Gotto, Gemma Lewis, Adrian Maldanado, Richard Strathie, Lynda and David Rollason, Peter Rowley-Conwy, Michael Stansfield and Jeff Veitch.

There would have been no thesis at all were it not for my very patient supervisors Chris Gerrard, Adrian Green and Pam Graves and without the unending support I have had from my family and friends, especially Emma Dobson, Rachael Harkes and of course Ed Treasure.

CEHS
Durham 20-12-2019

For my parents, who have always supported me in everything I have wanted to do with no question and hesitation, and always with full support.

1

Bridging the border

1.1. Episcopal houses

This thesis investigates the development of episcopal houses between 1450 and 1660 across four dioceses in England and Scotland (Durham, Carlisle, Glasgow and St Andrews). Against the backdrop of the English and Scottish Reformations, Civil War and Commonwealth periods which redefined the religious climate in Britain and, more specifically, the role of the bishop, the overarching aim is to explore how these contemporary political, religious and social events influenced residences and their residents.

Working on the premise that man-made changes to the built and natural environment hold meaning, this research must be in part archaeological because of the need to understand the many physical changes made to the 31 sites within the study area and the 'materiality of episcopacy'. On the other hand, in order to understand the role of and necessity for a bishop, and their place within English and

Scottish society in the later 15th, 16th and 17th centuries, a range of documentary sources must also be explored in order to understand how and why the lifeways of bishops, clergy, household, family and guests changed. This multi-disciplinary and multi-scalar approach has the potential to bring new perspectives. As will become clear, to date there has been no similar examination of bishops and their roles, at least for this period, and this thesis aims to redress that imbalance.

1.2. Objectives

This thesis has five primary objectives:

- First, to assess the function of episcopal sites, how they were used by their households and the families who lived there.
- Second, to investigate how the layouts of episcopal sites and the buildings present there changed over the course of the study period.
- Third, to explore how other different interest groups interacted and engaged with episcopal sites *within a contemporary context*. The focus here will be on the dynamic relationship between bishops and their wider communities, on hospitality and largesse.
- Fourth, to evaluate how religious transformations of the period manifested themselves through objects, buildings, and landscapes. What was the impact of religious change on the specific episcopal sites under study here and what happened when lessees and new owners came to occupy and re-shape their post-medieval histories?
- Lastly, to compare and contrast the development of residences in dioceses of differing wealth and historical backgrounds. The broad geographical range of the thesis, which takes in both sides of the Scottish/English border, makes this possible. This is a first attempt at a study of this kind and it takes into consideration the many differences between regions and diocesan backgrounds. The findings add nuance to studies of bishop's houses and help to place them within wider society.

1.3. Geographical regions

Residences from four dioceses are examined here, two in England (Durham and Carlisle) and two in Scotland (St Andrews and Glasgow). These dioceses have been selected for three reasons. Firstly, the four dioceses border one another (Figure 1.1) which furnishes a rare opportunity to study similarities and differences between regions which share historic relationships and geographical proximity. Most importantly, these four dioceses straddle the Anglo-Scottish border, so that the effects of historic events and circumstances relating to both countries can be examined. As we will see, throughout the later medieval period, these four dioceses shared intermittently fractious and interconnected relationships. The Diocese of Carlisle traces its early medieval origins back to the early Glaswegian

religious houses and was part of the territory maintained by the Bishops of Durham until 1133 (Dobson 1983; Shead 1969), while Durham Priory maintained an important daughter house, Coldingham Priory, in the Scottish Borders (Brown 1972). Both in England and Scotland, bishops were translated between bishoprics though not between countries. Despite their connections, however, the Anglo-Scottish wars of the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries tended to shape the architectural environment and its associated landscapes.

The four dioceses also vary in wealth and circumstances. For example, the dioceses of Glasgow and St Andrews were both elevated to archdiocesan status within the study-period, while the diocese of Durham maintained its Palatinate status and the diocese of Carlisle was amongst the least wealthy dioceses in England and Wales. The four dioceses also contain a surprising range of site types which are available for study, all of them in varying states of preservation and structural condition. For the most part, because of the rural nature of these four regions and (in some cases) their designation as sites of 'National Importance', very few episcopal sites and landscapes have been entirely redeveloped in modern times. Nevertheless, developer-funded and community archaeology does provide a valuable new dataset which can be extracted from unpublished 'grey literature' including evidence for standing buildings, excavated sites and below-ground deposits. As we will see in Chapter 2, the abundance and quality of documentary evidence is variable. However, when the documentary, archaeological and material datasets for all four dioceses are combined, this mitigates against the limitations of specific case studies.

1.4 Historical context: national and regional perspectives

1.4.1 Pre-Reformation episcopacy in England and Scotland

Bishops were among the most powerful figures in later medieval Europe. Their role encompassed many of the foundational institutions that underpinned feudal power and authority in medieval Europe. As spiritual leaders of the Catholic Church, bishops were responsible for overseeing religious procedure within their diocese and communicating instruction from the Vatican. Monastic and conventual orders and dean and chapters all came under their purview, with the bishop being responsible for making ordinations and overseeing religious protocol. Their role as diocesan representatives of the Church directly informed the placement and ownership of the houses under discussion here. As possessions of the Catholic Church, episcopal residences were formally under Vatican control, though the Pope rarely enforced jurisdictions over its diocesan properties. Papal permission was granted for this and so provided a precedent for the level of papal interference within domestic diocesan affairs. For bishops, who owned numerous and disparate residences and estates, day-to-day governance and building work was usually arranged and commissioned without papal oversight.

Most episcopal residences were established during the 11th and 12th centuries and their location sometimes corresponded with early medieval diocesan boundaries and religious or urban centres. The distribution of some of the sites in this thesis corresponds with these characteristics. For example, Crayke Castle, a residence of the Bishops of Durham, lay within a territorial enclave of North Yorkshire which had been granted to the Durham diocese in 685 AD (see Appendix 5). The distribution of houses also facilitated the peripatetic lifestyle of medieval bishops. Analysis of the itineraries of the later medieval bishops of Durham reveals that between the 12th and mid-14th centuries the bishops moved regularly between houses to expend resources there and enact judicial control across the region (Smith 2016). The placement of their houses therefore broadly corresponds to the manorial and bailiwick divisions of the diocese, with each episcopal residence serving as an administrative centre. This arrangement both reflected and dictated the bishop's judicial responsibilities. In addition to their spiritual governance, bishops also owned vast swathes of land which enabled them to exert their lordly responsibilities. The leasing of land and sale and control of the resultant assets, for example, generated an important source of income for later medieval dioceses and there is a very direct relationship between the wealth of individual bishoprics and the quantity of land and resources owned by them. By the early 15th century, the division of wealth between the smallest dioceses (such as Sodor and Man, St David's and Llandaff) and the largest dioceses (including Winchester, Bath and Wells and Durham) can be largely explained by their vastly different geographical dimensions (Heal 1984: 51). The quantity and nature of medieval episcopal residences reflects this wealth disparity also. Among the sites under study here, the dioceses of Durham, Glasgow and St Andrews are among the wealthiest tier of medieval bishoprics (Heal 1987; Thompson 1998: 17). Carlisle was much less affluent, despite its sizeable geographical reach.

For the bishopric of Durham, its special Palatine situation was of course hugely influential on matters of prosperity and status and the issue of episcopal liberty of Durham was openly contested between Bishop Antony Bek of Durham and King Edward I in 1293 (Fraser 1956; Fraser 1959). For many, Durham's episcopal lineage could be traced back to St Aidan and the religious community on Holy Island. The foundation of Durham Cathedral and the cult of St Cuthbert centred on the monks fleeing Holy Island following Norse raids and establishing a new monastic community in Durham after 40 years wandering through north-east England (Bonner et al 1989). The early community, the *Haliwerfolc*, held distinct social and ethnic values which derived from their origin (Liddy 2008) and underpinned local attitudes toward national identity and Durham's place within it. Arguably, the interconnected nature of episcopacy, regional identity and religious history impacted upon the relationship between the bishopric of Durham and the English nation itself. Specific duties added to the episcopal purview following the establishment of the Palatinate of Durham in 1293 included the ability to mint coins, for which archaeological evidence has been found on Palace Green in Durham city (Allen 1999), to hold law courts (Larson 2010) and to levy taxes (Scammell 1966). Conditional

on this, the Palatinate of Durham acted as a buffer zone between England and Scotland and the bishop was expected to raise armies if needed, though in actuality their contributions were often minor (Gerrard 2016). The bishop's castle in Norham, close to the Scottish border, reflects precisely this aspect of their role. Built according to the conventions of a typical motte-and-bailey castle, Norham Castle saw significant military action between English and Scottish factions. The bishopric of Durham included in their number many of the most successful later medieval warrior-bishops in England, among them Antony Bek and Thomas Hatfield.

In contrast, the diocese of Carlisle was severely affected by Scots raiding parties which had a devastating impact on the infrastructure, buildings, economy and local ecology of the north-west region (Slavin 2014; Tuck 1985). Ongoing warfare throughout the 13th and 14th centuries during the Scottish Wars of Independence was exacerbated by bands of Border reivers who raided towns and homes in northern England and southern Scotland (Moffat 2007). The earliest two building phases at Rose Castle are believed to have been destroyed by Scottish raiders (see Appendix 9), for example, while the episcopal residence at Linstock Castle was leased by the Bishops of Carlisle to the townspeople of Linstock in 1450 to be used as a prison for Scottish raiders. The ongoing conflict between England and Scotland throughout the 13th-16th centuries only exacerbated ongoing famine through the destruction of crops and livestock (Slavin 2014). Tensions between England and Scotland extended across the border too. In 1525, Archbishop of Glasgow Gavin Dunbar condemned the Border Reivers for the damage they had caused in the Scottish Borders (Oram 2004).

Another key difference between the Scottish and English bishops centred on their residences within capital cities. All the English and Welsh bishops maintained residences in London, mostly located in and around the Strand, where they had been based since the 12th-14th centuries (Schofield 2017). There appears to have been no expectation for Scottish bishops to do the same in Edinburgh, though there were in fact episcopal residences within all the major diocesan centres. An episcopal residence in Edinburgh, the bishop's house on Edinburgh Cowgate (see Appendix 13), was first established *c.* 1509 by Archbishop James Beaton of Glasgow, who retained this property throughout his subsequent episcopate at St Andrews. This arrangement may well reflect the political and courtly expectations of medieval bishops in both England and Scotland. Depending on the particular roles they were assigned to by the monarch, English bishops spent differing proportions of their time in London undertaking their courtly obligations. Among these were the many bishops of Durham who held high positions at court. For example, Thomas Hatfield (1345-81) was appointed Lord Privy Seal in 1344, Thomas Langley (1406-37) was Keeper of King's Signet and Keeper of the Privy Seal during his episcopate, and Lawrence Booth (1457-76) served as Lord Chancellor of England (Pollard 2008). The Scottish bishops held similarly noteworthy roles within royal, aristocratic and courtly circles, but were more likely to have come from them originally. Alexander Stewart (1504-13), the archbishop of St

Andrews (1493-1513), was the illegitimate son of James IV of Scotland, while James Stewart, archbishop of St Andrews (1497-1504), was the second son on James III of Scotland. Many others (such as Patrick Graham (1472-78) and Alexander Gordon (1550-51) had royal blood. The effect of this was to create an episcopal class with closer ties to the secular elite, rather than a separate entity which was bound primarily by religious instruction.

1.4.2 The English Reformation

The official 'Break with Rome' in 1532, which was formalised with the Act of Supremacy during that year, catalysed the English Protestant Reformation. Unlike elsewhere in Europe, the unique circumstances surrounding the English Reformation allowed for the retention of bishops whereas they were universally abolished elsewhere during all other European Reformations. The Henrician Reformation has often been noted for its lack of radicalism or transformative underpinning religious ideology, and this partly manifested itself through the retention of the episcopacy in the English Church. Bishops were to continue as a constituent part of the English Church until 1650, though aspects of their role and lifestyle did change with the Reformation. Significant archaeological attention has been paid to the physical impact of the Reformation on architecture and material culture (see, for example, Gaimster and Gilchrist 2003). Most work, though not all of it by archaeologists, has been focused on the effect of iconoclasm in churches and cathedrals (e.g. Aston 2003; Spicer 2003; Oakey 2003; Tarlow 2003; J.Jones 2017; Parish 2017a) and changes to lay worship in domestic settings (Tarlow 2003). The impact of the Dissolution of the Monasteries (1536-41) is a similarly widely understood and archaeologically explored phenomenon (e.g. Morris 2003; Doggett 2001). Very little research, however, has examined the impact of the Reformation on bishops specifically; most scholarly work had tended to examine their houses and material culture during the later medieval period only (i.e. up to *c.*1532 and not much beyond).

Materially, the Dissolution of the Monasteries had less impact on bishops than it did on other Church groups, but it did affect their financial situation and the hierarchical structure of the Church more generally. With the removal of monastic institutions, priories and convents, the established ecclesiastical hierarchy of the Church was forever changed. Although bishops retained their positions, the everyday duties which had previously involved liaising, advising and working closely with these communities now ended. At episcopal residences with resident college communities, such as at Auckland Castle and Darlington Manor House, purpose-built accommodation for resident religious communities ceased to have a function. These colleges were generally rare at episcopal residences, and more usually found in association with cathedrals. For example, at both Auckland and Darlington very little is known about their use during either the later medieval or early modern period and almost nothing is known archaeologically (see Appendices 2 and 3). Documentary references to the reuse of the college at Auckland Castle as a '*bowling alleye and shooting range'* in 1561 confirm that the

community there had already disbanded by that date allowing for the re-purposing of the college buildings there (Raine 1852:70).

It has long been recognised that financial gain was a motivating factor behind the Dissolution of the Monasteries. Through the systematic liquidation of assets belonging to churches and cathedrals, Church wealth came to be unlocked. Once the monarch assumed the role as Head of the Church of England, this wealth could then be freely used between Church and State in new ways. The material, financial and human impacts of the Dissolution of the Monasteries in both Carlisle and Durham have all been extensively studied and are well understood due to the exceptional survival of contemporary documentary records (Dobson 2005; Dobson 1983). For bishops in particular, there was a significant financial toll. Prior to the Reformation, the bishopric had obtained much of its wealth from Church assets and through revenue from adjunct religious institutions. These institutions were obliged to maintain close relationships with the bishops and were subject to annual visits from them (Ekelund et al 1989). With the removal of these assets, a significant portion of episcopal wealth disappeared. In addition, new Elizabethan systems of taxation imposed on bishops and clergy now curtailed their financial prosperity further. Other than the financial implications of the Act of Supremacy, however, ecclesiastical property continued to be managed and governed just as it had been before the Reformation. Although there are a few examples of monarchs interfering in the domestic ownership of episcopal property, they are rare and most prominently exercised during Henry VIII's exchange of London properties in the 1530s (see Chapter 6).

The introduction of Protestant ideologies within the Anglican faith throughout the Henrician but predominantly during the Edwardian and Elizabethan reigns provided further opportunities for the adaptation and development of the episcopal role in line with new religious doctrine. For example, officially after the Henrician Reformation, but most sweepingly during the reign of Edward VI, as attitudes towards clerical celibacy changed so clergy were permitted to marry and have families (see Chapter 3 for a discussion of the spatial and architectural impacts of this). In churches and cathedrals, there has been significant work examining changes in iconography and decorative practices following the Act of Supremacy and during subsequent bouts of iconoclasm (Walsham 2017). On the other hand, little has been said about how domestic clerical architecture was affected by changes in religious belief and procedure following the Reformation, and the extent to which it was affected by the same iconoclastic, iconographic and artistic influences. Chapter 4 therefore addresses the ways that episcopal residences were adapted for 'performative' display.

Bishops, their role and placement within the Anglican Church also became central issues during the Marian Counter-Reformation (1553-58). As a Catholic who was deeply influenced by the Spanish Church which had avoided the spread of European Reformation, Mary I reversed the religious reforms implemented since 1539, which included changes to guidelines on heresy and clerical celibacy.

Although she did not try to regain monastic lands confiscated by Henry VIII which were now in the hands of new owners, she did attempt to restore the Church to papal control. For bishops, Mary I's religious policies were met with a mixed response. Some married bishops were now forced to renounce their marriages or flee abroad (Carlson 1992). Similarly, under the new heresy laws, bishops were forced to renounce Protestantism or face imprisonment (Loades 2006). The English bishops under study here who held episcopates during Mary's reign were Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of Durham (1530-59), Robert Aldrich, Bishop of Carlisle (1537-56), and Owen Oglethorpe, Bishop of Carlisle (1557-59). All three bishops were unmarried. Tunstall and Aldrich shared many of the same approaches to their faith; both accepted the Six Articles and Act of Supremacy and so maintained their Henrician Catholic stances (Louisa 2010). As a result, they more easily accepted Mary I's pro-Catholic reforms.

1.4.3 The Scottish Reformation

Although connected to and influenced by the English Reformation, the Reformation in Scotland had a different flavour, process and set of outcomes which meant that the trajectory of episcopalism differed from that in England. Whilst the Reformation in England was abrupt, catalysed by Henry VIII's 'Break with Rome' in 1532, the Scottish Reformation was a lengthier process involving decades of growing Protestant support among the wider Scottish populous which was exacerbated by prominent Scottish reformers, such as John Knox and Patrick Hamilton, who publicly addressed the laity. Influenced heavily by Continental theologians including Zwingli, Erasmus and Luther, the Scottish Reform movement opposed and defied the position of the Scottish bishops (Gannon 1930; Greaves 1973; Yule 1969; Ryrie 2006). Unlike in England where the episcopacy had been formulated within the foundational precepts of the English Church, bishops in Scotland directly opposed Reformation until the Scottish Reformation Parliament in 1560, at least officially. This period is marked by violence from both the episcopacy and Reformers. Patrick Hamilton, an early Protestant Reformer was tried for heresy by Archbishop James Beaton of St Andrews and burnt at the stake in St Andrews in 1528. George Wishart suffered a similar fate in 1546 in St Andrews, with Cardinal David Beaton, Archbishop of St Andrews, overseeing his trial and execution at St Andrews Castle. Blamed by members of the Scottish Reform movement, his involvement in Wishart's death is cited as a primary motive behind Beaton's subsequent assassination by Reformers at his episcopal residence in 1546 (Dawson 1993).

This disconnect between the theologies of the Church and popular Reform movement was exacerbated by the intellectual links being forged at universities with Continental scholars, reformers and theologians. Since the late-15th century, the universities of St Andrews and Glasgow had welcomed and fostered Renaissance humanist scholars (Doughty 1975). These universities also had strong connections with the archbishoprics of Glasgow and St Andrews, having been founded and

supported by bishops since the early-15th century. Episcopal and humanist agendas now collided uncomfortably in the cities of Glasgow and St Andrews as they became heartlands for Protestant unrest.

Aside from opposing the principle of bishops within the Protestant agenda, Scottish bishops attracted ire from Reformers. Unlike in England, there was a strong and well-established trend of nepotism within the highest clerical levels, together with simony and absenteeism (Prentis 2017; Ryrie 2006). These traits reoccur among the bishops in this study. In both the dioceses of Glasgow and St Andrews, numerous members of the same elite families became bishops. Two members of the Hamilton family and three Beatons were appointed bishops in the decades preceding the Scottish Reformation Parliament of 1560, for example. These families were all 'favourites' of the incumbent monarch. Similarly, illegitimate royal offspring such as Alexander Stewart, the Archbishop of St Andrews (1504-13) who was the son of James IV of Scotland, were deemed to be inappropriate appointments by Reformers. Scottish bishops differed still further from English ones because of their openness in taking mistresses and engaging socially with royalty and other nobility and the manner in which they involved themselves in political affairs (see Chapter 3).

On August 1 1560 the Scottish Reformation Parliament passed the *Confession of Faith Ratification Act and Papal Jurisdiction Act* which effectively abolished the jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Church in Scotland and initiated the Scottish Reformation. Present within the assembly and among the authors of the *Confession of Faith* were John Spottiswoode (Archbishop of Glasgow) and John Douglas (Archbishop of St Andrews) together with prominent Reformers, including John Knox. The Scottish Reformation had both immediate and prolonged impacts on a range of religious and social processes, including church liturgy, kirk structure and community education (see McCallum 2010 for discussion). Under a series of changes made to Church structure, as set out in the *First Book of Discipline*, calls were made to replace existing clergy with reformed ministers, though this process was lengthy. Moreover, the decision was made to replace the existing 13 medieval dioceses with 10 districts to be governed by a Superintendent instead of a bishop. In actuality three bishops converted to Protestantism and were therefore able to retain their roles. The plan to replace the bishops wholesale with superintendents was never enacted and, by 1576, archbishops and bishops were formally recognised within the Church structure.

Unlike in England, there was no formal dissolution of the monasteries. Instead members of monastic or conventual orders were permitted to remain until the end of their lives or until their role was completed. Because of this, there is no singular destructive episode associated with their building complexes. Instead, religious buildings associated with Catholicism were subjected to a more gradual process of stone quarrying and partial demolition. For example, St Andrews Cathedral, which had become vacant due to the abolition of the Mass, was systematically robbed for stone which was then

used in construction across the town (Neilson 1921). Perhaps due to the continuing role of the bishops, there is little to suggest that bishop's houses suffered a similar fate, though very little work has been undertaken to examine this more closely.

The fate of Scottish bishops within the Reformed Kirk remained stable until the minority of James VI/I which began in 1567. Throughout the unstable 1570s, there was a noted rise in Presbyterian sentiment across the country (McCallum 2016). This resulted in the issue of the *Second Book of Discipline* in 1578 which adopted a stronger Presbyterian tone and called for the abolition of episcopacy. Upon James VI seniority, this approach was reversed in line with his pro-episcopacy sentiments. By 1625, James VI had significantly reduced the level of radical clergy with the Scottish Kirk and instigated 11 bishops within a diocesan structure. At this point in time, the Scottish church most closely resembled the English Church structure.

1.4.4 The Wars of the Three Kingdoms, Commonwealth and the abolition of episcopacy in England and Scotland

The Wars of the Three Kingdoms, or the combined set of wars that comprised the Civil Wars in England, Ireland and Scotland, took place between 1639 and 1651. Although the causes were varied, nuanced and are heavily debated (see for example Morrill 1984; Somerville 1999; Fletcher 1983), religion and the role of the bishops were central to this conflict. The Bishop's Wars in 1639 and 1640 reflect the centrality and importance of bishops and religion to the ideological conflict between Church and State. These two wars, initiated by Charles I to defend episcopalism following its abolition during the Glasgow Assembly in 1638 against Covenanters seeking to promote Presbyterianism as the national religion, echoed many of the same arguments and concerns that James VI had faced previously in 1625 (Fissel 1994: 1-5). In relation to the study areas in this thesis, many of the skirmishes in the Bishops' Wars took place in the Scottish Borders and Northumberland, in territory belonging to the bishoprics of St Andrews and Durham, although no battles took place on land owned by the diocese. However, the lasting impact of the abolition of episcopacy on Scottish episcopal residences between 1638 and 1661 is poorly understood and has been severely understudied. The events of the period are complicated by the restoration of episcopacy in Scotland in 1661 until 1689 and the subsequent re-abolition in the Church of Scotland, though the episcopacy was to persist within the independent Scottish Episcopal Church. Presbyterian traditions within the Church of Scotland, on the other hand, entirely rejected episcopacy and this resulted in the eventual abandonment and sale of episcopal lands and estates which then impacted directly on the survival of Scottish episcopal residences and on the trajectory of their academic study.

The military events of the Civil Wars had a lasting impact in all four dioceses. Within the Durham diocese, there were repeated Scottish incursions. In 1640 the Scots seized Newcastle and Durham and

this resulted in the ceasing of trade and coal production for many months. Further Scottish invasions of north-east England in subsequent years had an equally devastating economic impact which affected the nation, society and the episcopacy severely (Greenhall 2012). The diocese of Carlisle was similarly affected by battles, warfare and raiding throughout the Civil Wars. In both English regions, Parliamentarian and Royalist control fluctuated and the north of England was particularly unsettled. The episcopal residences and lands in these regions were all directly affected by the conflict. Durham House, Melbourne Hall and Rose Castle were used to accommodate or garrison armies but, once again, the structural damage caused to standing buildings has not so far been investigated.

From 1646, episcopacy was abolished in England and Wales under the Commonwealth of England and Wales, and thereafter episcopal estates became vacant. After valuation, sites were sold off by Parliamentary Commissioners to raise revenue for the new Commonwealth government. In general, they were rapidly bought up by successful Parliamentarians as investments. Typically, these prospectors held staunchly anti-episcopal religious and social views. In the dioceses in this study, it was principally two individuals who acquired episcopal property. Most of the estates of the Diocese of Carlisle, including Rose Castle, were acquired by Sir William Heveningham, a regicide and active political figure within the Protectorate government (Hollis 2004). On the other side of the Pennines, Sir Arthur Haselrigge, a prominent Puritanical regicide who was appointed Commander of the North by Oliver Cromwell, acquired large portions of the Bishopric of Durham's lands, including Durham Castle, Auckland Castle, Stockton Manor as well as their industrial assets (Durston 2004). Very little work has examined the archaeological impact of the Commonwealth period on episcopal property either here or more widely but due to the brevity of the Commonwealth and the subsequent restoration of episcopacy in 1660, architectural and physical damage may perhaps have been erased in campaigns of later building repair and restoration. Within secular and urban contexts, there are a greater number of surviving examples of Commonwealth-era buildings (see Mowl and Earnshaw 1995), but this remains a fleeting and elusive historical period. Chapter 6 discusses in detail the study-sites acquired by these men during the Commonwealth and compares and contrasts their differing treatments with their personal values.

1.5 Past research

As we have already seen, in comparison with studies of other medieval and later building types, such as castles or monasteries, bishops' houses have received relatively little attention. This may be due to their complicated histories, varied uses and diverse forms. Unlike other site types, like manor houses or hunting lodges, the term 'bishop's house' or 'episcopal residence' can be applied to any domestic house type used as accommodation for the bishop and belonging to the bishopric. This might encompass any residence type, or more likely a combination of them. Consequently, they seem to fall beyond the scope of synthetic studies of historic buildings.

There have been three main studies of bishops' houses to date. Michael Thompson's *Medieval bishops' houses in England and Wales* (1998) is the seminal text for this topic and the first to define the genre of 'bishops' house' and to identify it as a singular and important site type *in its own right*. Beyond synthesising existing standing buildings and historic environment data, however, his volume presents no new archaeological information. Naomi Payne's thesis (Payne 2003) on the medieval development of the residences of the bishops of Bath and Wells and Salisbury was more innovative in its approach and particularly in its advocacy of archaeological techniques such as geophysics alongside documentary evidence. Payne's contribution was to demonstrate the potential of studying a group of episcopal residences in a particular diocese. Irrespective of site type, her approach considers the residences according to their owners and takes into consideration the role of the bishop, the houses and the local settings in her analysis.

The edited volume *Princes of the Church: Bishops and their Palaces* (Rollason 2017), published following a 2015 conference of the same name which took place at Bishop Auckland in Co. Durham, is the most substantial single published contributions in this field in recent years. Incorporating papers on medieval architectural development, parks and landscapes, food and consumption, habitational practices, recent archaeological findings and European episcopal residences, *Princes of the Church* is the most coherent attempt to place the latest findings about bishop's houses into a wider academic and theoretical framework. Despite the breadth of disciplines represented and its holistic narrative, however, *Princes of the Church* includes strikingly few contributions which examine the post-medieval development of bishops' houses. Of the 24 papers, only five examine the use of these houses after the Reformation. This period bias was also true of Thompson (1998) and Payne's (2004) work which focus exclusively on the later medieval development of episcopal houses. Even amongst biographical studies of individual episcopal houses there is an overwhelmingly focus on the later medieval period. Certain periods and events, including the Commonwealth and Civil War periods, are commonly glossed over. Fortunately, these gaps in research are more even-handedly dealt with by biographical overviews of individual episcopal residences. Detailed building biographies which combine an array of archaeological, historical and standing buildings data are available for Sherborne Old Castle (White and Cook 2015), Spynie Palace (Lewis and Pringle 2002), Lincoln Bishops' Palace (Chapman et al 1975), and St David's Palace (Turner et al 1997). In particular, these publications demonstrate the potential of adopting a diachronic approach to exploring patterns of change and continuity. But while their individual strengths are in their detail and thoroughness, their weaknesses lie in their lack of consideration of other episcopal residences. All these sites were heavily invested in and among the most important medieval episcopal residences within their respective dioceses. Most were located within their diocesan centres and they are all unequivocally 'palaces'. It was their role, value and prestige during the later medieval period which arguably informed their future survival and ensured an enduring interest from antiquarians, scholars and academics. As a counter balance, it is

important to emphasise that these major houses were just one component piece in a network of residences which also comprised manor houses, castles and hunting lodges. The risk posed by restricting study to the major palaces is that much of the nuance in episcopal behaviour surrounded their use of multiple houses and this is lost. The synthetic overviews presented by Payne and Thompson, while affected by issues surrounding lack of surviving archaeological deposits and standing building remains for some site types, do take into consideration the interconnectedness of these houses. Overall, however, there is still great scope for an encompassing examination of the development of bishops' houses nationwide which takes into consideration the distinctiveness of different site types and their combined relationship, geographical variance between dioceses and then places these findings within a European context.

Clerical residences have also received academic coverage in wider discussions of palaces, castles and manor houses in British archaeology and standing buildings studies. Synthetic works on palaces (see for example James 1990; James 2018; Keevill 2000; Rollason 2016; Thurley 2017) all make use of examples of bishop's houses in their discussions of the wider form, nature and development of palaces across England and Europe. These integrated approaches recognise the social placement of the episcopate alongside royalty and nobility as landowning classes and are best placed to capture the similarities and differences between sites used by different owners and identify common trends among them. In this they have been largely successful, though building types specific to episcopal residences have perhaps been more successfully identified in standalone studies. For example, Simon Thurley (2009) has identified the unique way in which cloisters used at Tudor episcopal palaces conflate Christian and domestic procedure, thereby evoking aspects of both the episcopal role and function of the residence. The true value of the synthetic works on palaces is their ability to provide a practical, methodological and typological basis with which to understand these site types and their role within wider spatial and geographical parameters.

Surprisingly little original archaeological fieldwork has been conducted at episcopal residences. Large-scale excavations were conducted at Wolvesey Castle (Winchester) between 1967-71 (Biddle 1968; Biddle 1969; Biddle 1970; Biddle 1972) and, fifty years later, this site is still one the most intensively investigated in Britain. The Biddle excavations were particularly valuable for understanding the multi-period occupation of the site from the early medieval through to post-medieval periods. In addition to establishing the phasing of the site and the succession of built phases there, the material culture and faunal assemblages derived from the Wolvesey excavations are the largest and most intact samples yet to be retrieved from an episcopal household. Excavations of the bishops' palace at Lincoln (Chapman et al 1975) yielded a similarly interesting artefact assemblage which sheds light on the use of local and imported pottery and wares, among other household items found there. Excavations at Winchester Palace (Phillpotts et al 2006), the London residence of the

Bishops of Winchester, have provided the largest dataset for understanding the scale and nature of London episcopal residences. The potential value of deploying geophysical prospection on episcopal palace sites has been most clearly exhibited at the Bishop's Palace at Wells (Dunning 2010; Turner et al 2010) in which the extensive below-ground remains of ranges of the episcopal residence were located and mapped. This multidisciplinary project specifically explored the architecture of Bishop Jocelin of Wells, as well as his contributions to Wells Cathedral, and successfully integrates multiple archaeological and historical sources and techniques, in this case implemented by several different institutions.

The recent and ongoing excavations and associated archaeological observations at Auckland Castle in County Durham represent another important contribution to the archaeological record for bishop's houses in England and are especially relevant in the context of this thesis. Fieldwork since 2015 has uncovered the remains of hitherto undiscovered later medieval structures and is now shedding shed light on the precise nature of 17th century demolition, repair and restoration processes. In comparison with other excavated episcopal residences, the close attention paid to understanding these later phases stands out and has the potential to provide a valuable dataset for other sites of this kind, and for Commonwealth occupation at episcopal residences in particular. Furthermore, due to good environmental conditions at the site, the excavations at Auckland have generated extensive and well-preserved faunal and artefact assemblages for the later medieval and early modern period (Chapter 4).

The excavations at Auckland Castle are a blend of developer-funded archaeology ahead of the regeneration of the site into a museum and heritage attraction, and research excavations conducted by Durham University 2018-2021 under the direction of Chris Gerrard and Pam Graves. The project underlines the potential of developer-funded archaeology to broaden the archaeological record at episcopal residences. More generally across the study area, developer-funded archaeology has contributed hugely to what is now known and the results from many of these projects have been incorporated into this thesis. There is another piece of work to be done in synthesising the contributions of developer-funded archaeology on episcopal residences in Britain and this would reveal how valuable developer-funded archaeology has been in providing new information about the lesser-studied and more poorly preserved episcopal residences. Smaller manor houses, lodges, tower houses and farm sites have generally escaped the gaze of the large-scale archaeological projects and often survive less well. In these cases, commercial developer-funded archaeology provides a useful resource for understanding and assessing their preservation, scale and nature.

1.6 Organisation of the thesis

This thesis is arranged into seven chapters. Chapters 1 (Bridging the border) and 2 (Sites and sources) are primarily concerned with background, sources and datasets. Chapter 2 is arranged into two halves.

The first provides a critical overview of available sources and their differing availability between regions while the second is a brief overview of the sources used in this thesis. Fuller site biographies can be found in the Appendices. The Appendices contain an accompanying gazetteer which outlines the phasing of individual sites, as well as the nature of the historical, archaeological and standing buildings evidence together with any visual sources. The Appendices are referred to throughout the text when clarity on the phasing or development of a site is required.

Chapters 3, 4, and 5 are detailed investigations into different themes relating to the use and development of bishops' houses. These themes have been identified according to the aims and objectives outlined above. Chapter 3 investigates the changing domestic complexion of the household in the light of religious and social changes, and the manner in which buildings were adapted to accommodate these. The ways in which these buildings served the bishop and clergy, wives and families and servants and household are all explored.

Chapter 4 examines the theme of hospitality and what hospitality means in the context of a bishop's house. Based on the premise that the provision of hospitality provides opportunities for the expression of self-identity and allegiance, this chapter explores how buildings were adapted to foster suitable environments both by adapting structures and through decorative schemes. This chapter also examines the faunal and material culture remains recovered from excavated contexts at Auckland Castle in order to gain insight into the nature of dining and feasting there.

Chapter 5 explores the development of the landscapes associated with the sites under study. The development and role of parks, gardens and productive landscapes are all discussed in this section in order to understand better how medieval landscapes of production maintained their usefulness and relevance.

Chapter 6 explores the use of bishop's houses during periods when they were *not* occupied by bishops. Leasing, abolition of episcopacy in Scotland, seizure of London houses and the re-use of residences during the Civil War and Commonwealth period are all explored here. Through analysis of the physical changes made to buildings and landscapes, an assessment is made of the wider public perception of bishops and their 'social placement'.

Finally, Chapter 7 provides a discussion and conclusion which addresses the aim and objectives laid out in this first chapter. The findings from this thesis are discussed in context and alongside evidence from other bishop's houses, historic buildings and wider social, religious and political events.

2

Overview of sites and sources

2.1 The sources: strengths and weaknesses

Three main types of evidence have been consulted for this thesis: standing buildings, archaeological data and historical sources. Each has the potential to illuminate different aspects of a building's use and function but, when considered together, this trio of sources present a richer impression of form and function than single sources used in isolation. Needless to say, the evidence is not distributed equally across the dioceses. Historical sources for the English dioceses are the richest, for example, especially those in the Bishopric of Durham collections. Most of the sites which have received archaeological attention, either through excavation or geophysical survey, belong to the bishoprics of Durham and Glasgow, but there are no extensively investigated sites belonging to the bishopric of Carlisle. In contrast, the highest proportion of standing or ruined buildings cluster in the English dioceses, while most Scottish sites have no extant buildings at all.

In Figure 2.1 the sites are categorised according to their state of preservation and the quality and quantity of any available sources. Following initial categorisation and the removal of (so far)

unlocated sites and those which were inactive during this period of study, the remaining sites have been classified into a simple two-tier system in Figure 2.2. Tier 1 sites are those with the most significant surviving physical, textual and archaeological remains; Tier 2 sites lack one or more of these characteristics. This designation of sites by tiers has informed the data collection process for this thesis, with greater time and resources being devoted to Tier 1 sites. At the same time, by highlighting these evidential disparities, flaws in the dataset have also been identified.

2.1.1 Standing buildings

The sites under study here survive in varying states of preservation. Figure 2.3 considers their current form which ranges from standing buildings, partially and entirely ruined structures to below-ground deposits only (see Section 2.2.2). Most standing buildings cluster in the English dioceses, with the best examples being confined to those buildings which had a continuing function to play after the Restoration. Durham Castle, Auckland Castle and Rose Castle were all diocesan residences until 1840, 2012 and 2009 respectively. After their transition out of episcopal ownership, these buildings were then adapted to other roles which has further ensured their good preservation. In all three instances, it is clear that the restoration of the episcopate in 1660 played a major role in their preservation. Indeed, repair projects in the later-17th century tended to retain those elements of the buildings which were most closely associated with medieval bishops. Notably, at Durham Castle and Auckland Castle portions of the earliest building phases, the Norman Chapel and St Peter's Chapel (formally le Puiset's Great Hall) were both restored and retained and still survive today. The more recent demands of stewardship have resulted in detailed standing buildings reports to inform their management (eg. Durham Castle which lies within the Durham World Heritage Site), while the listing process after 1947 has further protected them against modern destruction, unsympathetic repair or obscuration of older building fabric. Ultimately the standing buildings evidence from these sites is rich, well preserved and well understood.

Other English residences and the Scottish residences have not fared so well. In general, the preservation of those sites that were not re-occupied by the bishops after the Restoration is less complete. Among these residences associated with the bishoprics of Durham and Carlisle, the majority are ruined today; only three (at Howden Manor, Crayke Castle and Linstock Castle) have been partially reused. These three were all used as private residences following the Restoration, which has contributed to parts of them remaining in use and being maintained. In contrast, the majority of severely ruined sites or those with no above-ground remains tend to be associated with houses that were less favoured as accommodation during the later medieval period (i.e. pre-*c*.1530) (Smith 2016) or with bouts of destruction during the Civil War and Commonwealth periods. Following the Restoration, little attempt was made to restore them and this has inevitably contributed to their perpetuating dilapidation. In some cases, as at Bishop Middleham Castle, Norham Castle,

Horncastle Bishop's House and Melbourne House, there are known episodes of post-occupation quarrying which must have involved active demolition and the removal of stonework and other building materials.

In Scotland, the volatile religious climate during the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries arguably fostered an environment unsuited to the retention of episcopal dwellings. By the early-18th century all of the Scottish residences studied here had either been abandoned or demolished, with most falling into rapid decline following the abolition of episcopacy in 1688. For example, St Andrews was among the first to be abandoned in 1598 and Glasgow Bishop's Palace was demolished in 1741 following a sustained period of abandonment since 1688. Arguably, because they were the main diocesan centres for the bishoprics of St Andrews and Glasgow, these sites might have been imbued with a negative significance which prevented their wholesale reuse in later periods. In contrast, other Scottish sites were sold after 1688 and assumed new roles as private residences or as lodgings on larger estates. The Bishop's House at Stow continued in the possession of the family who had feued the residence from the later 16th century, while Monimail Tower fell into the ownership of nearby landowning families after 1688. In both cases, these were not the primary residences of their secular owners, and both sites subsequently fell into disrepair. Elsewhere, as at Tyningham, post-abolition owners took the decision to demolish their residence entirely. While the preservation of the sites does depend heavily on individual circumstances, it was the political context across Scotland which prevented the active reuse of sites there and it is this which has harmed the possibility of their survival through to the present day.

Among the ruined buildings, levels of recording and preservation are variable. Norham Castle and St Andrews Castle, for example, are managed as historic attractions by English Heritage and Scottish Heritage respectively, and both have had their standing buildings recorded recently so as to inform their conservation strategies. These two sites stand out among the ruined residences because of their exceptional levels of research and recording. Among the privately-owned sites, the quality of standing building recording is more uneven. For instance, Bewley Castle had a standing building assessment conducted in 2000 but the castle has not been subjected to a stone-by-stone record (Ryder 2000). Detailed sketches and observations made in 1885 record some of the ornamental carved stonework from the windows, while modern observations show that these features are eroded and have lost some of their detail (Ferguson 1885). At this site, an updated standing buildings record is now required to gauge its rate of decay. The ruined remains at Monimail Tower have also deteriorated recently as a result of its current use for small-scale agricultural and domestic purposes; large areas of overgrowth are now actively contributing to the decay of the *in situ* masonry. Elsewhere, the reconstruction project at Dairsie Castle in 1996 incorporated parts of the ruined remains of the original building but

this has resulted in some modifications to the original masonry, as well as the obscuring of the early fabric in places (Inglis 2011: 128).

Many of the sites examined in this thesis feature no upstanding physical remains at all, particularly those found today in urban contexts. Stockton Castle, Darlington Manor, the bishop's house on Edinburgh Cowgate, Durham Place and Carlisle Place have all been demolished and their sites have been subsequently built upon. Because of the lack of standing buildings remains, earthworks and other remains visible in the urban landscape, these sites tend to be less well understood. Some sites have been partially excavated or 'evaluated', or have had sites excavated nearby, but these investigations are infrequent and restricted in scale (discussed in more detail in section 2.2). As a result, sites in urban contexts are the most limited in terms of their physical evidence and material culture.

Natural topography and environmental factors also affect survival and preservation. Wheel Hall stands outs here because of its apparent rapid erosion by the waters of the River Ouse. Records of the form and shape of the earthworks there in 1973 demonstrate substantial erosion during the intervening years (Smith 2016; le Patourel 1973). Masonry and earthwork features at Bishop Middleham Castle have also sustained damage from weather erosion which has prompted minor land slippages, while other parts of the site have been re-purposed for modern agricultural uses. Post-Restoration farming practices have similarly contributed to the decay and destruction of other rural sites through the grazing of animals in and around standing or ruined structures, or the ploughing of sites with sub-surface features. At Ancrum, for example, modern ploughing has disturbed *in situ* archaeological deposits, while the grazing of cows at Bewley Castle has contributed to the dislodging and instability of the standing buildings there.

2.1.2 Archaeology

Excavated sites

Nineteen of the sites discussed in this thesis survive today only as below-ground archaeological deposits, while 12 of the standing sites are accompanied by probable or known areas of sub-surface deposits. Of these, only 10 (52%) been the subject of intrusive archaeological excavation. In general, where excavation has been applied, the results have significantly improved and extended our current state of knowledge of the archaeology of bishop's houses. However, the excavations do vary considerably depending on their scale, overall aims and the level of post-excavation attention to material and biological finds. These factors are often related to whether they formed part of a research or rescue project. Most excavations are undertaken ahead of re-development in order to record and preserve any archaeological information. The aims of these projects are dictated by the requirements of commercial development (and the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation) and not by research

questions and frameworks. This can result in some excavations providing only partial, frustrating and tantalising glimpses into the episcopal past. Research-led excavations are less numerous and confined only to the sites of Auckland Castle (2012-21), Stow Bishop's House (1984-85), Ancrum (2014 and 2019), Bishop Middleham Castle (2019-20), and Norham Castle (2013). At Ancrum, Howden Manor and Norham Castle, the excavations were undertaken by amateur archaeological groups and were less ambitious in their extent and outputs. Figure 2.4 lists the sites which have been subject to archaeological excavation and this information is linked to Appendices in Volume 2.

Auckland Castle has received the most archaeological attention. At the time of writing in 2019, 22 separate excavations have taken place since 2012, preceded by some earlier excavations. These excavations, catalysed by development at the site, have focused on multiple areas in and around the principal buildings, and have yielded substantial artefact and ecofact assemblages, as well as below-ground structures. Together with the examination of the standing buildings there, Auckland Castle is the most investigated sites to be considered here. The hunting lodge at Westgate Castle was similarly the subject of targeted archaeological examination in 2012. Large portions of *in situ* masonry, including the base of a spiral staircase, were uncovered there which have helped to shed light on the exact form of a medieval building which is not well recorded in contemporary documents (ASUD 2012). At Ancrum, excavations in 2012 also uncovered structural remains, confirming interpretations suggested by geophysical analysis (Maldonado 2012). Further excavations were conducted in the summer of 2019 which revealed more structural remains and large portions of dateable ashlar masonry. Although focused on the post-medieval phases of Darlington Bishop's House, pits discovered in the surrounding development zone did contain large quantities of faunal remains relating to the episcopal occupation phases at Darlington Bishop's House (ASUD 2014a). These discoveries, analysed alongside documentary sources, revealed important details relating to the use of this residence. Finally, recent excavations at Bishop Middleham Castle in 2019 have shed light on the scale and preservation state of the medieval buildings there and shown that the site was larger than previously believed, extending beyond the Scheduled Area.

Smaller-scale excavations at Crayke Castle, Seaton Holme, Stow Bishop's House and Stockton Manor have proved similarly informative. Findings here are tantalising but the scale of these projects means that they are less able to answer many of the key research questions that large-scale datasets drawn from more extensive archaeological projects can. For example, excavations in 2004 unexpectedly uncovered the remains of a 14th century pottery kiln in the grounds of Crayke Castle (Dennison 2004). This excavation was prompted by the development of the site, but the discovery has arguably done little to add to our current knowledge base for the site as a whole. At Stow Bishops' House, excavations of the interior of the hall produced a small artefact assemblage, including some personal dress accessories (Cox et al 2000). Although no faunal remains were uncovered and no

environmental sampling strategies was undertaken, these findings do at least hint at the potential for future work.

Material culture

The site with the largest artefact assemblage is Auckland Castle. Due to multiple concurrent excavations there over recent years (discussed above), large quantities of finds have assisted with the dating and understanding of specific features. Notably, high volumes of medieval and post-medieval pottery, glass, artefacts associated within dining, literacy, hunting and dress accessories have all been recovered. Similar artefact assemblages were also obtained from excavations at Darlington Bishop's House, including substantial quantities of worked stone thought to derive from the demolished bishop's house there and then reused in later building phases. Providing vital insights into the appearance of Stockton Bishop's Manor, ornately decorated worked stone was recovered during excavations there in 2014. Pottery recovered from the excavations at Crayke Castle indicates the presence of ceramic production at the site.

Among the excavated sites in Scotland, similar assemblages have been recovered. For example, at Ancrum, small amounts of pottery together with some metal objects, including a needle and two knife blades, were discovered (Maldonado 2012: 21). Excavations at Stow recovered a comparable proportion of pottery with some metal dress accessories, furniture fittings, glass and clay-pipes dating from throughout its occupation period to the 19th century (Cox et al 2000: 688-696). Although the finds recovered from these excavations vary in type and quantity, they provide vital clues to the appearance of these sites, their use by inhabitants and their social characteristics together with their use after occupation by the bishops. Finds recovered through field-walking of the Mantle Walls site at Ancrum offer less specific insights. Ceramic, glass, lithics, metal, metal slag and substantial portions of worked stone, including portions of a spiral staircase, have all been recovered there (ADHS ongoing).

Durham Castle, Auckland Castle and Rose Castle were all retained as episcopal residences after the Restoration and they are the only ones with surviving material culture still associated with them. The furniture, fixtures and fittings of Durham Castle are particularly well-understood, having recently been drawn together, managed and curated under the auspices of Durham Castle Museum. Artefacts dating from the study period include (not exhaustive): the 16th century misericords housed in Tunstall's Chapel, 15th century wooden hatches and screens in the kitchen, buttery and Great Hall, 17th century wooden fireplace surrounds together with multiple 16th and 17th century weapons on display, tapestries, artwork and other furniture. At Auckland Castle a similar range of artefacts, furniture, fixtures and fittings are on display, and many of these have intertwined stories with those at Durham Castle. For example, the misericords now on display at Durham Castle were originally

carved for Auckland Castle, while Fox's screens and ornate woodwork in Durham are matched by similar woodwork at Auckland. Furthermore, the 17th century weapons currently on display at Durham Castle were brought there from Auckland Castle. In this case, the long-term shared ownership of these sites is well illustrated through their surviving material culture. In contrast, due to the fire damage and ownership changes at Rose Castle during the Civil War and Commonwealth periods, together with multiple post-Restoration renovations to the castle fabric, very few fixtures and fittings from the study period now remain intact and *in situ* at that site. Notably, the doors to the chapel made in 1488 are an original feature.

Bioarchaeological material: faunal and plant remains

The recovery of organic remains is limited to a handful of sites which have been extensively excavated in recent years since the widespread application of scientific archaeological methods. Auckland Castle, Darlington Bishop's Manor and Westgate Castle have all produced substantial quantities of bioarchaeological material and these have been analysed. In addition, excavations conducted in the grounds of St Patrick's Church on Edinburgh Cowgate yielded substantial faunal and plant remains that are thought to be related directly to the neighbouring bishop's house (Jones et al 2011). Waterlogged conditions at Auckland Castle, Darlington Bishop's House and St Patrick's Church have all created excellent preservation conditions for organic remains. In sum, because very few sites have had excavations which have yielded bioarchaeological material, and even fewer have been appropriately analysed, this dataset is especially fragmentary and concentrated mainly on the most recently excavated sites in the bishopric of Durham.

Excavations at the Darlington Bishop's House yielded large quantities of animal bone associated with the medieval and early post-medieval occupation layers. Disarticulated remains of horses, deer and dogs together with bones associated with birds of prey and waterfowl suggest that this site was associated with hunting as well as the raising of hunting dogs for use elsewhere, with horses being knackered for meat for the kennels (ASUD 2014a; Smith and Graves 2017). At Auckland Castle animal remains associated with hunting and local agriculture have all been recovered (ASUD 2015b (3417)). Large quantities of fish, shellfish, animal bone (pig, cow, sheep, deer, poultry etc; as yet unstudied) and domestic and exotic plant remains suggest that the site was used for high-status feasting and entertaining, and that food was both produced locally and imported. These revelations hint at the role this site played as a setting for important social interactions, and through the discovery of imported foodstuffs, reveal wider interactions between this site and trade pathways further afield. In a similar way, the butchered remains of deer bones discovered during excavations at Westgate Castle allude to the wider exploitation of the landscape surrounding the site. Understood as a whole, these finds suggest a complex pattern of food and resource production across the region (ASUD 2012).

Excavations at St Patrick's Church in Edinburgh also provided valuable insights into the species of animals reared in the close vicinity of the bishop's house, together with the fuel that was being used. Analysis of pollen, insect and parasite remains from 15th-17th century contexts indicates that the site was used intermittently for the deposition of animal, human, domestic and industrial refuse interspersed with periods of abandonment (Jones et al 2011). The presence of beetles commonly associated with heather indicates fuel, animal bedding or roofing material. The presence of thistle and sedge reveals that site held standing water during the early 15th century, while the decayed remains of ditches, timber piles and buried barrels hint at episodes of small-scale industrial activity (Jones et al 2011). This evidence sheds light on the wider exploitation of natural resources beyond the city, and provides important environmental context for this residence. The episcopal residence on Edinburgh Cowgate was clearly located in an area of mixed landuse including wasteland, stabling and local industries typical of medieval and post-medieval urban areas.

2.1.3 Historical sources

Historic accounts and receipts relating to the revenue and properties of the See

Compared to the accounts available for other dioceses in this study, those available for the bishopric of Durham are informative, lengthy and uniquely bureaucratic. Relevant accounts include the Bailiffs' accounts, Clerks' of Works accounts, Instaurers' accounts and Master Foresters' accounts. Each of these details the annual responsibilities of important figures within the day-to-day management of the bishopric, with account series generally beginning from the mid-14th century and continuing until the abolition of episcopacy in England in 1646. None are wholly complete depending on the survival and retention of documentation. Today, all bishopric account information is archived with the Church Commissioners Deposit (CCB) at the Palace Green Library and Special Collections in Durham, UK and is publicly accessible.

Historic accounts relating to the revenues and properties of the Diocese of Carlisle are less detailed and complete. Despite this, they can still provide valuable and useful insights into the extent of landholdings owned by the bishopric, their management structure and the uses of sites. The accounts are organised by bishop, with 41 surviving annual accounts between 1401 and 1657. In addition, there are two 16th century household accounts for Rose Castle together with records of the rentals afforded to different medieval estates. All documentation relating to the accounts, revenues and properties is held within the Diocese of Carlisle Archive at the Carlisle Archive Centre in Carlisle (CAC) and is publicly accessible.

Sources which describe the properties and revenues of the bishopric are far rarer for the Scottish dioceses. This is attributed to the widespread loss and destruction of bureaucratic documentation during the Scottish Reformation and later centuries (Marwick 1897). Some rare survivals from the

episcopate of Cardinal Beaton provide vital insights about the nature of land and estate administration within the 16th century residences of the Bishops of St Andrews (Hannay 1913). These sources detail the produce and revenue from the bishopric between 1538 and 1545 and provide startling insights into the extent of possessions and landholdings of the bishops. For the bishopric of Glasgow, the post-Reformation movements of their medieval cartularies, which included information relating to the burghs and landholdings of the Glasgow bishopric, have been painstakingly reconstructed by Marwick (1897) and Simpson and Webster (1962). Both parties have traced the deliberate relocation of these medieval cartularies to France during the Reformation for safekeeping. Despite petitions for their return in the 18th century, these sources were retained in France, with only small parts of the original collection and a synoptic précis being returned. The bulk of these collections was seemingly destroyed or lost during the French Revolution, with only five known original manuscripts saved and kept at the Bibliothéque Nationale in Paris (Duncan 1998). The majority of surviving evidence relating to the pre-Reformation bishops of Glasgow is recorded in the *Registrum Episcopatum Glasguensis* (Innes 1843).

Letters, informal and incidental sources

Letters and anecdotal evidence relating to both the houses and their inhabitants are useful for understanding the function of particular sites, and particularly how they were experienced by their occupiers. They are used here in the absence of more formal documentation, and to shed light on the personal stories of the buildings inhabitants. By their very nature, their survival is usually incidental and they cluster in already rich archival collections, notably those relating to the bishops of Durham and Carlisle.

Of particular value are letters pertaining to the post-Restoration use of the residences of the bishops of Durham. Letters written by Bishop John Cosin (1660-72) discuss the state of Durham and Auckland castles 1648-60, together with receipts and commissions for building work (MSP 20). Because of the paucity of relevant documentary material dating from the Commonwealth period, these informal sources allow some measure of the scale of change to these buildings. In more personal terms, letters and petitions between Abigail Snoden and Bishop Richard Milbourne of Carlisle provide insight into the role of widows (CAC Q/11/1/192/2), while correspondence between Bishop Robinson (1598-1616) and Queen Elizabeth I illustrates the financial insecurity, and personal toll of this, within that bishopric (CAC DRC/1/3).

Building, staff inventories and surveys

Building inventories list the objects contained within the rooms of a specific house at a given moment in time, usually for the purpose of valuing assets following the death of a bishop. These documents provide a snapshot of the spatial configuration of these houses and the arrangement of furniture,

fixtures and fittings at the time the inventory was taken. In so doing, they relate details about transitory style, fashion and internal decoration, together with the changing use and function of different spaces. In the same way, staff inventories detail the servants and staff working in the episcopal residences at a given time. Staff inventories are less numerous, but equally insightful. In general, few inventories were taken (or have survived) for the study period and most are 17th century in date, towards the end of the study period. Relatively few sites have comprehensive inventories, the most useful being for Auckland and Durham Castles (CCB 210/220724A), and the most complete staff inventories focus on Rose Castle (CAC DRC/1/3/8ff). These factors limit their potential for comparative research.

Like building inventories, surveys record the assets owned by the bishopric at a specific moment in time but lack the same room-by-room resolution of building inventories. Surveys are more directly concerned with recording assets quantitatively and financially. The Parliamentary Surveys conducted ahead of the sale of English episcopal assets from 1648 are the most complete set available and they record all assets owned by English dioceses in that year (Kirby 1971,1972). They follow a standard format, which assists in comparison between dioceses, and record all assets including private buildings and parks together with rental land and properties. No similar form of bureaucracy exists for Scotland, which again affects the overall comparative potential of these sources.

Illustrations

Numerous historic plans, sketches, paintings, engravings and photographs record the appearance of these sites at different points in time, and from different visual perspectives. These range from images of the buildings during the study period and after. In many cases, they show now-demolished buildings and landscape features and reveal details otherwise undetectable using archaeological methods. Depending upon the circumstances surrounding their production however, the accuracy of their depictions can be hard to verify. Many of the sketches lack appropriate detail and artistic liberties can affect the scale and detail of features.

For sites with little or no surviving building fabric, historic images are some of the only resources which give an indication of the scale and layout of buildings. For example, at Darlington Manor, a 1794 painting reveals its form and landscape context. When viewed in conjunction with an 1866 plan of the site, a fuller picture of the site can be gleaned together with the impact of later building developments. At Rose Castle, two plans dating from 1640 and 1671 clearly reveal areas of demolition and reconstruction which have been essential when recreating the impact of events at this site.

These visual resources are of particular value for understanding the Scottish sites which generally lack an extensive documentary legacy. Glasgow Bishop's Palace, Partick Manor and Monimail Tower

have all been the subject of Romantic paintings depicting them in their more ruined states. In these instances, they are the only surviving images and highly detailed. In contrast, watercolour paintings of Norham Castle by J.W. Turner lack useful architectural detail because of Turner's particular painting aesthetic. 19th century photographs of the Bishop's House on Edinburgh Cowgate are the only visual record of this site, and though few in number they depict important architectural details, including the windows and bartizan, which are not recorded elsewhere.

For sites which are relatively intact, or retain large portions of their original building fabric, historic images are a useful source. At Auckland Castle, a 1680 painting of Auckland Castle famously depicts its two towers as well as fragments of Bek's Chapel which were destroyed during the Commonwealth period. Buck's view of this site dating to 1728 reveals an elevated ground-level on the approach to Auckland Castle which hints at an episode of unrecorded landscaping. Schematic plans of Auckland Park, many of which lack detail, instead reveal the planting layout at different points, and in the case of the 1740 image, depict unrecorded structures now demolished.

Historic maps

Historic Ordnance Survey and Tithe maps, together with additional maps, landscape plans and sketches, have been accessed for all the sites. Regressive map analysis has been applied to parks and gardens with a view to identifying and mapping their features and parameters. In some instances, this has been achieved, in other instances drastic landscape changes combined with the ephemerality of historic park boundaries have prevented this.

At Crayke, Darlington and Bishop Middleham, where the residences are no longer associated with their parks, maps have been successfully used to identify their extent. At Crayke, the boundary of the triangular-shaped park is fossilised in post-medieval boundaries, at Darlington the park boundaries respect the 19th century road layout, while at Bishop Middleham the ancient park boundary is partially aligned with the modern boundary of the nature reserve.

In a similar way, the identification of historic place-names hints at landscape uses related to the episcopal residences. At Monimail, a landscape feature close to the residence site is recorded in the 1890 Ordnance Survey map as 'Cardinal Beaton's Well' which suggests that this feature existed within the extended parkland. At Auckland Castle, successive historic maps reveal the existence of 'Lodge Farm', recorded in 18th century maps as the 'lodge', which may suggest that it is an older historic feature of the park there. Similarly, at Bishop Middleham, 'Island Farm' on the peripheries of the medieval parkland corroborates the assertion that the landscape was prone to flooding in the past.

2.2 The sites: collective chronological development

2.2.1 The residences of the Bishops of Durham

Medieval Development – Foundation to 1450

Following the establishment of Durham Cathedral and its monastic community after the settlement of St Cuthbert's community on the Durham Peninsula in 995 AD, the following centuries witnessed rapid construction of religious buildings, episcopal houses and parks. Durham Castle was probably the first residence built in the 11th century (Page 1928; Brickstock 2007). Durham Castle falls within the typical Norman motte-and-bailey style, with the earliest surviving features comprising a chapel (Norman Chapel) together with the earthworks (motte and moat). The most notable early bishop-builders associated with Durham Castle are Flambard (1099-1128) and le Puiset (1153-1195) who are thought to have built much of the outer bailey walls, gatehouse, first-floor north hall and upper hall, gallery and made other stylistic amendments. It is likely that this construction phase was accompanied by additional wooden structures to create a building complex comparable in design and style to other contemporary Norman castles. Durham Castle's closest comparable episcopal residence however, is Norham Castle. Thought to be initially constructed by Flambard (Saunders 1997), Norham Castle is strikingly similar in form and broad appearance. In the same way, the complex features a *donjon* atop a motte, with a moated inner and outer ward. Norham Castle might have also featured a suite of other wooden structures at the time it was first constructed. Both Durham Castle and Norham Castle share similar defensible positions on top of elevated natural promontories. Taken together, the shared characteristics of these sites underlines the defensive priorities of 11th and early 12th century bishops. The placement of these two sites in the diocesan centre and in the Anglo-Scottish borderlands reinforces the notion that these two areas were of key importance to the early bishops of Durham.

Arguably the most significant bishop-builder was Hugh du Puiset. In addition to his work at Durham Castle, le Puiset is associated with the construction of St Peter's Chapel (formerly the Great Hall) at Auckland Castle, the earthwork defences, curtain walls and gates at Norham Castle together with multiple other building projects in Durham city, including parts of Durham Cathedral and Ushaw College (Curry 2009). During his episcopate, he also initiated a widescale re-evaluation and consolidation of episcopal assets and commissioned the Boldon Book (Curry 2009; Austin 1982). With this in mind, his building projects reflect a period of adjustment, development and upscaling experienced throughout many parts of the bishopric. His style is distinct, extravagant and associated with high-quality decorative stonework (Thurlby 2017; Cunningham 1990). More than any other, fragments of le Puiset's building episodes have been retained and incorporated into later building designs, so that elements of his work have become inextricably associated with the Durham episcopal aesthetic, which persisted throughout the study period and after.

In later centuries, other manor houses were built across the diocese (including Stockton Manor, Darlington Manor, Bishop Middleham Castle, the bishops house at Wolsingham, Evenwood Manor, Westgate Castle), and beyond (Howden Manor, Crayke Castle, Wheel Hall). These were all established by the mid-14th century. The majority of these manors fell within ancient bailiwicks (administrative land divisions) where bailiffs, instaurers and other officials were stationed. Accounts pertaining to these medieval bailiwicks often include financial information, receipts and details of works and expenditure alongside information relating to the land assets, rentals and produce generated there. This evidence suggests that these particular houses were considered to be important assets which generated their own revenue and provided resources connected with the running of the bishopric. They differ from other houses, most notably Durham Castle, Norham Castle and Durham House, which are not associated with resource production.

While their location largely reflects the situation of the older bailiwicks, these additional houses also held further geographical significance. Wheel Hall, Howden Manor, Crayke Park and Darlington Manor are all situated on main thoroughfares going south, Wolsingham bishop's house and Westgate Castle are both located at the eastern extent of the bishop's hunting forest of Weardale, while Darlington Manor, Stockton Manor, Auckland Castle, Crayke Castle and Bishop Middleham Castle are all associated with their own extensive parks. These locations, together with analysis of available faunal remains and documentary sources, indicate that these particular houses held distinctive and individual roles just as they did in other parts of England (Smith and Graves 2017; Hare 2017).

Development during the Study Period – 1450 to 1660

By 1450, Bishop Middleham Castle and Seaton Holme had fallen out of use altogether (Smith 2016), and are therefore not among the residences considered here. Other houses continued to be owned by the bishopric, but they were not in constant use. Analysis of the itineraries of the medieval bishops of Durham reveals a sustained pattern of house preference accompanied by extensive building at the most favoured and frequented houses (Smith 2016; Smith and Graves 2017). This pattern appears to have continued into the study period, with the majority of important building projects being undertaken at Auckland Castle and Durham Castle. Notably, at Durham Castle Bishop Richard Fox (1494-1501) remodelled the Great Hall, kitchens and service space, inserted Trumpeter's Pulpits and built a new four-storey chamber block immediately south of the Great Hall. Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall (1530-59) added a new chapel, gallery, stairway and bell-tower, while Bishop Richard Neile (1617-27) refashioned the suite of rooms north of the Great Hall. At Norham Castle, Fox also built an engineered water supply to Norham Castle, known today as Fox's Aqueduct, while bishops Booth (1457-76) and Ruthall (1509-23) invested heavily in updating and strengthening the outer defences. At Auckland Castle major investment occurred during the later 16th century. Here the addition of the College and construction of the Scotland Wing and long gallery above it drastically extended the

footprint of the earlier building (Section 4.3). All three buildings continued to be heavily invested in throughout the early part of the study period, and after the Reformation too.

This building pattern contrasts with the fate of many of the manors owned by the bishops of Durham, which were mostly leased out during the mid-later 16th century. For example, in 1548 Crayke Castle was leased, and in 1584 Howden Manor was leased to Elizabeth I with Wheel Hall also being leased to the Crown in 1586. In each case, the bishops maintained ownership of the wider estates associated with them, and so generated considerable revenue. Following their lease, no episodes of construction are recorded, and this is corroborated by the general lack of substantial structural evidence identified from this period. Similarly, no destruction episodes are recorded from the period during which they were leased, and no such episodes have been identified archaeologically. It would seem that this phase was largely static in terms of building development, but extremely important in terms of understanding the financial situation of the bishops at this time, and for comprehending the ways in which houses were viewed both materially and symbolically.

Unique in terms of its history, Durham House in London underwent significant transformation during the study period. In 1535, according to a new law enacted by Henry VIII to reconfigure the arrangement of elites and allies in London, Durham House was forcibly exchanged with Coldharbour in London, which was then known as Durham House (Croot 2014). The original Durham House was used as an auxiliary royal property, housing diplomats, Elizabeth I and Walter Raleigh before its eventual demolition during the 18th century. This move has often been overlooked in discussions of this residence (e.g. Schofield 1994, 2017), but is significant for informing our understanding of the architectural legacy of the bishops of Durham in London. Architectural details recorded in letters relating to the original Durham House feature 'speckled columns', which might refer to the Frosterley Marble used in residences and other ecclesiastical architecture associated with Durham, while the plan of the building shares some characteristics with other residences owned by the bishops of Durham (Smith 2016). Together, these features conjure an image of a residence whose architectural embellishments echo those in Durham. Arguably, this residence might have been built in order to project a particular aesthetic associated with Durham, thereby visually enforcing its ownership to a London-based audience. The forcible ejection of the bishops from this building might well have had wider symbolic repercussions.

Following the abolition of episcopacy in 1649, the houses of the bishops of Durham were sold by the Parliamentary Commissioner, surveys of the houses and estates being taken for Auckland Castle, Crayke Castle, Howden Manor and Stockton Manor (Chapter 6). In general, this phase is poorly documented and is best understood through post-Restoration building accounts and the buildings. Architectural and archaeological evidence indicates that the treatment of these buildings varied according to their different owners and wider circumstances. Auckland Castle stands out as the site

most heavily impacted during the Civil War and Commonwealth period. During the Civil War it was used to garrison Parliamentary soldiers and was latterly sold to eminent Parliamentarian Sir Arthur Haselrigge. It has been repeatedly claimed that he was responsible for demolishing large portions of the medieval building, including a chapel built by Bek, and that Haselrigge built a new house within the grounds (i.e. Parson and White 1828: 257; Mackenzie and Ross 1834: 277). Documentary evidence indicates that this mansion was completely demolished by Bishop Cosin after the Restoration, and its precise location is still unconfirmed (MSP 63p 215-218). During recent archaeological excavations and geophysical analysis at Auckland Castle, large portions below-ground walling and foundations were discovered in the area east of the Scotland Wing (Chapter 6). These might correspond to areas demolished by Haselrigge during the Commonwealth, and indicate the earlier footprint of Auckland Castle was larger and more dispersed than previously thought. Elsewhere, the other residences of the bishops of Durham show little evidence of such deliberate destruction episodes, appearing to have suffered from neglect instead. During the Commonwealth period, Durham Castle is known to have been used as a temporary prison for soldiers captured during the Battle of Dunbar in September 1650. Post-Restoration letters and accounts by Cosin similarly record extensive renovations to the interior and exterior of the building, ranging from the removal of walls and addition to buttresses and the redecoration of interior rooms (MSP 20 46p-57p). This evidence indicates that the building suffered substantial decay. In contrast, the Commonwealth owner of Crayke Castle, Sir William Allenson, set about restoring portions of Crayke Castle after periods of neglect during its years of being leased. This rendered the building 'untenable' for garrisoning in 1646 and 1647 (see Appendix 5). It seems that there was no prescribed pattern, arrangement or trajectory for these bishop's residences during the Civil War and Commonwealth periods; their development depended instead on the personal ambitions of their owners, together with external influences.

Post-Medieval Development – 1660 to present

The post-Restoration lives of all these houses are similarly contingent on their owners and individual circumstances. Some houses have survived well, largely due to their modern uses, while others soon became ruined or were entirely demolished.

The best preserved residences are Durham Castle and Auckland Castle, which were both owned by the bishops until 1840 and 2012 respectively (Appendices 1 and 2). Both sites received considerable attention in the immediate post-Restoration period by bishops Cosin, Crewe and others. In order to recover, restore and repair damage and loss incurred during the Commonwealth period, they set about preserving authentic medieval building features, while also constructing new episcopal architecture which echoed the historic precedence of previous bishops, and reinforced their own religious ideals (Green 2016). Because of their status in this period as 'palaces', they were more likely to be chosen by bishops as arenas to exercise their building ambitions.

Stockton Castle, on the other hand, had been so seriously affected by years of neglect and decay prior to its sale in 1649 that when the estate was recovered in 1660 no attempt was made to restore it. In contrast, Darlington Manor was leased in the 18th century for use as a Quaker Workhouse which resulted in large-scale structural amendments of the building in order to make it fit for its new purpose (Longstaffe 1854: 153). The building was eventually sold off by the bishopric in 1808 and demolished and redeveloped in 1870. Crayke Castle was similarly leased for use as a farmhouse until its sale in 1827, and very few structural amendments were made during this period, while Norham Castle was left to decay after Elizabeth I decreed by in 1596 that nothing further should be spent on the site (Page 1923).

Viewed as a whole, there are no clear trends from the post-Restoration biographies of the houses which help to explain their differential survival rates and developments. To some degree the architectural priorities established by the medieval Bishops of Durham did play a role in deciding which sites were to gain special attention later on by the post-Restoration builder-bishops, while the unique and varied conditions of the houses during the study period also became a factor in their post-Restoration lives. Ultimately however, it was the long-term leasing of houses together with periods of sustained neglect which were the key factors in their eventual disappearance.

2.2.2 The residences of the Bishops of Carlisle

Medieval Development – Foundation to 1450

The bishopric of Carlisle was established by King Henry I in 1133 out of a segmented territory carved from the Bishopric of Durham (Lowther and Bouch 1948). Built in 1122, Carlisle Cathedral and Augustinian priory were elevated to the status of a cathedral when the diocese was created (Tatton-Brown and Crook 2002). Tatton-Brown (2004: 258). has argued that the earliest episcopal residence of the bishops of Carlisle was located within the Carlisle Cathedral precinct. While Carlisle is unique among the dioceses of England and Wales because it lacks an episcopal residence at its diocesan centre (Thompson 1998), this assertion is so far unconfirmed by archaeological, historical or architectural evidence. It is possible that another early residence was situated elsewhere within Carlisle, but this too lacks verification.

Six houses are closely associated with the Bishops of Carlisle during the medieval period. These include three within the diocese (at Rose Castle, Bewley Castle and Linstock Castle), two beyond the diocese (Melbourne House and Horncastle Manor) and one in London (Carlisle Place). A possible residence at Bishop's Row in Penrith remains unconfirmed but is listed as an estate which generated revenue for the Bishops of Carlisle (Bouch 1956; Tatton-Brown 2004). No confirmed archaeological or building remains have so far been located. In all the other cases, precise foundation dates are unknown but we can be confident that they had all been established by the mid-14th century.

Referenced for the first time in 1255, Rose Castle appears to have been the earliest residence built by the bishops of Carlisle, though it might have been preceded by an earlier house on the same site (Tatton-Brown 2004) (see Appendix 9). Rose Castle grew rapidly in size and scale in the coming centuries following the attainment of two licences to crenellate in 1336 and 1355. The four wings that comprised its quadrangular arrangement around a central courtyard were already in place by the time of our study period, and the site was complete with curtain walls, a moat, drawbridge, gardens, chapel, Great Hall and a range of typical service spaces. Due to the number and diversity of its rooms and spaces, Rose Castle stands out among the other contemporary residences of the Bishops of Carlisle. Its nearest comparator is Bewley Castle which built between 1325-32. This site similarly displays some elite architectural details include ashlar facades, decorated stonework, inset window seats and trefoiled windows, and included a range of rooms associated with medieval episcopal occupation, including chambers, a chapel and garderobes (Carmichael 1927; Ferguson 1885). Despite sharing these basic characteristics, the scale of these residences varies hugely, and this further highlights their particularity which was linked to their functions.

In surviving episcopal registers for the medieval bishops of Carlisle, Rose Castle stands out as the most frequented residence during the 14th and 15th centuries. The high level of investment at Rose Castle, compared to the other residences of the Bishops of Carlisle, might reflect the same phenomenon for focused building investment identified in the residences of the Bishops of Durham (see above or Smith and Graves 2017). In contrast, the pele-tower style displayed at Linstock Castle is arguably symptomatic of the fluctuating political instability in the Anglo-Scottish border region during the later medieval period (Edmonds 2014). Both Horncastle Manor and Melbourne House were situated away from the diocese, in royally gifted manors. The dispersed nature of these houses may reflect this pattern of gifting, but likely also had practical benefits. Melbourne House, situated in Derbyshire, and Horncastle Manor in Lincolnshire, would both have provided convenient way-stations on journeys to the south. Melbourne's situation near the royal hunting park at Melbourne may also have been a pull-factor (Cantor 1983: 17). In addition, the manor of Harrow was gifted alongside Horncastle and Melbourne, but no adjoining residence is thought to have been built there (Dryburgh and Hartland 2007: 402). Carlisle Place in London would have served as the base of the bishops when conducting business in London. In this way, each site seems to have fulfilled a specific and individual niche which is accentuated due to their relative paucity.

The surviving structural remains relating to the residences of the bishops of Carlisle all cluster within the diocese, and their remains all display clear indications of martial capabilities. At Rose Castle, two licences to crenellate were issued in the 14th century, while the earliest structural remains consist of a solidly built stone tower and the Strickland Tower (c. 1400-1419). It seems likely that other defensive features, such as the moat and drawbridge, were contemporary or slightly post-date this feature.

Linstock Castle consists of a possible 13th century three-storey red sandstone tower, possibly made from reused Roman blockwork, with substantial post-medieval alterations. At Bewley Castle, the natural topography and elevated position both suggest another defensive locale. Numerous reports of raiding Scots in the 13th and 14th centuries together with the reported siege of Rose Castle by Edward the Bruce in 1322 (Wilson 1912) all point to these houses being at the frontline of Anglo-Scottish aggression. The obvious features associated with militarism which pervade the surviving residences within the diocese should not however be viewed as a universal feature of all residences associated with the bishops of Carlisle. It is likely that houses beyond the dioceses adopted more typical features associated with episcopal manors but their lack of survival means that we are unable to draw any comparisons.

Development during the Study Period – 1450 to 1660

The only house which falls completely out of use before the study period begins is Linstock Castle, which was gifted to the village of Linstock in 1400 and later used as a prison (Hutchinson 1794: 580). The removal of this residence from their repertoire of building stock heralded the further concentration of the bishops' time and investment at Rose Castle. In the 1480's Bishop Bell made elaborate additions to the castle, with the insertion of both a first-floor chapel and tower, together with a series of important repairs, notably to the drawbridge, and the conversion of other rooms including the pre-existing chapel and brewhouse (CAC D/MH 10/3/7). Between 1520-37 Bishop Kite made further amendments with the construction of his tower, and extensive renovations including the remodelling of the gateway, the division of the Great Hall, the installation of new windows and the redecoration of chapel and chambers (CAC D/MH 10/8/9). These building modifications wholly overshadow any that occur at other Carlisle residences, and are of comparable scale and nature to those completed in the bishopric of Durham, and elsewhere.

In contrast, the two residences situated beyond the bishopric in Melbourne and Horncastle experienced a complicated pattern of ownership and habitation. Horncastle fell out of the possession of the bishopric after 1533, only to be recovered in 1554 and leased to Queen Elizabeth I in 1559; while Melbourne House was sold off forever by the bishops in 1539 and Horncastle in 1557. The sale of Melbourne House was possibly one response to the worsening finances of the bishopric during the mid-late 16th century, and might have been seen as a way to generate income rapidly. In any case, the forfeit of these sites reveals a conscious effort to consolidate landholdings within the bishopric.

The residences of the bishops of Carlisle were further damaged and depleted during the Civil War and Commonwealth period. In 1644, Rose Castle was seized by the Scottish army in support of Parliament, but fell into Royalist hands in 1648. At this point, it was reportedly torched by the resident Parliamentarians and left largely uninhabitable, with 41 of its original 48 rooms destroyed

(CAC D/MH 10/3/7; Tyson 1983). It was sold by Parliamentary Commissioner a year later, to the eminent Parliamentarian Sir William Heveningham. Analysis of a detailed plan of Rose Castle drawn by Bishop Rainbow (1664-1684) in 1671 reveals that it had had a quadrangular arrangement before the Civil War, and that the south and west wings had been lost entirely (CAC D/MH 10/3/7). However, detailed receipts identified by Jones (1981) indicate that Heveningham went to considerable effort and expense to repair and restore the damage. From these receipts, it is possible to get a clear impression of the scale of the destruction at Rose Castle during the Civil War. Elsewhere however, the documentary evidence is largely lacking. Presently, it is thought that there was little structural impact on the other Carlisle residences during this period.

Post-Medieval Development – 1660 to present

Just like the bishopric of Durham, there were prescribed attempts to restore parts of the episcopal houses which were negatively affected by the events of the Civil War and Commonwealth. The restoration and later building efforts of the bishops of Carlisle have been scrutinised by Weston (2013) and Tyson (1983) and others. Substantial reconstructive efforts were made by Bishop Stern (1660-64) which involved the taking down of some earlier portions of the building, together with the addition of other structures rebuilt from the salvaged stone removed from Rose Castle. Ultimately, Stern's building campaign removed vast portions of the remaining early fabric, including the chapel. Bishop Rainbow then set about removing large portions of Stern's work and replacing it with new, allegedly more sympathetic, buildings (Tyson 1983; Weston 2013: 65). Rainbow's style and that of his successor Thomas Smith was classical Revival. Today little of medieval and early post-medieval Rose Castle survives, but the textual sources clearly detail its evolution. In comparison, no new building work is known to have been conducted at the other residences of the Bishops of Carlisle. Ultimately, Bewley Castle was sold in 1853 in a ruined state (Ferguson 1885: 415).

2.2.3 The residences of the (Arch)Bishops of St Andrews

Medieval Development – Foundation to 1450

With its early medieval origins, the diocese of St Andrews, its landholdings and administrative mechanisms, was firmly established by the early-12th century (Barrow 1994). The earliest resource for understanding the range of sites inhabited by the 15th century bishops is the *Scotichronicon* which lists the homes owned by the bishops, including: St Andrews, Inchmurdo, Dairsie, Monimail, Torry, Kettins, Monymusk, Stow, Lasswade, Liston and Tyninghame (Watt 1998: 415). While insightful, many of the houses listed are not complemented by known standing or archaeological remains and this limits our understanding of them. All these proposed residences correspond with known (arch)deaconries affiliated with the (arch)bishopric of St Andrews. These territorial designations acted like the bailiwicks in the bishopric of Durham, and their varied distribution and number are

comparable. Given their geographic location, it seems highly likely that these residences might have served different purposes. For example, the bishop's house at Stow in Wedale lay near the Anglo-Scottish border on the main thoroughfares south and close to the important medieval religious institutions at Melrose and Coldingham. Similarly, Monimail Tower, Dairsie Castle and Monymusk are all situated on or close to the main medieval route between St Andrews and Perth. These places would have provided useful way-stations when travelling, places to host guests to the dioceses, and locations from which to manage estate resources.

Analysis of some of the surviving architectural remains provides some impression of the comparative style and nature of some of these sites, which supports the notion that these houses developed distinctive functions. The best preserved medieval examples are St Andrews Castle, Monimail Tower and Stow Bishop's House, with insightful photographic evidence of Dairsie Castle contributing to our understanding of this site. The evidence drawn from these sites suggests that the medieval bishops of St Andrews employed a range of building styles. At Stow Bishop's House, the only standing archaeological remains have been interpreted as a two-storey multi-period rectangular house which featured a range of rooms, including living and service rooms (Cox et al 2000). In contrast to other residences, Stow Bishop's House was modest in scale and style. The medieval building phases at St Andrews Castle, notably those undertaken by Bishop Walter Trail (1385-1401), were extensive and combined elements of elaborate palatial domestic design with obvious defensive capabilities. Trail's architectural investment at St Andrews Castle repaired earlier damage at the site, and also extended the palace complex into the form it has today (Rogers 1849:89). Earlier accounts of the site attest to its clear military role; multiple sieges are known to have occurred at the site since 1200 (Rogers 1849: 85-90). Arguably, Trail's building work at the site extended its domestic capabilities. The varied and ruined remains of Monimail Tower further indicate a commitment to building large-scale complexes, which included both domestic areas and towers, gateways and curtain walling. The similarities end there however, as Monimail was a far smaller building with a dramatically different topography.

Development 1450 to 1660

Despite the bishopric of St Andrews reaching the peak of its wealth and landholdings by 1450 (Barrow 1994), many episcopal residences had already fallen out of regular use by that date. Sanderson (1984: 251-270) has reconstructed an itinerary for Cardinal Beaton during his episcopate as Archbishop of St Andrews (1539-1546). Among these, residences in St Andrews, Monimail and Edinburgh stand out as the most heavily frequented. Surviving accounts from Beaton's episcopate reveal that many earlier residences had remained in the ownership of the bishopric, and that they collected teinds from them (Hannay 1913: 127-138). This suggests therefore that many of these houses were no longer used as frequently, with a greater proportion of time being spent at a handful of sites. This pattern of ownership hints at the same phenomenon identified within English sites (see

above) even if the lack of comparable episcopal registers and accounts makes comparison challenging.

Beaton's itinerary further indicates that he was spending large quantities of time at his personal residences, notably Ethie Castle. Similarly, Archbishop James Beaton (1522-1539 (SA)) is thought to have built the bishop's residence on Edinburgh Cowgate while bishop of Glasgow, and this transferred with him when he became bishop of St Andrews. This pattern of personal home ownership differs from that presented at other English dioceses. Unusually, the bishop's house on Edinburgh Cowgate then transferred to his successor Cardinal Beaton, who happened also to be a cousin. It is not clear to what extent this familial connection impacted on the decision to keep this house on as an episcopal residence. Nevertheless, this was the first time a new residence was constructed and maintained within a diocese during the study period. Noticeably, this is the first episcopal residence built within a pre-existing urban context and in close proximity to Holyrood Palace. Arguably, its location reflects the increasingly politicised careers of its occupants, who by now played important roles in the lives of their monarchs and their international standings. Furthermore, this house could be seen to mimic the long-established London residences of the English bishops. Based on 19th century photographs of the site before its demolition, Edinburgh Cowgate was built as a town-house with elaborate architectural features typical of the fashionable Scottish Baronial style. It differed completely from the older, traditional castles and hall-house manors elsewhere in the diocese. Arguably, the construction of Edinburgh Cowgate reflects a significant shift in the priorities of the bishops at the time, the places where they based, and the way in which they chose to present themselves.

Elsewhere in the bishopric, episcopal residences are associated with long periods of violence and damage. Most famously, St Andrews Castle was the scene for the murder of Cardinal Beaton in 1546 following Beaton's execution of Protestant preacher George Wishart (1513-1546). St Andrews Castle was subsequently besieged and held by a Protestant mob, which led to mines being dug by anti-Protestant attackers, and counter mining from within the castle in order to break the defences and end the siege. The siege was eventually ended by cannon fire, and the castle thereafter pronounced indefensible (Bonner 1996). Archbishop John Hamilton (1547-1571) later set about repairing, restoring and rebuilding large portions of the damaged structure and he is responsible for much of the outward façade of the building. The windows here are deliberately small and ornate with significant amounts of detailed carved stonework adorning the gateway and parapets. The overall design served to reflect the continued wealth and might of the bishops in this otherwise fragile period (Finnie 1985). The significance of these architectural additions was arguably accentuated by the historic legacy of St Andrews Castle, both as the archdiocesan centre and the location of numerous medieval battles, as well as an iconic landmark.

Following Hamilton's execution in 1571 and the eventual abolition of the bishops in 1591, St Andrews Castle was left to fall into ruin which was hastened due to its exposed coastal position. This however, was not the fate of all episcopal residences. In 1564 Monimail Tower was sold to Sir James Balfour of Pittendriech, and was reported to have been 'ruinous, waste and broken' by this point (Arc 2002: 5). Balfour then made substantial building amendments, including: the addition of a new doorway to the 'tower', the removal of at least one storey of the 'tower', as well as the addition of a parapet and Balfour's own coat of arms (Arc 2002: 5). The fate of Stow is less clear; it is believed to have continued to have been occupied by lessees under the ownership of the bishopric (Cox et al 2001: 680).

Development post-1660

The general trajectory of these buildings after the study period is one of reuse, abandonment and decline. Episcopacy was never reintroduced to Scotland so none of these residences there ever resumed diocesan ownership (Chapter 1). Instead, their 'secondary lives' are dictated by their individual circumstances which have profoundly affected their current states of preservation and the volume of surviving texts and related images.

St Andrews Castle was never reused, possibly because of its form and its historic connotations. Consequently, this site decayed unchecked, with a substantial portion of the east wall of the Great Hall falling into sea in 1801 (Grierson 1807: 146). Today, St Andrews Castle is an Historic Scotland property, and conserved against the effects of erosion. Elsewhere, episodes of post-medieval decay and reconstruction are recorded. The remains of Monimail Tower were incorporated into the landscape gardens of the Melville family, who deepened the ground-floor so that it could be used as an icehouse (Arc 2002). It is precisely because of this adaptation of the original building that a small part of Monimail Tower remained largely intact, while the other areas of ruined masonry were also incorporated into the surrounding landscape design which has preserved them to this day. At Stow, the bishop's house fell into ruin, with archaeological evidence indicating that it was used as a rubbish pit until the 19th century (Cox et al 2001: 681). At Dairsie Castle, the site was also left unoccupied under its 17th century owners, the Morrisons, who reportedly used the towers as dovecots (Leighton et al 1840: 262). Following a similar pattern of neglect, the Bishop's House on Edinburgh Cowgate was finally demolished in 1872; it had become slum tenement housing in Edinburgh's inner city. Ultimately therefore, the residences of the (arch)bishops of St Andrews were subject to varied fates. In general, however, there were few efforts to eradicate these sites from the landscape entirely. Instead, most are associated with periods of extended decay with little effort to preserve them until recent times.

2.2.4. The residences of the (Arch)Bishops of Glasgow

Medieval Development – Foundation to 1450

Dating from *c*.1114, the Diocese of Glasgow was the third largest territorial bishoprics in Scotland, and the largest of the four study dioceses. Initially, the Diocese of Glasgow encompassed some of the geographic area which now falls within the Diocese of Carlisle, but in the ensuing decades this territory was more formally delineated (Shead 1969). Despite its vast area, the Diocese of Glasgow is associated with the fewest known episcopal residences of all the study-dioceses. Known sites include: Glasgow Bishop's Palace, Bishop's Loch, Partick Castle and the Bishops House at Ancrum.

Dransart (2017:87) has convincingly argued that the earliest residence associated with the bishops of Glasgow was situated in Glasgow itself at a different location than that of the 13th century Glasgow Bishop's Palace. She argues that earthworks uncovered during 19th century construction work and, now obscured by later developments, closer to the entombed remains of Glasgow's patron saint Kentigern, correspond to the original bishop's house. Plausible though this is, without archaeological evidence her assertions cannot be tested. In the13th century there were multiple attempts to form a new episcopal residence within Glasgow, which was completed before c.1290 (Dransart 2017). The form of this building at this time is not well understood either textually or archaeologically, with the available visual and archaeological evidence focusing on the later phases of Glasgow Bishop's Palace which are well illustrated. Archaeological investigations of the site did uncover substantial portions of 14th and 15th century building courses which suggest a continued investment at the site. Bishop Cameron is known to have constructed a great tower between 1426-46 (see Appendix 14). Taken together, these sources indicate that Glasgow Bishop's Palace was a substantial building with continual and repeated investment throughout the medieval period, while the presence of a tower indicates a commitment to its visual prominence within an urban context.

In addition, the bishops held two further residences close to the Diocese of Glasgow's diocesan centre within its rural environs. Both sites have 13th/14th century origins, confirmed through the assemblages of artefacts recovered during recent excavations at these sites. In addition, both residences are associated with locations close to or within episcopal parkland. The landscape around Partick was noted in the 17th century for its woodland, deer and hunting opportunities. The Loch, still in existence around Bishop's Loch, is noted for its natural fishing and hunting. Furthermore, the bishops held another house in Ancrum in the Scottish Borders. Strategically, this site lay close to the border and would have provided a convenient way-station for journeys south. Furthermore, Ancrum is located close to a range of other religious houses, notably Melrose Abbey, Coldingham Priory and other episcopal residences. The natural topography here hints at its defensive capabilities, positioned as it is on a promontory and surrounded on three sides by a watercourse. Understood together, the locations

and natural topographies of these sites seemingly play an important role in how we understand the development and motivations behind these residences. Their distribution fundamentally reflects the interests of their owners, either for military and political strategy (Ancrum) or pleasure and landscape exploitation (Lochwood, Partick).

Development 1450-1660

The greatest expenditures during the study period were seemingly focused at Glasgow Bishop's Palace and the Bishop's House on Edinburgh Cowgate. In 1544 Bishop Dunbar built a large round-towered gateway flanking the entrance of Glasgow Bishop's Palace (Innes 1834) which added to the varied arrangement of buildings there. 17th century images show the site to have been imposing, ornate and complete with gardens and high-walling, which contrasted with the neighbouring domestic buildings in the city of Glasgow. Bishop James Beaton (1509-1522) constructed the bishop's house on Edinburgh Cowgate during his period as Bishop of Glasgow. This residence latterly continued with him upon his episcopacy in St Andrews. Arguably, these two substantial building projects reflect the changing aims of the bishopric. Dunbar's gateway echoes Hamilton's construction of the façade at St Andrews Castle and might reflect a deliberate attempt to reinforce the structural identity of the bishopric in its most visible and historically imbued location. Similarly, the construction of a residence in Edinburgh might reflect the changing priorities of these bishops.

Following the Reformation, Archbishop Spottiswoode is known to have commenced numerous restoration projects in Glasgow after 1611, including: Glasgow Cathedral, Glasgow Bishop's Palace and, possibly, Partick Castle. The extent of his work is not well understood, though Spottiswoode has been associated with the construction of a new dining room at Glasgow Bishop's Palace (Murray 1995: 1148; Hill 1885: 8). Nevertheless, through his building projects we can begin to understand the negative impacts of the Restoration on the major buildings. For example, Partick Castle is known to have been the site Beaton fled from for France in 1560 and it had not been inhabited since then. There is some debate as to whether Partick was repaired by George Hutcheson as a private dwelling, or by Spottiswoode. Regardless, some sites were clearly abandoned and suffered obvious neglect. Given that other residences within other bishoprics are associated with acts of deliberate desecration, it seems plausible that the residences owned by the Bishops of Glasgow met with a similar fate. In 1572, Lochwood was sold to Robert Boyd who ultimately demolished this site due to its uninhabitable state (Misc 1834: 159). Overall, it is clear that the residences of the Bishops of Glasgow were profoundly affected by the events of the Reformation which led to sustained periods of abandonment and ruination.

Development post-1660

The overall pattern of neglect and decay of these sites continues well past the period under study here. Murray (1995) has reconstructed attempts to save the already ruined Glasgow Bishop's Palace. Reports of repairs then provide the only reliable insight into the collection of rooms and spaces there, and also reveal that the only fully intact part of the building was Cameron's tower. Large portions of the rest of the complex appear to have been left entirely roofless and uninhabitable (Murray 1995). However, despite some petitions to save the building based on historical merit, the overwhelming distaste for episcopalism resulted in the eventual demolition of the site in 1788. Today, the site of Glasgow Bishop's Palace has been entirely redeveloped. In a similar way, Partick Castle declined and was ultimately demolished and the site was then redeveloped. Greenthorne (1928: 12-15) collected anecdotal testimonies and informal written accounts from the late 18th and 19th centuries which indicate that the site was roofless and uninhabited by 1783, while (now-demolished) 18th century farmhouses were seemingly erected using the reused worked stone. The whole complex was entirely demolished in 1836. Taken together, this evidence aligns with that already presented for the Diocese of St Andrews: buildings were generally not reused and those most strongly associated with their episcopal past were especially vulnerable.

Turning away from the buildings and their building biographies, the next chapter considers the people who lived in bishop's houses – namely the bishops' families and their households.

3

Household and family

3.1. Introduction

At any given time, a major episcopal residence would have hosted the bishop himself, a range of staff, his guests and visitors. After 1547 in England, and after 1560 in Scotland, bishops commonly had families with them too; wives and children who lived with them in their houses. In studies of the episcopal household it is the individual bishops, as heads of these household, who usually dominate discussion (for example Dunning 2010; Cunningham 1990; Thurlby 2017) while other divisions of the household receive considerably less attention. In part this stems from the paucity of more holistic studies of bishops' houses (see Chapter 1) but the result is that 'other' members of households have been underserved by modern debate. Historiographical trends in castle studies, for example, have long steered away from traditional architecturally-focused discussions or those centred on elite or military behaviour (see for example Creighton and Liddiard 2008) and this perspective has been replaced by a

growing emphasis on the contribution of ordinary, disenfranchised or otherwise excluded individuals (and see elsewhere Gilchrist (1999) and Scham (2001). This chapter also argues that hitherto unacknowledged inhabitants of bishop's houses had demonstrable impacts on building design, layout and form. Three sections covering English and Scottish sites explore different occupant groups – bishops, families and servants.

3.2 Bishops at home

During the period examined here, there were approximately 15 major building episodes at the residences under study. These episodes fall into three categories: maintenance, work focused on service spaces, and improvements to accommodation. This section is primarily concerned with the latter category. All of the events listed in Figure 3.1 are documented historically, with archaeological and standing buildings evidence providing more depth. In those building projects initiated by bishops, there is little to suggest purposeful destruction or demolition, although this did occur during the Civil Wars and Commonwealth period when changes were made by non-episcopal residents (see Chapter 6).

At first glance, the number and scale of major building campaigns varies little from earlier periods. At Auckland Castle, for example, there are six documented building episodes between 1193 and 1450, with others possibly being identified during excavation (see Appendix 2). On average, this equates to three major building projects per century. On closer inspection (Figure 3.1), it is apparent that most of these campaigns cluster towards the beginning of the study period, before many of the defining events of the English and Scottish Reformations. Significantly fewer building projects occurred *after* the First Act of Supremacy in 1534, and the majority of these were instigated at sites owned by the bishops of Durham.

What were the influences which contributed to the ebb and flow of these building projects? One positive underlying factor was the ideological momentum of the English Reformation which encouraged the continuation of the episcopacy in the face of its wholesale abolition elsewhere in Protestant Europe (Marshall 2009: 566). Changes in Church governance and financing also affected decisions by individual bishops to build. For example, owing to its considerable assets, landownership and income from pilgrimage, Durham was among the wealthiest bishoprics in England and Wales. At the opposite end of the spectrum, Carlisle was consistently among the poorest; differences which are reflected in the numbers of their houses and parks (Chapter 5). Work conducted by Felicity Heal (1980) has demonstrated that changes to Church finance and systematic programmes of taxation introduced by Henry VIII and accelerated under Elizabeth I had a profound impact on diocesan incomes, which served to solidify the gap between the richest and poorest dioceses in England and Wales. However, her findings have also revealed that, in contrast to contemporary sources detailing

the diminished living conditions of bishops, their plight was less extreme than has been assumed. Using evidence drawn from wills and bishops' testimonies, Heal argues that the personal wealth of bishops was generally high, and that cases of genuine episcopal hardship were in fact rare. In any case, Heal's findings underline that a bishop's personal wealth was often *not* derived from the bishopric, and as a result the wealth of the diocese at large is no measure of personal fortune.

Nevertheless, a combination of sources relating to the Bishops of Carlisle does reveal examples of genuine hardship which translated to patterns of neglect and decay at Rose Castle. Bishops John Best (1560-70), Richard Barnes (1570-77), John May (1577-98) and Henry Robinson (1598-1616) all reported experiencing hardship during their episcopates, which was amplified as a result of ensuing famine and repeated raids of cattle by Scots through the course of the later 16th century (Appleby 1973). Robinson was reportedly too poor to appear before Elizabeth I; he was unable to buy appropriate clothing (Bouch 1948:54), and his spending reveals that he was more concerned with improving living conditions for people within his diocese (Fincham 1990: 456-8). Despite this, on his deathbed Robinson commented that Rose Castle had been '*more ruinous than now (thanks be to God) it is'* (CAC DRC 1/3/41).

This comes as no surprise given the episcopate of his predecessor, John May. May resided at Rose Castle almost all the time, after the leasing of Bewley Castle in 1580 (see Chapter 6), and made no visits to London at all (CAC DRC 1/3/91-206; Summerson 2018). After his death in 1598, May left an inventory which reveals the state of the buildings at Rose Castle (CAC P 4/96 and transcribed in part by Summerson 2014). Although the inventory is incomplete and only records 24 rooms, its format allows for easy comparison with the inventories of the Bishops of Durham including the 1574 inventory of Stockton Castle and the 1628 inventories of Durham and Auckland castles. A significant disparity of wealth is immediately indicated by the number and nature of objects recorded in rooms. In the 1598 inventory of Rose Castle, no objects are recorded as new, which contrasts the '*new lockes and wainscoting*' repeatedly recorded in the inventories of Durham and Auckland castles. Similarly revealing are the bequests left by May to his family which amounted to '*an auld Edward piece*' for his daughters and his New Year's gift from the Queen Elizabeth I which was left to his wife (CAC DRC 1/2/97), while his son is known to have inherited substantial debts (Summerson 2018). It would seem that May's lack of wealth probably accounts for his impoverished lifestyle, lack of assets and the ensuing neglect of his accommodation at Rose Castle. In addition, no heirlooms are listed in the inventory of Rose Castle, suggesting that the diocese did not possess objects and furnishings which were tied to the bishopric, and implying that any belongings inside the houses were owned personally by the bishop and therefore changed over with each new incumbent. This was the common pattern, bishops spent a great deal of time and money moving possessions from one house to another. Regional products travelled overland but 'sea carriage' was also sometimes needed when, for

example, the Durham bishop travelled further afield. In 1466 the Bishop of Durham was moving items 'by ship' from Newcastle to London from his 'staithes' at Gateshead (Raine 1852: 52) while in October 1621 Bishop Neile was in London awaiting his 'wagon' and a carrier with his 'carpets' and 'hangings' (these were to be lined, bordered and barred) (Raine 1852: 74). At Durham House in 1528, Cardinal Wolsey was moving furniture, including 'bolsters', 'pillows' and 'bedds' between Durham House and his other residences at Tyttenhanger, Hampton Court and York Place (LMA CLC/521/MS00231)

Comparison between the inventories of Carlisle and Durham residences at first seems to highlight the wealth gap and lifestyle differences between their respective bishops, but the true picture is more complicated and nuanced than these sources initially reveal. Phases of structural dilapidation also occurred at residences owned by the Bishops of Durham. Richard Neile, for example, cited the dilapidations of Durham and Auckland castles in the 17th century as the motivating factor behind his ambitious building campaigns at both sites (discussed by Green 2016 and Foster 2005). At Durham Castle, Neile was responsible for extensive internal and external modifications, while at Auckland he invested heavily in renovating indoor spaces. The results were two of the most impactful building campaigns in the history of these buildings which are consolidated in descriptions in his 1628 inventories (CCB 210/22724A; CCB/B210/42). These included the refurbishment of the Senate Suite at Durham Castle and installation of new kitchens at Auckland Castle (Green 2016). The point to emphasise here is that the fates of episcopal residences and the scale of works undertaken at them are not entirely related to their historic valuations. The bishop had a personal role to play and their own financial means was an important factor behind any decision to build. In general, at their appointment to the diocese, bishops of Durham were typically older than Bishops of Carlisle, and had held more prior offices. Furthermore, more bishops of Durham died in their role, with fewer translating to episcopal roles elsewhere. Because of the prestige attached to the Durham bishopric, Durham bishops were often at a more advanced point in their careers and sometimes had access to greater sources of personal wealth.

All this has profound implications for how we understand the ways that bishops lived and used their houses. Building campaigns conducted before and after the events the Act of Supremacy have a slightly different focus, suggesting the different needs of pre- and post-Reformation bishops. Pre-Reformation building projects are often centred around improvements to service areas and on increasing their capacity. Later post-Reformation building projects focus instead on the development of a 'second-range', which was intended to accommodate private apartments and rooms. At Durham Castle, building works initially by Tunstall c.1540, and then by Neile in the 1620s, both concentrated on updating and transforming accommodation areas in this 'second range'. The presence of a 'second-range' became a defining feature of later medieval bishop's houses, though to-date their purpose has

not been satisfactorily explained (Thompson 1998, Rollason 2017; Burger 2017; Kerscher 2017); many the larger, better studied and more prestigious bishop's houses such as Sherborne Old Castle (Dorset; Cook 2015), Lincoln Bishop's Palace, and St David's Bishops Palace (Pembrokeshire; Turner 2017) include additional ranges which often contained a second hall or large chamber, creating a new dual architectural focus on the site with access routes between major buildings. They are equated with private halls for conducting ecclesiastical matters, while the Great Hall was reserved for profane activities such as administration. Some monastic plans similarly include both a monk's hall and a camera for the prior or abbot which served different audiences.

At Durham Castle, the second range is thought to have initially included the hall constructed by Bishop Flambard (1099-1128) in the early 12th century, and then altered by Bishop le Puiset in the later 12th century to accommodate two halls placed one above the other (Leyland 1994; Brickstock 2007). The current Great Hall was probably initially constructed by Bek (1284-1310) and modified by Hatfield (1345-81), and with little evidence of significant internal remodelling of this part of the Castle prior to the study period, it was probably used as the Great Hall of Durham Castle from the late 13th/14th centuries onwards. On that basis, the north range probably accommodated the majority of living space for the bishops throughout the later medieval period. The north range was then substantially altered by Bishop Tunstall between 1538-42 (CCB B/76/32 (190069A); CCB B/76/34 (190071)) who conducted significant works at the site including: adding a tower (since demolished), chapel and long gallery, remodelling the external south façade of the north range (Chapter 4) and repositioning the castle gateway. It seems likely that the lower floor of the north-range was already subdivided by the time Tunstall made these additions, as there are no records in Clerk of Works' accounts detailing the internal subdivision of rooms here nor do the works appear in accounts relating to Tunstall's work. Bishop Fox (1494-1501) has sometimes been credited with this work as an extension to his building programme which was focused primarily on a service and apartment block south of the east range (Brickstock 2006).

In any case, as we shall see in Chapter 4, Tunstall's building works profoundly altered the spatial arrangement of the Castle, creating new access routes through the site which better connected the different ranges. In so doing, the internal spaces within the north range were provided with an additional layer of privacy. It seems very likely that a functional difference was also enforced between the two ranges, with the Great Hall (the east range) being accessible and the north range made more private. From the available evidence it is not possible to establish the precise use of the internal rooms in the north range during Tunstall's episcopate, although some sense of their use in the 1620s is fossilised in the 1628 inventory. Working on the premise that the inventors recorded spaces in the order in which they walked around them, and using existing spaces as locational reference points, it is possible to establish a broad sense of the layout (see below). Neile is known to have invested heavily

at Durham Castle, remodelling large portions of the accommodation areas (see Green 2016 and Appendix 1 for more). The 1628 inventory shows that Tunstall's gallery, chapel and other works had survived up to this point in time, so the access routes he designed were still in use by Neile. Using this source, an imagined reconstruction can be created which places the probable location of the bishop's private spaces, his bedroom and study, towards the eastern end of the north range on the third floor. Access to these areas of the building was challenging, and their location places them 'deep' within the structure.

Access analysis is a sociological theory that uses the managed flow of human traffic through spaces to infer patterns of hierarchy and social reinforcement. In an architectural context, the permeability of spaces has a direct relationship to social hierarchies in these buildings. Rooms are ordered according to the number of rooms a person would have been required to have gone through to reach a particular point. The 'deepest' or most 'layered' spaces are those which required travel through the greatest number of rooms to reach these spaces. Deeper spaces generally took less traffic and are therefore equated with ideas of privacy, seclusion and social status. Moreover, multiple access routes through buildings, often described as 'ringy', can reveal further intentions relating to social order, access and the exertion of different levels of control. Access analysis has been effectively employed in several archaeological case studies, most notably by Richardson (2003) and Gilchrist (1999). Both these works reveal that restricted access through buildings was used to reinforce gender roles, with female-only spaces in medieval royal palaces (Richardson 2003) and convents (Gilchrist 1999) typically being located in the deepest parts of buildings. When the same principles are applied to the evidence drawn from Neile's 1628 inventory of Durham Castle, social hierarchy seems to have been enforced through restricted access to the bishop's most private areas, thereby emphasising his elevated status. Tunstall's structural interventions are the key here because they provided a bypass around the north-range. Using the Norman doorway in Tunstall's gallery, it now became possible to enter guest spaces without the need to reach the area inhabited by the bishop.

These findings, when combined with the physical elevation of these rooms, reinforce the notion of privacy, exclusivity and social elevation of bishop's private spaces, and their novelty at this period. Elsewhere in this north range, guest spaces and dining spaces transformed the building from its medieval double-storeyed structure, to a complex of rooms each of which carried a specific purpose. Arguably, these changes echo the wider changes to the episcopal role at this time, which demanded a more varied set of roles to be performed by bishops from the confines of their houses. Less emphasis was by now placed on hospitality and other activities based in the hall, such as meeting with officials and members of the public, the production of texts, and meetings among theologians. The transformation of the second range from wider, open spaces to collections of smaller, more private

rooms heralded this occupational shift and signalled the ways in which the daily life of the bishop had changed.

In Scotland, alterations to episcopal spaces also highlight the impact of the Reformation and changes to the lifestyle of the bishop. At St Andrews Castle, the bishop's apartments were moved from the east to the south range following extensive damage during raids in 1547 (Figure 3.2). Until that date, the Great Hall probably sat in the east range (since quarried and affected by severe coastal erosion), with the kitchens being located at the north end of the hall, and private chambers at the south end. This arrangement is corroborated by the probable presence of a chapel in the eastern portion of the south range. The northern wall of this building has a ground-floor colonnaded walkway whose north wall is dated to the early 16th century by surviving window tracery and pictorial evidence in the form of a 1693 illustration of the site (see Appendix 12 for a full discussion on this). Using these fragments of structural evidence, it is possible to establish a broad layout of the site which places the bulk of accommodation to the south of the building, close to the gateway but primarily accessible through entrances via the Great Hall. In contrast, Archbishop John Hamilton (1547-1571) created the new bishop's apartments in the south-west range, profoundly altering their arrangement and likely reducing their size and capacity. Hamilton would have acutely aware of the events of 1549 involving the murder of Beaton and siege of St Andrews Castle so relocating the private bishops' apartments to an area that had been previously strengthened during the episcopate of Beaton evidently made sense.

To conclude briefly, bishops' private spaces were evidently treated in contrasting ways. Durham Castle underwent substantial redevelopment in order to maximise privacy and create spaces better suited to the changing requirements of its bishops. On the other hand, safety and protection were at the forefront of the new layout at St Andrews Castle where fortifications were maximised and any priority previously given to elitism and hierarchy was abandoned. Finance and the impact of taxation also played an important role in decisions to build, particularly in the diocese of Carlisle, and this ultimately led to a lack of building.

3.3. Families

3.3 Women's chambers, nurseries and the houses of mistresses: the domestic situation of bishop's wives, children and mistresses

During the later 16th and 17th centuries, the 'home' in Britain experienced a period of stylistic and functional transformation that eschewed the long-established architectural grammar of elite medieval buildings and began to incorporate new values of privacy (Abate 2003), comfort (Crowley 2003) and family (Crawford 2004). Later medieval building design was steeped in hierarchy, meaning and symbolism which had dictated the purpose of rooms and controlled access to them by visitors. During

the Early Modern period, spatial hierarchy and the meanings attached to spaces became ever more complex with the insertion of new rooms. Friedman (1992) argues that buildings became more intricate and socially fraught. In effect, once rigid medieval building plans now became more nuanced and complex as new room types evolved. Gender was at the heart of this stylistic transformation, with more rooms specifically for use by women and children being inserted into the domestic plan. Women's chambers became ever more common during the 16th and 17th centuries, having been omitted from all but the most high-status of medieval house plans previously (Friedman 1992). Similarly, nurseries appeared as wider social changes in attitude toward children and childhood developed (Cunningham 2005: 40-53). In addition to these fixed-use spaces, other spaces with less rigid purposes can also be associated with the female gaze. For example, galleries and gardens were used for perambulation while libraries often became the focus for hobbies and pastimes (Laurence 1994: 52-58). Increase in long-distance trade in the beginnings of the 16th century resulted in wealthy men spending longer periods of time away from their homes (Laurence 1994: 52-60). Together with an overall decrease in the size of households during the later-15th and 16th centuries (Johnson 2002: 47), the result was smaller households dispersed across remote countryside estates and this led to an increase in female involvement in building projects. Female architectural patrons now emerged as serious consumers of design and décor (Friedman 1992).

Despite this architecturally vibrant context at the onset of clerical marriage, women and children seem to have limited visibility (Figure 3.3). The presence of accommodation spaces for this new influx of women and children are hard to detect and were easily re-converted when no longer needed. In royal palaces and other stately homes, we might expect to find rooms and ranges created exclusively for women, housing bedchambers and specific spaces for servant's spaces, sometimes with medieval antecedents (see for example Richardson 2003; Goldberg 2011; King 2003). In houses owned by lesser clergy clear efforts were sometimes made to extend and enhance living quarters. For example, following the marriage of Matthew Parker and Margaret Harlestone in 1551, four years before his appointment as Archbishop of Canterbury and while he was Vice-Chancellor of Corpus Christi College in Cambridge, Parker significantly extended Corpus Master's Lodge from a one-person domicile into a four-bedroom house to accommodate his growing family (Bjorklund 2003: 352).

In the residences of the bishops of Durham, rooms appear to have been designated for the use of women and children within pre-existing accommodation areas that were undergoing transformation. The 1628 inventories of Durham and Auckland castles both record the existence of mistress chambers, nurseries and maids' chambers, located close to the bishop's private areas and within the footprint of the most socially exclusive regions of the building. Using the same principles outlined above it is possible to reconstruct their whereabouts based on the order of recorded rooms (Figures 3.4 and 3.5). At Durham Castle the location of the mistress chamber and associated maids' chamber are

placed after the gallery and chapel, suggesting that these rooms lay on the second floor at the eastern end of the north range, probably in rooms that have since been destroyed when the Black Staircase was constructed in the 17th century (see Appendix 1 for a more detailed overview of the development of Durham Castle). The position of these rooms would have been very close physically to the bishop's bedchamber and study, probably on the storey above, and similarly close to the hall, dining rooms and guest spaces. At Auckland, there is no reference at all to mistress chambers in the corresponding 1628 inventory. However, the presence of two nurseries (high and low), very probably located within the accommodation areas, suggests an attempt to both re-purpose pre-existing spaces, and a desire to incorporate family rooms at the heart of the household and residence.

Elsewhere the presence of women is less visible. Laurence (1994: 52-65) has argued for female involvement in the design of galleries, libraries and gardens. At the English sites, however, the impact of women on these kinds of spaces is less evident. For example, the two long galleries at Durham and Auckland castles were constructed by Tunstall *c.*1540's but Tunstall was unmarried throughout his life and remained a known opponent to episcopal marriage (Newcombe 2013). The changes he made are more likely attributed to attempts to modernise his accommodation with fashionable new rooms (Chapter 4). Similarly, libraries at episcopal sites are typically not associated with women; many bishops amassed large and well-developed theological collections. Yet the tradition of the bishop's library continued beyond the study period, with some important collections being accumulated (see for example Doyle 1991). Gardens are discussed in Chapter 5, but there is no clear evidence to connect the presence of women in the home with garden design at these sites.

It is very possible that women were at their most visible through their involvement in the creation and design of art and textiles displayed in the home. Tapestries and textile art are well-recorded pursuits of later medieval and early modern elite women in domestic contexts (Gajewski and Seeberg 2016). Studies of their social context have found that, in addition to acting as a pastime, the creation of textile art by noble women provided an outlet for creativity and, through the exchange of items, they served as an important source of control, power and agency which lay outside existing patriarchy (Neuschel 1988; Nicholas 1988). Examinations of French textile art created by later medieval and early modern noble women reveals that religious images, including depictions of the Virgin Mary and baby, were popular subjects (Gawjewski and Seeberg 2016). Studies of the domesticity of early modern houses have recently drawn attention to the creation of dual social spheres based around gender (Friedman 1992; Parker and Pollock 1992; Mazzola and Abate 2003). Within a married household, men were found to dominate the outside world through paid work, labour and provision. The female sphere, on the other hand, centred around the domestic home and work and through this division of labour and worlds, women maintained their power and agency. The creation and display of crafts can be viewed as symbolic of their role as leaders within the domestic sphere. The lack of

visibility of household crafts on inventories and their absence from surviving collections of episcopal paraphernalia is unsurprising given that only furniture, fixtures and fittings belonging to the bishopric were typically recorded. Personal possessions were usually omitted.

These ideas bring into focus the extent to which bishop's wives were the primary managing agents in episcopal households. Before the introduction of clerical marriage, bishop's households had conducted their business without the need to accommodate wives and families and an established hierarchical system had duly become established. This changed in size and complexity throughout the later medieval period (Woolgar 1999: 42) but had persisted. Although women such as Abigail Snoden and Dorothy Neile clearly had power and influence, it is unclear how this was exerted domestically on a daily basis within the parameters of the wider household.

At the Scottish study sites, there is less evidence of spaces for women and children being created within the houses of bishops after 1560. In houses with extensive standing remains, such as St Andrews Castle, there is little to suggest that any new rooms were added to the domestic plan to accommodate bishops with wives. Arguably, it is precisely this lack of provision which might relate to tradition of bishops privately obtaining houses for their mistresses as part of the wider traditions for clerical concubinage. Marion Ogilvy, for example, is known to have resided primarily at Ethie Castle near Arbroath and at Melgund Castle near Aberlemno (Figure 3.6). Both residences were obtained by Cardinal David Beaton and used as residences for his family during his lifetime and indeed after his death. His itineraries show that he spent substantial portions of his time at these houses, while architectural evidence indicates that he invested heavily in their upkeep (Sanderson 1986). Beaton acquired Ethie Castle from the de Maxwell family sometime before 1530 and renovated the site before entertaining King James V there in 1530 (Sanderson 1986: 63). At Melgund, Charles McKean (2001) has demonstrated that the site underwent considerable building work during the 1540's and this profoundly altered the pre-existing residence. Previously, Melgund had been thought to be an original Beaton construction. Neither of these residences was owned by the bishopric and, following Beaton's death in 1547, neither house remained an asset of the diocese of St Andrews. Instead, Ogilvy inherited Melgund Castle and continued living at the site until her death in 1575 (Sanderson 2004b).

Both of these sites display clear elements of prestige and display elements typical of other bishop's houses. For example, Ethie Castle has a chapel in the undercroft space beneath the hall. Both Ethie and Melgund feature first-floor halls with additional accommodation areas extending out from these. Their exterior façades echo both one another and other Scottish episcopal castles. The use of sandstone as the primary building material, the concentration of building around a central keep, and the use of square and circular towers, parapet walkways and decorated rooflines all give these buildings an distinctive flavour which is echoed at other sites owned by the (arch)bishops of St Andrews (Figure 3.7). Internally however, the arrangement of rooms is not well understood. Melgund

Castle is extensively ruined, while Ethie Castle has had extensive renovations which have profoundly altered its interior arrangement. Following long periods as a private residence, Ethie Castle has received very little archaeological attention, and much of the building is only broadly dated.

The visual motifs linking these houses to others owned by the (arch)diocese of St Andrews suggest a connection between them which has profound implications for understandings of Ogilvy and other episcopal mistresses. While Beaton spent considerable amounts of time at Ethie and Melgund castles, his register indicates that he also spent large portions of time elsewhere (Sanderson 1986). Presumably, at this time Ogilvy would have lived independently in these houses, managing them in a similar manner to other elite wives. The visual motifs linking these residences to others owned by the (arch)diocese of St Andrews suggests that through her connection to Beaton and the diocese, Ogilvy obtained a status which enabled her to fulfil these wifely obligations. In this way, and unlike the situation of English episcopal wives, Ogilvy was able to gain independence, agency and status.

3.4 Decline and development of service roles

3.4.1 Gardener to gatekeeper

During the three-year episcopate of Francis White (1626-9), Bishop of Carlisle, a list was drawn up of all the 36 members of his household at Rose Castle (CAC/W/3456/3). Aside from the bishop and his family (his wife and two daughters), this included*: two of his wife's relatives, his chaplain, steward, gentleman-usher, chamberlain, cook, butler, two coachmen, groom of the stable, baker and brewer (one role), three chambermaids, 'Thomas in the kitchen', 'the boy Bushbie in the kitchen', cheese husbandman, 'Abed Simon, Dobbie Scott, John Bogg, Bushbie, Bushbie a boy, Arthur a boy', a wood leader, two or three other maids, porter, 'Robert Tengate', ground keeper and 'William Sutton.* Altogether, this document lists approximately 27 service staff if those listed by name alone are considered to have been members of the working household. The largest servant group recorded in this source are those engaged directly or indirectly in food preparation, suggesting that these areas were of central importance and among the busiest at the castle. Working women, in the form of the chambermaids, were also clearly present, together with working children. People engaged to work in Rose Park are fewer in number, with only the groundkeeper obviously involved in this kind of work, though other named individuals (i.e. William Sutton or Robert Tengate) might have worked in these jobs also.

From this kind of information it is possible to build an accurate picture of the composition of a bishop's household in the 15th to 17th centuries. In 1667 Auckland Castle listed a more modest 13 servants including a house steward, accountant, valet, housekeeper, coachman, postillion (to ride the leading horse drawing a carriage), coachman's helper, groom's helper, keeper of the Park walls, kitchen boy, usher of the hall, scullery keeper, and porter (Raine 1852: 120). The key roles mentioned

here would have been familiar in earlier times too. The 'steward of my Lord's household' held the senior overall role across the bishopric (e.g. 1457-8), as did other occasional visitors who had regular business with the bishop such as the 'receiver-general' (1478-9), computant (1474-5), attorney of the bishop (1543-4), and a 'master forester within the bishopric' (1543-4). These, and others, had roles across the bishopric; they were, in modern terms, the 'inner circle' of managers. Then there were those who were tied to individual responsibilities at the separate houses. Thus at Auckland Castle, there is mention at various times of a 'keeper of the manor-house' (1526-7), presumably the equivalent of a bailiff (1543-4) and sometimes an under-steward (1543-4). Those who controlled the finances were a clerk of works (1458-9), clerk of receipts (1479), or treasurer (1472-4), and there were special roles too such as the master of the choristers of the college (1513). A keeper of the garden at Auckland (1466-7) is also mentioned and out in Park could be found a parker (1526-7), paliciars (literally a 'fence-minder') of the park (1526-7), and in other Durham parks there were foresters, for example at Stanhope and Wolsingham (1543-4) (Raine 1852, 51-68).

3.4.2 New and old kitchens: the modernisation and development of service spaces

As we have already established, by the time the study period for this thesis begins, bishop's households were largely static. The time of the peripatetic bishop was over. As a result, service staff was by now largely fixed at different residences and those houses where bishops spent most of their time were maintained by the largest households. In that respect the extent of dedicated service space itself acts as a useful barometer of the size of household, and hints at the different capacities of each household to accommodate large events and groups. The beginning of the study period witnessed substantial remodelling of service spaces and investment in improvements to existing facilities. At Durham, Auckland and Norham castles, Bishop Richard Fox (1494-1501) focused his attention on service provision at all three sites. At Durham Castle Fox constructed a large four-storey service block, which included a large kitchen suite together with a buttery, pantry and ancillary accommodation spaces with chambers and a bakehouse (see Appendix 1 and 1628 Inventory of Durham Castle). In addition, Fox added a new water supply system to the site, likely replacing the existing well in the inner bailey (discovered during archaeological investigation by Leyland 1994). At Norham Castle, Fox added an elaborate new water-supply that included the construction of a purpose-built aqueduct into the site. At Auckland, the recent discovery of a wooden servery hatch matching that at Durham Castle and inscribed with the date '1500' shows that Fox similarly invested heavily in the service spaces there (see Appendix 1 for a discussion on this) (Figures 4.6 and 4.7). At Rose Castle, Bishop John Kite (1521-37) focused his building works in and around the 'Kite Tower', adding and improving the adjoining service spaces (for discussion see Appendix 9; Tatton-Brown 2004: 383). In so doing, Kite subdivided a pre-existing 13th century range (labelled as the 'former dairy' on Jefferson's 1671 plan; Figure 3.8) to incorporate a new set of service spaces; including

kitchen, buttery and pantry, in addition to the 'old kitchen' and service spaces located in the east and south ranges.

At each of these sites, there must have been a need to update existing services which had their origins in the 12th/13th centuries. However, the size and scale of expenditure suggest something more than simply modernisation. Some sense of the value placed on these spaces is reflected through the level of expenditure and craftsmanship on show. At Durham Castle for example, Fox's personal emblem (pelican eating its own breast) is carved into the servery screen (Figure 4.7), while extensive areas of open woodwork hint at scale of expenditure at the site. This point is again emphasised by the generous spatial footprint devoted to these areas. At Durham Castle, Fox's accommodation block and service areas are comparable in size to the great hall. At Auckland, the presence of two separate service areas (as revealed by the 1628 inventory) shows that a large portion of the building was devoted purely to service as opposed to hall or accommodation spaces. At Rose Castle, almost two entire ranges were devoted solely for service use. Altogether, the development of these spaces points to the priority given to service, which in turn hints at the more static residency patterns of bishops at this period.

The location of service ranges relates directly to their function, and it is usual for them to be located in close proximity to halls and dining spaces, often diametrically situated away from accommodation spaces. Fire safety, noise, smells and practicality are all likely reasons behind this deliberate placement of rooms (Scanlon 2005). Sites with medieval antecedents generally retained the standard medieval domestic plan with service areas extending from the Great Hall (see Gardiner 2008 for a discussion on this). At Durham Castle, Fox's new service areas are likely situated on the site of the earlier kitchens (see Appendix 1). At Auckland the location of the 'old kitchen, pantry, larder, scullery and brewhouse' have now been located through archaeological excavation and adjoin the low end of the original Great Hall (now St Peter's chapel). However, the insertion of new kitchen spaces often diverged from the established building pattern. At both Auckland Castle and Rose Castle, new kitchen spaces altered the service focus from the 'low' ends of the hall, to areas with greater public visibility. At Auckland Castle, the 'new' kitchen spaces were located in the lower floor of the west-range, closer to the accommodation areas. At Rose Castle, the 'new' service spaces were to be found near the 'new' entrance to the site, through the Kite Tower, also close to accommodation areas, and in areas visible to visitors. At both Auckland Castle and Rose Castle, there is strong evidence to suggest that the 'old' service spaces were in use concurrently with the 'new' spaces, suggesting a dual focus for the service areas, at least temporarily (Appendices 2 and 9). While at Durham Castle the location of the service areas intimates that they were hidden from direct view, their placement at Auckland and Rose castles on either side of courtyards suggests that they were visible, and that servants must have moved routinely between the service areas in full view of people entering the site or living there. If this is so

then the division between high and low areas of the building had become blurred so that the insertion of 'new' service spaces suggests not only a shift to longer residential stays at these sites, but also in the perceptions of those who worked there as different circulation patterns came into force across the site.

This trend in late 16th and 17th century contexts to plan for two service zones has been observed by others, such as Alison Maguire and Andor Gomme (1995). It has been interpreted as an attempt to increase the ability of these sites to host large-scale hospitality, while also reflecting changing social attitudes toward servants and staff. For example, Maguire and Gomme (1995) surmise that parlours were multi-use spaces which, because of their location and warmth, might have been used by all the members of the household. Elsewhere, Cooper has posited that the location of service spaces close to entrances might have facilitated servants spying on visitors, eschewing the notion that service spaces were always hidden from plain sight. While these ideas have received criticism (see Pennell 2016: 56-8), they nevertheless provide context for understanding the changes manifest at the sites under consideration here. Without doubt, the boundaries between bishop, family and service staff narrowed significantly during this period, and this is reflected in building design.

The next chapter builds on this discussion of families and household composition in bishop's houses to explore questions of 'hospitality', defined here as the reception and entertainment of guests, visitors, or strangers.

4

Hospitality

4.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the different ways in which guests experienced hospitality at bishop's houses. Section 4.2 investigates dining and feasting at residences belonging to the bishops of Durham through a preliminary investigation of faunal and artefact assemblages derived from recent excavations at Auckland Castle and an analysis of the spaces and material culture which served as backdrops to hospitality. Section 4.3 explores the building work conducted at these sites which explicitly affected the ways in which they were used and experienced by guests. This includes the insertion of what are referred to here as 'performative areas' such as long galleries and guest accommodation. The inclusion of these spaces is significant because they reveal the intention of the host to communicate a specific set of ideals through the creation of designed environments. In most instances, they were created in the early-mid 16th century, as household activities and displays of hospitality were beginning to change in tune with wider Tudor fashions.

At the outset, it must be acknowledged that this chapter relies heavily on evidence relating to the residences of the Bishops of Durham. This is due to the range and availability of high-quality archaeological datasets and high proportion of standing buildings available or this diocese. Unlike other dioceses, it is possible to draw parallels and conclusions about the use and role of these sites but it is hoped that the findings here might be tested in the future as further information on the archaeology of other bishop's houses becomes available.

4.2 Feasting and dining

4.2.1 On the bishop's table

Recent excavations at Auckland Castle in 2018 and 2019 have brought to light faunal and artefact assemblages dating from the 16th and 17th centuries. Excavations at the site of the 'Old Kitchens' in 2018 uncovered both demolition contexts containing dateable 17th century artefacts *and* faunal remains, together with the sealed floor surface and hearths of the kitchens which were in use throughout the study period under discussion here. Similarly, excavations on the North Terrace of Auckland Castle in 2019 uncovered substantial faunal, artefact and ceramic assemblages which were probably deposited during the demolition and levelling of the northern curtain wall and rooms north of the Great Hall by Bishop Cosin shortly after 1660 (see Appendix 2 for a discussion of this).

The finds from these demolition contexts probably derive from an accumulation of waste which was redeposited in order to level the ground surface. Due to the ongoing nature of the excavations, the findings are based on preliminary data and full quantities and detailed archaeozoological analysis is forthcoming. Archaeobotanical analysis of soil samples recovered from these excavations is currently underway and may yield additional insights into the scale and nature of food imports and cultivation at the site.

Figure 4.1 details the remains of mammal, fish, bird and shellfish recovered. Red deer, cow, sheep, dog, chicken, pig, freshwater fish bones, oysters, clams and lobster have all been positively identified (Rowley-Conwy pers. comm). All these must have been exploited in the years preceding the levelling process and the finds are consistent with terrestrial and marine resources known to have been acquired by the Bishops of Durham during and prior to the study period. Figure 4.2 details all the known animals and foods which the Bishops of Durham exploited in their park at Auckland and other nearby parks, together with other foodstuffs referenced in accounts and other documents.

Earlier excavations at Auckland Castle also uncovered evidence of a grape seed within a medieval context (ASUD 2014b), suggesting that the bishops were acquiring exotic foodstuffs during the later medieval period. The faunal assemblages do not, however, show evidence of exotics (though baleen has been recovered) and it is possible that further analysis of the ecofactual material may reveal more.

References to a '*spicerie*' in Neile's 1628 inventory of Auckland Castle (CCB 210/22724A) confirm that spices were stored here, presumably for use in the kitchen. This was nothing new, Auckland 'grossers' were being paid for spices bought at Beverley fair in 1582 (Raine 1852: 72) and cumin and pepper were regularly recorded rents from 15th and 16th tenants at Crayke (see for example CB B/106/5 (189889). Cardinal Wolsey's account of moving possessions between Durham House and his other residences records a payment of furniture from Durham House to his 'clerke of the spicerie' in 1528 **(**CLC/521/MS00231).

In this case, however, the *spicerie* was clearly a room and is referred to as a separate space with locks, furniture and grinding apparatus, rather than a spice cabinet which were popular furniture items in middle and high-status British residences at this date (Pennell 2016: 327). Although spices were becoming increasingly available during the 16th and 17th centuries as a result of a proliferation in the spice trade (Donkin 2003), they were still costly and prestigious commodities. Their use in feasting and dining settings at Auckland Castle demonstrates one avenue of conspicuous consumption.

Combing through documentary references it is possible to build up a picture of the foodstuffs coming into different bishop's houses. There were seven pipes of wine (about 3850 litres) remaining at Durham Castle after the installation of Bishop Laurence Boothe (1459-60), much of this was probably shipped into Newcastle, as it was in 1492-3 where the bishop bought it from a local merchant, and at least some of the barrels were French – 'three hogesheads of Gascoigne wine' was paid for in 1593 (about 714 litres). Beer was also drunk by bishops. In 1622 Bishop Neile evidently preferred his beer 'well hopt' and complained that much of it had been wasted in the past because of the 'mustiness of the caskes'. Meat was a staple and the accounts mention '2 fat oxen' and '2 fat cows and '28 fat sheep' for the table in 1492-3 for entertaining the Chancellor, Auditor, and Surveyor and 'my Lord's other officers' at Durham. Animals were moved about routinely on the hoof too. In 1473-4 some 287 oxen were driven to London, payments being made out by the Bishop of Durham for suitable pasturage along the way (Raine 1852, 53). In 1513-4 Durham oxen and stirks were delivered 'for use at my Lord's house' in London; two years later the head is stated at some 42 oxen and 40 cows. It took three weeks in all to drive them to London. At Auckland, fish are also regularly listed: 1200 'salt fish' from Hartlepool, Sunderland and Shelys (presumably Shields) in 1466 together with 5 barrels of salt salmon from Gateshead to Auckland, to which should be added fish caught locally in the Rivers Wear and Gaunless (trout) and fish from the fishponds there (Chapter 5). Once again, 'carriage' to the London house was a major expense. Thus 'sea fish of value' called 'selez' were transported to the bishop's table in London in 1514-5, six barrels of salmon in 1519-20, and in 1521-22 Thomas March was paid for the carriage of 'a fish, called a steurigion-fish' to London which had been gifted to the bishop by Lord Dacre. Shellfish were also consumed in quantities: two horse loads of whelks in 1479-81, for example, were delivered to Auckland as a gift from the Prior of Carlisle (Raine 1852: 51-75).

The bishop's house at Howden Manor was also the place at which many 'royal fish', including whale, sturgeon, porpoise and seal entered the diocese. Occasional references to these suggest that its proximity to the East Yorkshire coast with access via the River Ouse (see for example CCB B/93/13 (189060). The recent discovery of whale baleen during 2019 excavations at Auckland Castle confirm that bishops were utilising this commodity too.

Descriptions of feasts at the residences of the Bishops of Durham shed light on the scale and nature of these events, and the particular role of food. In 1513 Bishop Thomas Ruthall of Durham (1509-23) complained in a letter to Cardinal Wolsey about the expense he had endured while visiting his bishopric, mentioning that "*300 persons some day is a small number…and sometimes 60 or 80 beggars at the gate...this is a way to keep a poor man in state'* and that he bought with him 8 tuns of wine from London (that is approximately 2,016 gallons of wine) and '*our Lord be thankyd, I have not two tunne left at this howre. And this is fayre utterance in two monethys. And schame it is to say how many befis and motons have been spent in my hows sens my cummyng, besides other fresh acats, whete, malt, fysch, and such baggages"* (Entry 4523. 24 October 1513. Letter between Ruthall and Wolsey, written from Auckland Castle. Letters and Papers Foreign and Domestic in the Reign of Henry VIII. Brewer 2015: 688). In two months this amounts to about 95 litres of wine each day. Similarly, a series of surviving letters between Bishop Tobias Matthew of Durham (1595-1606) and the keeper of Stanhope Park, Ralph Trotter, detail his ongoing demands for deer to be taken and transported from Stanhope Park to other residences to feed large numbers of guests. In one letter dated 1600, Matthew explicitly requests *'one fat buck'* to be delivered to Durham Castle ahead of a visit of judges and justices sent in the service of Elizabeth I, with additional orders to send another carcass immediately if requested (CCB B/23/25/28). For the Bishops of Durham there was always an ongoing commitment to providing largesse from the resources to be found on their episcopal estates, together with high-status imported foods (and see also Chapter 5 for animals in parks).

One especially striking aspect of the Auckland Castle assemblage is the paucity of tablewares. Given the large faunal assemblage, it might be reasonable to assume that pottery associated with dining, such as bowls or plates, might be similarly represented, but it is not. Possibly pewter, tin or wood vessels were in use instead on the bishop's table, something which would not be unusual at early modern feasts. The bishop of Durham certainly paid for pewter or 'puther' for his house in London in 1593 (Raine 1852, 72). The re-cycling of metal objects and depositional factors affecting the archaeological survival of wood might explain their absence. Analysis of the inventories of guilds by Gervase Rosser has found that that many guilds owned large collections of pewter tableware for use during fraternity feasts (1994: 439). Inventories for Auckland Castle (referenced above) do not include similar references but it may be that feast-goers brought their own tableware.

One fragment of a 17th century glass vessel (Figures 4.3) and a well-preserved knife with bone handle (Figure 4.4) were recovered from the 17th century demolition contexts in the 'Old Kitchens' and North Terrace. The glass fragment in Figure 4.3 is a baluster stem from a wine goblet. Most goblets of mid-16th to mid-17th century date feature lion mask designs and these are found archaeologically all across Britain, although they are not common (Willmott 2002: 63). The motif of the stamped lion mask knop on a blown glass stem was produced by different Venetian, Façon de Venise and other reproduction glass-makers. Studies in France (Goetz 1990) have revealed variations on this type of stem which do not include the characteristic lion mask but share many of the other stylistic details. The Auckland Castle example in Figure 4.3 features an embossed scallop shell in place of the lion mask. No comparable examples are currently known in Britain and it seems likely that the goblet was sourced on the European mainland. Its provenance cannot be fully ascertained without chemical analysis, however the scallop detailing may allude to St James (and therefore perhaps to Santiago and Spain) and this may have some significance within the religious context at this site.

Other fragments of glass from Auckland Castle are also indicative of high-status dining. One fragment (not illustrated) is an ornate glass rod moulded into a rose shape on one end, possibly a cage stem goblet (Willmott 2002: 73) in which intricately applied glass rods outline a curved detail along the stem of the vessel. These kinds of vessels have only been found at high status early modern sites, including Nonsuch Palace (Willmott 2002:72; Charleston 2001), and date from the 16th century. Very few parallels are known, but their origin may be Venice.

Similarly exotic is the knife shown in Figure 4.4. This well-preserved bone-handled table knife with ornate silver bolster was recovered from the same context as the glass fragments in Figure 4.3. It bears similarities to Dutch examples, particularly those from the Amsterdam knife-making industries (Rijkelijkhuizen 2017). The geometric faceted carved handle with green dyed inlaid pieces is not unlike those found on archaeological sites in the Netherlands (see for example the Damrak knife in Monumenten & Archaeologie, Amsterdam). Trade of Dutch knives and tableware was common in 17th century England, with established trade networks between Amsterdam and London (Moore 1999). These were prestige items, and few have been found so far in archaeological contexts in the UK though many remain in circulation as antiques and heirlooms. Work conducted by Rijkelijkhuizen (2017) has demonstrated that around half of the 17th knives he tested isotopically from Amsterdam workshops were made from elephant ivory, an expensive imported material for which cheaper substitutes could be found nearer Amsterdam. Further analysis would be required to evaluate the source of the bone/ivory of the knife found at Auckland Castle.

One important item of tableware is Fox's salt-cellar, thought to be gifted to the bishop by Henry VII in recognition for his work when negotiating the marriage between Margaret Tudor and James IV (Campbell 1999: 143-5) (Figure 4.5). This object presents a harmonised combination of imagery

evoking both religious and secular images of power. The pelican-in-its-piety is a repeated motif across the body of the piece and depicted alongside images of hunting and nature which adorn most of the silver-gilt openwork tracery elements of the vessel. Dogs, deer and cherubs with horns are all depicted amid entangled foliage which was likely set on a blue enamel background (Campbell 1999: 145). The central shaft of the salt-cellar features different Biblical scenes. This combination of imagery meshes together three central concepts. Firstly, and most prominently, Fox as an individual is celebrated through his emblem. His role as the bishop is then reflected through hunting and Biblical imagery, which may represent the dual responsibilities of a bishop as both a secular and religious leader, while the hunting imagery connects him with the role of a noble lord.

Taken together, the evidence for faunal remains and dining artefacts drawn from archaeological deposits and museum collections presents a vivid impression of the nature of feasting and dining at the residences of the Bishops of Durham during the study period. The faunal assemblages in particular reveal that the wider landscapes owned by the Bishops of Durham were heavily exploited to provide food for the bishop's table (Chapter 5). To these archaeological finds must be added objects which have not survived - a linen cloth on the table, silver at the high table including perhaps silver tableware and pewter, though wooden tableware would also have been in use even in the 17th century and forks did not become popular until the 1650s (Brears 1985). There were also imported exotic items; including spices, glassware and knives, and these finds demonstrate that the bishops were engaging in high-level elite trade networks. This is emphasised by the uniqueness of some of these items, such as the baluster goblet. The religious motifs on these items highlight their role as vessels of communication to a wider audience. The complicated series of visual messages present on Fox's salt-cellar is testament to this. The importance of these objects, both as historical artefacts and objects of value at the time is emphasised through the paucity of tableware identified archaeologically. The salt-cellar, glass vessels and knife would surely have stood out all the more among a sea of pewter or wooden vessels. Altogether, this evidence reveals that feasting continued as an important way of enacting hospitality, and that it provided a medium for the communication of identity and power through the display and use of exotic and expensive foods and artefacts.

4.2.2 Halls and dining rooms: backdrops for feasting and dining

Little real detail is available for these large social (and religious) occasions. There were four women serving at Auckland in 1543-4 (Raine 1852, 66) and it is clear that the floors in the hall and in other major apartments there were strewn with rushes. Payment was made for mowing these rushes in 1474-5, for example (Raine 1852, 54). In terms of other decoration in the rooms, the 1628 inventory indicates that the hall and apartments at Auckland were wainscoted, but if there were any tapestries (as seems likely) they probably belonged to the bishop and therefore went unaccounted for (Raine 1852, 111); there were certainly 30 yards of tapestry in 'my Lady's Closet' at Auckland in 1750

(Raine 1852, 109). After the event had ended, there was washing and clearing away to be done. In 1481 Emma Dod was paid to wash the table cloths at Auckland (Raine 1852, 57) and the same four women who served the tables in 1543-4 were also paid for the *'beryng of rubbysshe'*.

Between 1498 and 1501, Bishop Richard Fox of Durham (1494-1501) was responsible for an extensive building campaign at Durham Castle. He created a new room layout in the north range of Durham Castle which has survived in places but is now largely obscured by the later building work by bishops Tunstall, Neile and Cosin in the 16th and 17th centuries. Fox also constructed a new apartment block south of the Great Hall which vastly increased accommodation at the site. In so doing, Fox truncated the existing Great Hall which had been extended by Bishop Hatfield in the 14th century but made no major amendments to the exterior façade of the hall, which retains many of the features and building fabric commissioned by Hatfield and Bek. Fox's best known work at Durham Castle relates to the new kitchen and service facilities he constructed to the south and east of the Great Hall, and the woodwork around the buttery hatches which has survived largely intact (Figure 4.7). This displays his personal emblem (a-pelican-in-its-piety), his name and the phrase *deo est gratia* (God is great). Inside the hall, Fox also added a wooden screen along the screens passage, which again includes a carving of the pelican-in-its-piety and its date of construction (1499). A matching sister-screen recently discovered *ex situ* at Auckland Castle includes the date 1500 along with Fox's emblem (Figure 4.6). Based on its similarity to the one from Durham Castle, it is reasonable to assume that it occupied a similar position. Lambert (1796:7) has also attributed the construction of two trumpeters' pulpits to Fox's building work, though both Gee (1928:74) and Leyland (1994: 17) argue that these might date from Hatfield's episcopate.

As feasts held within the diocese were occasions which served entire communities, the people who would have experienced these building changes were primarily those drawn from the local area, as well as visiting guests. The iconography inserted by Fox reflects this. Using his emblem and allusions to religion, Fox refers explicitly to his role. This distinguished this space from that of a secular elite. To that end, the trumpeters' pulpits arguably echo royal buildings. At no other episcopal Great Hall examined for this thesis were they found to be present, perhaps reflecting the uniqueness of the Durham episcopacy; Fox's pre-Reformation episcopate lay at the zenith of episcopal wealth and power in Palatinate Durham (Chapter 1). At this moment in time, the Bishops of Durham enjoyed some of the greatest temporal oversight within the region and were able to enact judicial powers which extended their role beyond that of a typical bishop or lord. Fox's use of mixed religious imagery, royal details and promotion of his personal cult may echo his conceptualisation of his role. The insertion of larger and more developed service areas at Durham Castle emphasises his wish to extend and develop the hospitality capabilities of the site, providing an extended audience for his building changes within the Great Hall.

Elsewhere, changes to Great Halls also reveal a commitment to increased levels of comfort. At Norham Castle, following sustained damage during an assault in 1513 by James IV of Scotland., Bishop Thomas Ruthall of Durham (1509-23) set about restoring the site in 1514-15 following an inspection issued by Cardinal Wolsey. Many of Ruthall's repairs focused on the defensive parts of the site, such as improving the curtain walls, ramparts, inserting provisions for cannons and guns and re-roofing the donjon, but he also inserted new domestic areas inside the inner ward (Figure 4.8) (CCB B/31C/220204/4). Conforming to the floor plan of a typical hall-house (at least within the limitations of the local topography), Ruthall inserted a Great Hall, chamber, kitchen and service spaces abutting the existing 12th century donjon. Standing buildings analysis of the donjon (Dixon and Marshall 1993) has revealed that this building would have had capability to be used as a hall and that it shares parallels with other 12th and 13th century counterparts such as Hedingham Castle in Essex. There is no strong evidence that Ruthall spent large quantities of time at Norham Castle (Johnson 2002), but the site was used by Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall as a refuge during the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1536. Tunstall himself was responsible for making further amendments to the layout, including improving some defences and making repairs to the domestic accommodation, but the bulk of the work had already been conducted by Ruthall (Johnson 2004).

It is significant that Ruthall, who was also responsible for the insertion of a new Great Chamber at Auckland Castle (see Appendix 2), created a suite of domestic spaces which respected a conventional medieval layout. The provision of these spaces clearly shows a desire to provide areas for hospitality and to modernise the existing building ranges. Unfortunately, due to the subsequent abandonment and dilapidation of the site from the late 16th century, much of the stylistic detailing and all fixtures and fittings have been lost. These features might have shed light on the subtle ways in which these spaces communicated aspects of diocesan identity to a wider audience.

The 1628 inventories for Durham and Auckland castles both refer to dedicated dining rooms which were added in the 16th century by renovating pre-existing medieval ranges (see Appendices 1 and 2 for a full discussion). However, if the Bishops of Durham inserted dining rooms into their buildings they *only* appear to have done so at their primary residences. The survey of Stockton Manor conducted after the death of Bishop Pilkington in 1576 makes no reference at all to a dedicated dining room. Similarly, at Howden Manor there are no standing remains or documentary references to suggest a dining room despite its ongoing use as an episcopal residence throughout the 16th and 17th centuries. At Norham Castle the lack of any later building work with an obvious focus on accommodation and hospitality suggests that this residence too may have lost those functions.

Primary episcopal residences belonging to the Bishops of Carlisle and St Andrews reflect this same trend. The post-Restoration plans of Rose Castle indicate that the Great Hall there was subdivided (Figure 3.8). The thinner width of the south wall of the 'Great Dining Room' suggests that this was a

later attempt to subdivide the larger Great Hall to create a more intimate dining space, sometime before the partial demolition of the buildings during the Civil War (see Appendix 9; Chapter 6). Similarly, at St Andrews Castle a new suite of apartments was created by Cardinal Beaton between 1543-6, and then adapted by Archbishop John Hamilton in the 1560s and this probably included a dining room or chamber (Figure 4.9) (see Appendix 12).

There are no defining building characteristics which objectively differentiate a dining room/chamber from other chambers. At Durham, Auckland and Rose castles, dining rooms/chambers are all adjacent or near the Great Hall. There are obvious benefits to this as it enables easy access to any kitchen or service spaces. Kenyon (1990: 138-151) has also noted this tradition at medieval castles where two dining and kitchen areas serviced on the one hand everyday dining and, on the other, large hospitality events, but it is a feature not found at episcopal sites at that date. Based on current archaeological and documentary evidence, all the residences examined in this study had just one kitchen and hall throughout the later medieval period. This probably reflects the greater number of episcopal residences at that time, the larger size of episcopal households and their peripatetic circuits. However, the insertion of dining spaces at the junction between the Great Hall and accommodation area might be argued to demonstrate a latent adoption of the same kinds of practices employed by earlier secular nobles. While in earlier centuries, bishops did not have families resident with them, post-Reformation bishops in England and Scotland (Chapter 3) would have had greater need of more intimate spaces like these. Moreover, as the need to provide largesse waned, so smaller-scale entertaining was favoured. Viewed symbolically, these rooms straddle the divide between the public and private residential zones which had defined the medieval architecture associated with hospitality. By drawing the sphere of hospitality nearer to the accommodation areas, the socially exclusive nature of later medieval hospitality was reduced and this may have encouraged greater comfort and intimacy between guests and host. References to the small Durham House Group meeting in the dining rooms of Durham House in London are perhaps one such exchange (Foster 2004).

The location of these dining spaces may be a point of difference between the layouts of the major English and Scottish sites. Although St Andrews Castle is the only Scottish site in this study for which we have a clear understanding of its post-medieval layout; Beaton's new apartment block lay to the south of the building complex, west of the main gateway. Based on the layout of rooms in other contemporary Scottish apartments, it was typical for apartments to include a dining room/chamber. For example, building work conducted by King James V (1513-42) at Holyroodhouse in Edinburgh involved a major update of the domestic apartments there, including the insertion of dining chambers (Dunbar 1984: 16-19). Beaton's new apartments however, were located at a distance from the existing kitchen and service provision and, based on the evidence of the standing buildings, access between the kitchens and apartments would have entailed traversing the central courtyard. This seems

inconvenient and possibly the Great Hall was reserved for major dining occasions and the apartments for more intimate or private meals.

Another important point of difference is that St Andrews Castle served a range of additional purposes that the English study sites did not. With a jail tower and dungeon located north of the kitchen range, and defensive towers on the north-western corner of the complex, this castle incorporated defensive and judicial capabilities in addition to meeting the requirements of an elite residence. Throughout the period, many people were imprisoned in these rooms, including Archbishop Patrick Graham (Thomson 1960). Situated on the coastal side of the site, they emphasised its fortress-like quality and the ongoing threat of attack from the sea. By placing the accommodation areas towards the southern-limit of the complex, not only was the castle zoned in terms of its functions and symbolism, but also the safety and comfort of the bishop were prioritised. In addition, it is clear here, as elsewhere, that pre-existing structures impacted on the layout of residences and room layouts do not strictly conform to what might be expected. There is no clean break between different dining and hospitality traditions.

4.3 Performative spaces: the insertion of long galleries

The insertion of galleries was an important addition to the layout of some of the buildings in the selection under study here. In all cases their introduction profoundly affected the spatial navigation of the site, as well as visual aspects for visitors, and this because the galleries were inherently performative and intended to be viewed and experienced by guests. At Durham and Auckland castles Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall (1530-1559) was responsible for adding galleries there, while another was added to Rose Castle, probably in the 1530s as part of a wider building campaign by Bishop John Kite (1521-1537), although there is no clear date for its construction and this part of the building was demolished during the Civil War (Appendix 9). There are no known instances of galleries being added to any of the Scottish sites despite their wider use as elite Scottish palace sites from the mid-16th century onwards (Dunbar 1984).

Originating in France, long galleries emerged as covered wooden walkways in England in the late 14th century but did not gain in popularity until a century later (Coope 1986: 44). They are most commonly associated with 16th century Tudor prodigy houses in which they represent the last stage in the process of the development of galleries in Britain and were usually purpose-built as first-floor rooms in new houses. They offered new scope as entertaining spaces, as well as for displaying art and artefacts and facilitated processions between some of the more significant areas of buildings. At the sites under study here, they were inserted into buildings in the early-16th century, and consequently their dimensions and form were dictated by pre-existing structures. In her review of English galleries, Rosalie Coope (1986) argues that early galleries added to pre-existing buildings are better termed ‘corridor-galleries’, as their potential as standalone rooms for the display of items and indoor

perambulations was not fully realised. The rooms under discussion here fit that description, they served as *de facto* corridors sandwiched between different building elements. Whereas almost all other rooms had specific functions and access arrangements, the gallery had a much less specific purpose.

The three galleries at Auckland, Durham and Rose castles are all similarly sized (*approx.*30m), but their locations inside the buildings do vary. At all three, clear processional routes were created which altered the pre-existing access arrangements and spatial focus. At Durham Castle, the gallery was situated between the parlour on the west end and Tunstall's chapel and stairs to the east. Exactly how these ranges connected cannot now be known due to later building work at the west end of the north range, and Richard Pears (2019) has posited that the gallery may have been intentionally unconnected. Although this is possible, at this date there are few instances of top-floor galleries being created purely for the admiring of views. The more common form was corridor-galleries, and this fits with the morphology at Durham.

At Auckland Castle, the gallery (in a part of the building now named the Scotland Wing) was added *c.* 1530 and extended from the accommodation block westwards making use of the pre-existing medieval curtain wall. One 14th century reference to a lean-to against the curtain wall has been interpreted as a possible earlier structure on the site of the Scotland Wing, but recent archaeological and standing buildings analyses do not corroborate this suggestion (Appendix 2). Ongoing archaeological work at Auckland has demonstrated that the gallery overlooked a large square courtyard of buildings enclosing a two-storey 13th century chapel built by Bishop Bek. The Scotland Wing is today accessible via its east end with direct access into the accommodation block. However, standing building analysis has revealed that this building was truncated at its western end and there might have been access from this end also. The recent discovery of a north-south section of curtain wall extending south from the Scotland Wing makes it very likely that this might have been accessible as a first-floor walkway, and the discovery of a double staircase flanking an entrance through this wall supports this.

At Rose Castle, the gallery was located before the low-end of the Great Hall, adjacent to the brewhouse with seemingly direct access to the storerooms which lay behind (Figure 3.8). We only know about this space from the ground floor plan which does not for the most part provide information for upper storeys. However, based on the rooms which appear to have access *from* this gallery, a ground-floor location is most likely. In this instance, the gallery seems to have provided an elongated entrance pathway to the low-end of the Great Hall from the central courtyard.

The different spatial positioning of these galleries has important implications for how they were used. At both Durham and Auckland Castles, the galleries were close to accommodation and chapels. The

addition of galleries provided new access routes which changed the ways that different spaces were accessed and created structured processional routes which deliberately emphasised the chapels at both these sites. At Durham Castle, prior to the construction of the first-floor gallery, access to the rooms on the western extreme of the north range would have entailed walking through the south range or entering this range via the original exterior entrance (ie. the Norman Arch). The insertion of the gallery served to link both the north and west ranges, bypassing the internal accommodation areas and thereby providing direct access to Tunstall's chapel which was constructed at the same time. In effect, Tunstall's gallery opened up those areas of the castle which had been socially exclusive because of their depth and difficulty of access, whilst preserving the social exclusivity of the accommodation areas. Once the gallery was inserted, Tunstall's chapel, which had been situated distantly from the Great Hall, was now only three rooms away, and two spaces from the dining room. It became the intuitive destination for people using the gallery, and through the careful placement of rooms, the importance of the chapel was accentuated.

Bishop Tunstall had previously combined high-level diplomatic and political positions in court with his ecclesiastical career. It has been speculated that his translation to Durham and appointment as the first president of the reformed Council of the North in 1530-33 was a strategic decision by Henry VIII to distance and occupy Tunstall who had supported Katherine of Aragon during their divorce and was an outspoken opponent to the Act of Supremacy (Newcombe 2013). Tunstall's gallery was constructed between 1538 and 1543, and his chapel between 1543 and 1547, so his building work coincided with the second period of his presidency of the Council of the North in 1537-38, and it was perhaps this which influenced his decision to build. The Council, which normally met four times a year, was tasked with presiding over legal and administrative affairs relating specifically to the north of England and comprised 30 notable individuals in the north, including clergy, lawyers, sheriffs, sergeants and constables (Brooks 1966: 20). During the earlier incarnation of the Council of the North (1472-1485) the unofficial headquarters were at Sheriff Hutton Castle and Sandal Castle in North Yorkshire (Brooks 1966: 14; Reid 1921: 33). During the full lifespan of the reformed Council of the North between 1530-1641, it became the responsibility of the President to accommodate members, a point reflected in a letter from the Council requesting lodgings near York because the then-President Robert Holgate, Bishop of Llandaff (latterly Archbishop of York), had no suitable residence available (Brooks 1966: 20). Other Presidents also conducted building work, either ahead of their terms of office in order to provide accommodation, or afterwards as a response to their status increase. For example, Kenninghall Manor, the residence of Thomas Howard, 3rd Duke of Norfolk, had a long gallery before 1546 (Foister 1981:278).

It can be argued therefore that the galleries at Durham and Auckland Castles provided communal areas with good access which showcased the religious role of the diocese. In both cases, it is

specifically the chapels at both sites which were their focal points. At Durham, Tunstall's chapel was placed at the west end of the gallery, providing an unambiguous destination. At Auckland, the arrangement of 16th century windows preserved in the south wall of the second storey of the Scotland Wing, together with the central position of the 16th century fireplace on the same wall internally, all suggest that the view from the gallery was intended to be Bek's two-storey chapel. Bearing in mind that by the time Tunstall was building his gallery, Bek's chapel was over 200 years old, the gallery was, effectively, a viewing platform which extended around at least two of its sides (north and west, possibly south). The northern wall of Bek's chapel would have lain about 8 metres from the southern wall of the Scotland Wing. Unfortunately, there are no surviving depictions of the chapel. Based on written descriptions (Appendix 2), it might have featured a second storey of reduced dimensions, with stylistic details which included flying vaulting and ornately glazed windows. Excavations now suggest that the chapel was about 40 metres long and, based on current thinking, this size of makes it unique for any British bishop's palace. Even among royal palaces Bek's chapel is larger than St Stephen's Chapel at Westminster Palace, though considerably smaller than St George's Chapel at Windsor Castle. It is only now, with the results of the 2018 excavations to hand, that these spatial and visual inter-relationships have become clear for the first time since the 1650s when the chapel was demolished by Sir Arthur Haselrigge (Chapter 6).

At Durham, there is one further dimension to be considered. Views from the original gallery at the castle were focused on Durham Cathedral in a manner that visually echoes the situation at the Scotland Wing at Auckland. Through the creation of his new gallery at Durham, Tunstall fundamentally altered the earlier access routes through the site by encasing the 11th century first-floor Norman entrance (the Norman Arch). Leyland (1994) has demonstrated how this entrance was aligned with an earlier gateway and the entrance to Durham Cathedral. Tunstall was also responsible for the creation and re-positioning of the castle gateway, in a move which interrupted and re-aligned access routes across the site. Human traffic through the complex was now more directly encouraged through the principal entrance to the Great Hall. In practice, as this doorway was created by Bishop Thomas Hatfield (1345-1381), and the north range had been out of use as a hall since *c.*1500. Tunstall's realignment of the access routes refocused attention on Hatfield's entrance and simplified the access routes through the site for visitors. In so doing, Tunstall's chapel was afforded greater depth of access within the building, whilst the internal accommodation areas were more effectively zoned.

At the same time, the role of the Norman Arch as an active doorway was removed and its role now changed to become an ornamental fixture. Multiple studies (i.e. Erikson 2013; Jacobs 2017) have examined how doors and thresholds have served as metaphors for the concepts of liminality, transition and transformation in historic contexts. Studies of concealed objects (Eastop 2015) and iconography

on church doors (eg. Lunnon 2017) reveal an ongoing commitment to the belief that doors held significance as boundaries between the safety and chaos of the interior and exterior worlds throughout the later medieval and early modern periods. Borrowing from these themes, it is possible to understand Tunstall's removal of this doorway as a major access route as a powerful decision to assert his dominance over this building through the extrication of this symbol of historic episcopacy. Was Tunstall showcasing and promoting the institution of episcopacy and the history of his diocese? This idea is supported with a range of tangential evidence. For example, Tunstall transferred 22 stalls, nine of which have misericords and had previously been in the '*stalls of the highe chapell'* at Auckland Castle (CCB B/77/36 (190075)) and these were removed in 1547-8 over a period of 17 days (Raine 1852, 69). These stalls date from the episcopate of Thomas Ruthall, as evidenced by his coat-of-arms, and date between 1508 and 1522 (Remnant and Anderson 1998: 43). Paul Hardwick (2011: 79) has noted the differences between them, suggesting that they might have had a more complicated provenance than the documentary evidence would suggest. By re-deploying these misericords within his new chapel, Tunstall drew both on the legacy of previous bishops and forged a link between these two chapels. Arguably, it was this promotion of episcopacy which may have been central to Tunstall's building decisions. As we have seen, Tunstall was known for his support of Katherine of Aragon as well as rejecting Elizabeth I's Oath of Supremacy; unlike many other English bishops, Tunstall maintained a peaceful episcopate during the reign of Mary I. Although he often latently accepted changes the religious changes imposed upon him (Newcombe 2012), his overriding religious sentiments aligned closely with Catholicism. It is perhaps unsurprising therefore that his 'performative' spaces were overwhelmingly focused around traditional symbols of historic episcopacy. Tunstall's episcopate fell at a time of stress and flux for bishops, and by anchoring the symbolism of his architecture designs around episcopal power, he was arguably making a statement about his own religious identity.

At Rose Castle, the gallery engendered a very different use and purpose. Positioned at ground-floor level (though perhaps also with a first-floor gallery above) in front of the entrance to the low-end of the Great Hall, and with access to service spaces behind, this gallery lacks any of the privacy, spatial exclusivity and views of Durham and Auckland. It could have been accessed by any visitor to Rose Castle and seems to have been a busy part of the site. Throughout this period, the Bishops of Carlisle maintained hospitality despite financial hardship; Bishop John Kite's (1521-37) epitaph records that he was known for *'kepyng nobyl houshold with grete hospitality'* (Cooper and Cooper 1858: 62). Fewer Bishops of Carlisle engaged in high-level politics as the Bishops of Durham, Winchester or London did. It was precisely because of his low-ranking status that some remarked with surprise and disdain that Owen Oglethorpe, Bishop of Carlisle (1557-59), was to officiate at the coronation of Elizabeth I (see Starkey 2007 for a discussion on this). The counties of Cumberland and Westmorland contained the fewest clergy at and after the Reformation and this put a great strain on the Bishops of

Carlisle to provide according to expectation (Clark 1996). Economic insecurities and the depletion of resources because of harvest failures and famine (Appleby 1973) further exacerbated the differences between these dioceses and would have influenced the abundance of provisions. On that basis, it is reasonable to suggest that the bulk of visitors to Rose Castle would have been drawn from the local communities and that may explain the very different role played by the long gallery here.

In the next chapter we turn away from the detail of the buildings to the wider landscape setting of bishop's houses. Many of the same themes explored in this and previous chapters are echoed, including the importance of hospitality and the structured use of designed spaces, but this time on a wider scale.

5

Episcopal landscapes: gardens, parks and forests

5.1 Introduction

Bishops had a large stake in private landholdings. They were among the four main landowning groups across later medieval Britain alongside the monarchy, secular nobility and the Church (including monastic orders and cathedral communities). Like these other groups, the bishops' lands produced food and other resources as well as providing the setting for sport and hunting which served as displays of courtly and masculine power (see for example Beaumont James and Gerrard 2007). In addition, the landscapes connected to episcopal residences sometimes served ornamental purposes and were key to the deliberate creation of vistas and carefully designed views of episcopal houses and their associated landscapes (Creighton 2009; Liddiard 2007). Moreover, the ownership of parks and forests was a clear symbol of wealth, power and social position throughout later medieval and post-medieval Britain and Europe.

This chapter investigates the development and different uses of these outdoor spaces, beginning with gardens and the landscape located *within* house precincts, including courtyards, inner baileys, carriageways and approaches, moats, and the walled gardens which grew kitchen and medicinal

plants. The aim is to understand how all these spaces were developed and used to create deliberate views, and how they were used practically by residents. Secondly, the parks themselves are explored and especially their role as arenas for production. This section draws on both documentary sources, including reiver, forester and bailiff accounts, and archaeological information derived from on-ground observations, maps and images, and aerial photography. Lastly, episcopal forests and chases are examined to understand how these landscapes, which were typically associated with later medieval courtly hunting practices, were used and exploited. Finally, the uses and character of Scottish and English parks are compared and contrasted in order to identify any differences between sites and countries.

Auckland Castle plays a pivotal role in the discussion of parks in this chapter because of its uniquely well-preserved documentary record and its exceptional survival. Unlike other parks, Auckland Park remained in use as a park throughout the 17th-21st century. As a result, the perimeter and a range of features (i.e. fishponds, pillow mounds, ridge and furrow ploughing) can be discernibly identified unlike elsewhere. As a result, this park has been used as a primary case-study.

5.2 Background and context

Gardens, parks and forests are areas of enclosed or legally identified land set aside to produce food and other resources, and to enjoy pleasure pursuits (Stamper 1988). All three landscapes can be considered to have been 'live larders' in which food was produced for the bishop's table. Later medieval accounts reveal that foodstuffs were also routinely moved *between* parks and residences in order to accommodate differences in productive capabilities, and to mitigate unproductive yields of specific foods in different regions.

Typically, parks are the best understood in terms of this sort of deliberate production or managed 'farming' but gardens and forests were similarly productive, though this is sometimes overlooked in favour of their social importance. Studies of Tudor gardens at St Donat's Castle in Glamorgan (Whittle 1999) and contemporary literature on gardening and garden design (see Francis 2008; Tobyn 2017) show how these spaces served mixed purposes as places where foods and medicinal crops could be grown both practically and experimentally, and which could also serve as ornamental spaces which reflected trends and fashions and express the wealth and identity of their owners. The boundaries between these different functions are therefore necessarily blurred and reflect dynamic attitudes towards the role and uses of these outdoor spaces. In turn, the spaces *between* buildings, in the form of courtyards, terraces, outdoor walkways, carriageways, approaches and moats are often 'invisible' in the documentary sources. However, they are important for understanding how these episcopal complexes were experienced by their household members and guests. It was these 'negative spaces' which provided the backdrops to facades and crafted views of the buildings.

Forests too had different uses which shifted through time (eg. Langton 2015; Langton 2017). During the 11th-14th centuries, these were the setting for great chases, extended hunts that lasted days, weeks or months, involved large retinues of people and they became important symbols of wealth and power (Jones G 2017). While hunting may have been their primary function, emerging evidence also highlights the roles that these spaces played in the wider community through the exploitation of communal rights (Langton 2011). In most instances, forests and parks owned by bishoprics had been established at their foundation in the 10th-12th centuries (Jones G 2017; Rollason 2012). Most bishoprics did not acquire extensive new lands after this date. Similarly, most episcopal residences were established in the 11th-13th centuries, including those with connected parks. Among the study sites discussed here, there are no known cases of bishops acquiring parks or forests after that date. By the beginning of the study period, the parks and forests owned by the bishoprics had been under episcopal stewardship for hundreds of years. These were 'inherited' landscapes which had been cultivated for specific agricultural, productive or leisure purposes and had an established infrastructure in the form of park pales, deer leaps, fishponds and deer houses, for example.

The sustained use of these landscapes both before, during and after the study period complicates our ability to understand them. At Darlington Manor and Stockton Manor, the parks there have been entirely redeveloped within urban contexts and this has led to the destruction of pales and other boundaries, for example. In these instances, maps and illustrations have been used to reconstruct park features. Later 18th and 19th century landscaping of parks, such as at Tyninghame and Monimail Tower, have similarly contributed to the loss of diagnostic earthworks. At sites where parks have survived either totally or partially, understanding the precise date and range of use of landscape features is challenging due to their form, ephemerality and the many challenges in dating them morphologically. These challenges extend to understanding garden and outdoor spaces too. While finding garden walls and understanding the placement of courtyards is sometimes possible, it has proved impossible to understand planting schemes, paths and statuary using archaeological techniques (and at Auckland this has not been attempted and has not formed part of the research framework). These have to be reconstructed using textual and illustrative sources.

These issues are symptomatic of wider problems affecting the archaeological study of historic landscapes. Challenges in the dating of some features, such as park pales and boundary walls, are exacerbated by the relative lack of dedicated archaeology focused on the development of parks and gardens in England in comparison to that devoted to understanding the development of buildings, settlement patterns and urban development. While there have been influential studies on the development of later medieval and post-medieval parks, forests and gardens in Britain (see for example Liddiard 2007; Rackham 1986), few have employed modern rigorous scientific dating and analytical techniques to specific landscape features in order to better understand their continued use

beyond the later medieval period. Of those landscapes which have received the most archaeological attention, monastic (Bond 2004; Aston 1993) and royal (Bond 1981; Beaumont James and Gerrard 2007; Richardson 2005) are the best studied. 18th and 19th century pleasure landscapes have similarly been addressed, because of the survival and continued presence of elements of design there (as for example in Williamson 1995). In particular, landscape transitions between the later medieval and post-medieval are neglected in longer narratives on this subject, though some works (see for example Richardson 2005) do usefully extend their scope into the later 16th and 17th centuries. In Scotland, in particular, the study of parks and privately-owned landscapes is significantly underexplored. This can be attributed to the lack of available surviving documentary evidence (see Chapter 2), important differences in the 'natural landscape' of highland and lowland Scotland in terms of vegetation, climate and habitats which affect animal habitats, and the scale of fieldwork necessary to provide a more complete overview (Hall et al 2014).

Synthetic works on episcopal residences, such as those by Naomi Payne (2003) or Michael Thompson (1998), fail to examine parks and associated landscapes in much depth. The edited 2017 volume *Princes of the Church* (Rollason 2017) incorporated four papers on episcopal parks and forests. Three themes stand out. Firstly, episcopal parks and their resources are examined predominantly using historical sources (Drury 2017). Secondly, emphasis is placed on the symbolic role of parks as arenas for displays of hunting, courtly behaviour, masculinity, military prowess and economic dominance (Jones 2017; Langton 2017; Miller 2017). Thirdly, the focus is on the medieval development of these landscapes, with no attempt to extend analysis of them through later periods. Overall, the precise nature of episcopal parks, forests and gardens, and whether they differed from those owned by the royalty, secular nobility or religious orders, is an underexplored question. The same is true of the settings of bishop's houses, both the way in which landscapes created natural or man-made settings for buildings and views engineered from *within* episcopal sites out to the landscape beyond which affected how episcopal houses were experienced by their occupants and visitors in turn. Attempts at reconstructing viewsheds of landscapes surrounding elite royal and secular noble palaces have already been successful at Clarendon royal palace (Beaumont James and Gerrard 2007; Richardson 2005) while Oliver Creighton (2009) has examined how productive landscapes and associated features (i.e. fishponds, field systems, deer parks) were placed in visually prominent places in order to emphasise the economic capabilities of the landowner. The role of parks, forests and landscapes at elite sites was clearly complex, varied and nuanced.

5.3 Outdoor spaces within episcopal residential complexes: courtyards, baileys, terraces, gardens, moats and water features

All the sites in this thesis incorporated outdoor spaces immediately around the main buildings, some of which were quite substantial – those at Auckland Castle were estimated to extend to 5 acres in 1647 (Raine 1852, 82). These areas are best understood at buildings which have high levels of preservation such as Durham Castle, St Andrews Castle and Auckland Castle. Elsewhere, paintings and map evidence have been invaluable at shedding light on these spaces at sites where buildings have been either entirely or partially demolished, such as at Durham House and Rose Castle.

5.3.1 Courtyards

Courtyards are common at medieval castle sites as well as palatial and manorial sites and, by the time of the study period under discussion here, all sites (at least those which can be confidently reconstructed) had footprints that included some kind of central courtyard area around which buildings were clustered and through which the building complex was accessed by guests. These areas were subject to the highest volume and greatest diversity of traffic and people and, due to their central position, they were generally overlooked from surrounding buildings. At many sites, direct access to service areas, halls and accommodation could be had from these central courtyards. For example, at Rose Castle, Howden Manor, Durham House, St Andrews Castle and Auckland Castle, the service areas (including kitchens, brewhouses, bakeries and stables) were located opposite the bishop's chambers and both opened onto the courtyard. At St Andrews Castle, Durham Castle and Rose Castle, these central courtyards/baileys also enclosed the only known water wells at those sites.

At Durham Castle, the inner bailey arguably received the most attention of all the study sites. Developments by Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall during the 16th century have been discussed at length in Chapter 4 for the ways that they impacted the experience of guests, but he was also realigned the gateway and installed a new wooden water system in 1538 (CCB B/76/32 (190069A). Particulars of this water system are not well understood, and the accounts do not clarify its form. Certainly Durham Castle featured a well (now blocked-up) within the inner bailey. At Rose Castle, on the other hand, the Stearne 1671 depiction of the site as it was before the Civil War clearly shows an elaborate central fountain labelled 'Fountain with 4 Cocks' (i.e. stopcocks) (Figure 5.1). Presumably this was part of an early 17th-century garden of Renaissance influence such as those recorded by visitors to Hatfield House in Hertfordshire where there were two fountains, espaliers and a 'greenplot' (Taylor 2006: 211) or at Wilton in Wiltshire where there were a series of parterres *de broderie* (an 'embroidered parterre' with low clipped plants) in 1645 together with statues and groves (Taylor 2006: 515). Unfortunately, no contemporary depictions survive, and this image only provides a schematic depiction showing four tiered fountains surrounding a larger central tiered fountain. With the well located in the south-west

corner of the courtyard, the fountain is close to the service spaces (brewhouse, bakery, new kitchens etc) and this suggests a clear attempt at zoning. The fountain is positioned opposite the entrance through the Kite Tower and the bishop's chamber so it had great visual prominence. No iconography is mentioned.

5.3.2 Moats

Moats are the only other water features known at the study sites. Six sites - St Andrews Castle, Norham Castle, Durham Castle, Wheel Hall, Northallerton Manor and Stockton Castle - definitely or very probably featured moats. Recent excavation at Auckland Castle (see Appendix 2) uncovered the remains of a deep ditch, but geomorphological analysis and the discovery of a portion of a building which overlies part of the ditch shows that this feature must pre-date the study period. Martin Leyland (1994:88-90) has suggested that the moat at Durham Castle (filled in during the 17th century) was always dry due to the low water table on the Durham peninsula, and the same may have been the case at Norham Castle and St Andrews Castle where the moats are dry today.

At Wheel Hall (a residence of the Bishops of Durham), which now has no upstanding structural remains and has been substantially eroded by the River Ouse, documentary evidence indicates that the site was subject to frequent flooding which required repairs (CCB B/93/7 (189057); CCB B/93/5 (189055); CCB B/94/16 (189014). There are mentions of multiple fisheries (see below), mills (see below) and sluice gates which presumably controlled the level of the water in an encircling moat (CCB B/93/7 (189057)). Le Patourel (1973), in her survey of medieval moated sites in Yorkshire, concluded that the earthworks there constituted a moated enclosure consistent with other medieval examples. Unfortunately, the earthworks at Wheel Hall are no longer extant, and no archaeological work has taken place there to establish the date of the moat infill, but the ongoing use of the site throughout the 16th century as a centre of fishing and milling suggests that the relationship between the site and the river persisted, and this might have included the water-filled moat even at this later date.

Similarly, at Stockton Castle, which has since been demolished and redeveloped (Appendix 4), and at Northallerton Castle, also since demolished but with substantial earthworks surviving. The presence of moats is confirmed by documentary evidence. There are accounts detailing the movement of oats to be provided as fodder for the swans kept on the moats at both sites in 1494-5 and 1495-6 (CCB B/84/3a (189282); CCB B/84/3b (190127)). At Northallerton Castle, recent LiDAR images (Figure. 5.2) provide a clear view of the form of the moat, castle enclosure and motte. The moat encircles the building complex on four sides and is broken only by a causeway at the point of entrance. The deliberate foddering of these swans suggests a purposeful attempt to keep swans nesting and breeding

there. Unlike at Bishop Middleham Park where swans were kept in much larger numbers in a swannery (see below), the relatively small area of water at Northallerton Castle suggests that the birds there were ornamental. Their presence also demonstrates that this moat was not dry during the study period, but that it was adapted from its medieval function and held a crucial role in establishing the aesthetic character of the site.

5.3.3 Terraces and gardens

During the 18th and 19th centuries, many of the most actively used study sites (i.e. Auckland Castle, Durham Castle and Rose Castle) had gardens and terraces set out for pleasure purposes or to produce foods for elite consumption. The 18th century pinery-vineries at Auckland Castle, which are illustrated and have been recently excavated, are a notable example (see Appendices 2, 1 and 9) but it sometimes hard to know the origin of these landscaping features where illustrations are lacking.

At Rose Castle, Bishop William Strickland's account (CAC DRC/2/7) from 1400-1401 references repairs made to *'la herber'* in conjunction with building work to a tower at the site (presumably Strickland's Tower, see Appendix 9). Although little else is recorded about this space, this reference is the first to any purpose-made garden within the episcopal complex. The name suggests that it had productive capability, most probably for the growing of vegetables, herbs or medicinal crops. Its location is not known, though it might be reasonably inferred from post-medieval depictions of the site which show a gardened area north of the main building complex (see Appendix 9). Both depictions show four compartments with dividing pathways. The Jefferson image adds textual information, labelling the area as the '*wood yard now a garden'*, a text which cannot now be discerned on the original. This would suggest that, during the study period, this area functioned as the wood yard and that the garden arrangement depicted relates to its use in the last quarter of the 17th century. Surrounded by the 14th century mantle wall, this area of the site lends itself to an enclosed garden, and it is possible that this is *'la herber'* referred to in 1400.

At Durham and Auckland castles there are areas which today function as terraces but which held very different roles in the past. For example, the North Terrace north of the Great Hall/St Peter's Chapel at Auckland Castle has long been assumed to have commanded views over Auckland Park beyond. Excavation in 2019 (Gerrard pers. comm.) uncovered the remains of an extensive curtain wall which, based on its width, buttressing and embanking, is believed to have stood at about 7m tall, possibly more if its foundations are included. Not only would this have blocked all views from the terrace unless standing atop the curtain wall, it would also have created an enclosed space *between* the curtain wall and Great Hall, in close proximity to both the old and new kitchens (see Chapter 4; Appendix 2). It is likely therefore, that this zone would have a served functional and industrial purpose, rather than being set aside for pleasure or being purely ornamental.

Due to the spatial pressures on urban episcopal residences, gardens and outdoor areas tend to be well-recorded features. At Durham House in London, both the Agas Map (c. 1561) and the sketch plan of the site (1640) depict an area of walled garden immediately east of the main building complex. In the 1640 sketch plan, this is described as 'Durham House Gardens'. The singular tree depicted on the Agas Map corresponds with this. Carlisle Place, the second residence of the Bishops of Carlisle (Chapter 6) came equipped with a small park which provided them with outdoor space that had hitherto not been a feature of their urban residences. References to an over-prolific mulberry tree (see below) demonstrate that this space likely served as both an ornamental and productive space. Less is known about the outdoor space associated with the bishop's residence on Edinburgh Cowgate, though excavations of this area immediately east of the buildings have revealed that it was used for industrial processes and stabling animals, rather than for pleasure pursuits.

5.4 Episcopal parks: the bishops' live-in larder

5.4.1 Deer

Throughout later medieval Britain, venison was an elite food and the right to own a deer park was granted through royal decree (Birrell 1992; Birrell 2006) with licences to install deer leaps (salters). These were specially designed pieces of park pale which allowed deer to enter from outside the park without being able to exit, and were tightly controlled (Cooper and Shannon 2017). Part of the elite appeal of deer came from their role during hunts. During later medieval hunts and chases, deer and stags were considered the main hunting prize. Although a range of game was hunted, those protected by forest law (red deer, fallow deer, wild boar) maintained the greatest social cache (Young 1979: 4). Most deer parks were established in the 12th-14th centuries but even when hunting as a courtly activity subsided in popularity by the mid-15th century (Cantor and Hatherly 1979), deer and venison maintained their status as elite foods (Heal 2008). Most parks generally remained in the possession of elites during the post-medieval period and this ensured the exclusivity of venison as a food for the table.

Deer could not be kept by everyone. Firstly, depending on herd size, parks needed to offer enough space to provide adequate grazing opportunities and natural shelter. Very small parks were unable to accommodate herds for these reasons. Secondly, hunting for sport required large areas of unbroken ground which could be easily navigable by horse and provided clear sightlines across the landscape. Dense woodland made sport hunting challenging (Jørgenson and Quelch 2014). In reality, a combination of terrains and vegetation cover was preferred. This meant that most parks were not suitable for hunting on a large scale. In fact, in the case of the sites under study here, hunting probably occurred mainly in episcopal forests. It is possible that some small-scale hunting may have taken place in episcopal parks, but it seems most likely that their purpose was to rear deer for their meat. In

this instance, the deer were managed rigidly controlled landscapes, managed closely and caught using nets (Richardson 2005).

References to deer, venison production, poachers and the maintenance of deer parks occur frequently in administrative documentation for the Bishops of Durham. In 1626, for example, the bishop became involved in an incident relating to the illegal poaching of deer which was alleged to have occurred within Auckland Park (CCB B/23/25/35). Across the Durham bishopric, Auckland Castle, Bishop Middleham Park, Stanhope Park, Wolsingham Park, Evenwood Park and Crayke Park all had resident herds during this period. In 1503, for example, after a year of no venison out of his parks, the bishop demanded some of the best bucks from Auckland, Hulsyngham (Wolsingham) and Stanhope and for them to be delivered to York for him (Raine 1852: 59). A series of correspondence between the keeper of Stanhope Park and the bishops between 1599 and 1615 records eight instances (CCB B/23/23/1; CCB B/23/23/2; CCB B/23/23/3; CCB B/23/23/4; CCB B/23/23/5; CCB B/23/23/6; CCB B/23/23/7; CCB B/23/23/8) when the bishops made special requests for 'fat bucks' to be delivered to specified episcopal residences. Because of the seemingly incidental nature of these requests, it can be assumed that these deliveries are extraordinary, possibly for use during elite hospitality occasions. In each instance, the requests are made in the summer months (July-September) which not only coincides with the deer breeding season, but also with periods of time that bishops were known to have frequented their dioceses. The request for deer to be bought from Stanhope Park further implies that this site held particular significance as a producer of venison and was preferred above the other parks. Situated in the Forest of Weardale (see below), Stanhope Park had a long history as a hunting ground. This legacy, and the upland forest landscape there, might have influenced the nature and quality of the venison produced.

Elsewhere, Master Forester accounts are invaluable for understanding the size of herds and the provisions made for them. For example, one forester account dated from 1484-5 (CCB B/73/15 (188769)) provides unusual insight into the value of the bishop's deer herd at Wolsingham Park. Valued at 106d 8d, this account details the costs associated with maintenance of the park pale, the erection of internal enclosures within the park and the designation of areas set aside to produce hay for the deer. Deer keeping was clearly tightly managed, and within Wolsingham Park the landscape was zoned to maximise the venison yield. This evidence suggests therefore that Wolsingham Park functioned more as a venison farm than as a hunting park by this date. In contrast the irregularity of deer production from Stanhope Forest suggests that it may have been a hunting ground used to produce a different kind of venison product. Late 15th century reevers' accounts for Evenwood Forest reveal that they maintained a herd of fallow deer, unlike at other parks where the dominant species is likely to have been red deer (CCB B/73/10 (188871); CCB B/73/11 (188939);

CCB B/73/12 (188872); CCB B/73/13 (188873); CCB B/73/14 (190244); CCB B/73/15 (188769)). This further indicates that there were distinctions in management practice between sites.

Many of the sites have archaeological evidence for deer rearing. In particular, the park pales survive well at Auckland Castle and Bishop Middleham Park (Figures 5.3 and 5.4), but there are no observable on ground traces of park pales at either Crayke Park or Rose Park. Consisting of a deep interior ditch and bank which prevented deer from escaping the parks, these park features have survived in differing ways within the landscape. At Auckland Castle the preservation is especially good and recent LiDAR images captured in 2018 have revealed an additional curvilinear ditch feature (see Figure 5.5) which had not been previously been recognised (Drury 2017; Smith 2016). Ground examination of this feature suggests that it morphologically corresponds with a park pale (see Figure 5.3).

That said, in the absence of dating evidence (archaeological work is scheduled for 2021) it is hard to be definitive about the evolution of the park at Auckland which clearly went through several phases of development. In 1662 Bishop John Cosin wrote in his 'View on the Estate of the Bishoprick of Durham' of the rents and profits of the 'litle Parke at Bishop Auckland reserved for deere' (Tanner MSS xcii 10) This text thereby confirms that there was a distinction within the park based on function at this time. Cosin's reference to *two* parks probably relates to a practice that was already in place, possibly to an earlier delineation of the park boundaries of the later medieval period. This is supported by a reference in the 1646 Parliamentary Survey of Auckland Castle (Kirby 1968) in which both a summer and winter park are mentioned. This would imply that an earlier system of landscape had been in practice since before the Civil War period. The natural topography of Auckland Castle lends itself to simple internal subdivision. The River Gaunless conveniently bisects the park, as depicted in Figure 5.13. The relatively small footprint of Auckland Park suggests, particularly after division, suggests that it was not routinely used for hunting but instead for deer farming.

On a 1740 plan of Auckland Castle and park (Figure 5.6) two buildings are depicted roughly in the same location as, but predating, the present deer house which was built *c.* 1760. Although it is only a rough sketch, this image clearly shows one single storey rectangular building with a row of three doors situated east of a more conventional two storey domestic house with its chimney. The eastern rectangular building is probably a deer house. These structures were usually square or rectangular in plan, with multiple wide entrances on different sides which allowed the deer to move freely inside and get shelter (Bond 2004). No second storey was required for deer houses but they did often occupy relatively large footprints in order to accommodate entire herds within. The house depicted immediately west of the deer house might well have been accommodation for the forester, or possibly a slaughterhouse. The building of a 'logh' or lodge with clay and stone walls is accounted for in 1470, to which a 'great door' was added in 1476-7 and a chimney (of stone) in 1543-4 (Raine 1852:52, 54,

67). Other lodges are known on the Bishop of Durham's estates; there was one at Wolsingham called the 'Baylehihous' (Raine 1852: 71). The 1628 inventory of Auckland Castle also describes a slaughterhouse at the site as containing 'roapes'. Currently its location is not known and there are no identified upstanding remains. One theory is that the slaughterhouse described was demolished during the Commonwealth period or during Cosin's Restoration building work at the site. It is possible however that this building survived longer, and it might be depicted in this image. Evidence from urban contexts reveals that slaughterhouses were usually kept remote from settlements to prevent disease, smells and poor hygiene from affecting settlements (Rawcliffe 2018). Field survey over this area reveals no obvious earthworks, ruined building remains or masonry/artefact scatters but large-scale landscaping of those parts of the park closest to the palace building complex did occur in the 18th and 19th centuries alongside the construction of the current deer house in 1760 (Appendix 2) which is likely to have removed or obscured all traces of these buildings. Geophysical prospection of the site might reveal more. Traces of structural remains related to deer hunting have not been discovered at any other episcopal sites, though we must reasonably presume that they existed. Elsewhere, the redevelopment of parks as at Stockton or Darlington, or their 18th and 19th century conversions into farmland as at Crayke or Rose castles', have limited their survival (Figure 5.7).

The faunal evidence recovered across excavated episcopal sites similarly sheds light on the types of deer cultivated by the bishops. In assemblages recovered at Auckland Castle there are traces of both red and fallow deer from 17th century depositional contexts (Rowley-Conwy pers. comm.). This evidence indicates that bishops were accessing both types of venison, though it is impossible to know from this whether the deer themselves were acquired solely from Auckland Park or from a range of parks. The latter is more likely given the extent to which other foodstuffs were moving freely between the estates and properties of the bishopric. Similarly, the remains of red deer bones from excavations at Westgate Castle demonstrate the consumption of this breed there (ASUD 2012: 15).

5.4.2 Cattle and sheep

Cattle were farmed at most episcopal parks included for study in this thesis. James Bond (2004: 55-57) comments that upland pasture in the north of England was particularly exploited for cattle production by monastic communities because of the good quality hay meadows and upland pasture there. This suitability might well explain why the English bishops in the north also invested heavily in cattle, though they also rented out herbage in their parks (e.g. the Bishops of Durham at Auckland in 1479-80) and at Carlisle throughout the 17th century and likely before (CAC DRC 2/14). Cows could be kept for both milk and meat production and cheese was the most common product produced from cow's milk. They were also gifted, for example to friars by the Bishop of Durham (Raine 1852: 53). As at monasteries, cows kept in parks and other locations close to places of residence are more generally associated with meat production; cheese could easily be transported from dedicated

vaccaries or acquired as a form of rent. The available faunal evidence from excavated sites supports this in as far as butchered cow bones are present. Faunal assemblages from Auckland Castle, Darlington Manor, Bishop Middleham Castle and Westgate Castle all contain high quantities of cow bones in relation to other faunal remains recovered from these sites. The cow bones recovered from the 2018 excavations at Auckland Castle included butchered cow bones generated from probable 17th century contexts dated through their artefacts. It should be remembered however, that cows were also a common form of rental payment and might be used to repopulate cattle stocks in parks or be converted into food themselves (Bond 2004: 55). Not all cows represented by faunal remains were necessarily raised within an episcopal park.

Aside from their role as a foodstuff, Instaurer accounts for the Bishops of Durham reveal that the cows, or cow products (milk, dairy, meat and hides) from episcopal parks were sold or rented to generate income. For example, an Instaurer account from 1469-70 (CCB B/81/5 (190108)) records the total number of cattle across all parks for that year as standing at: 4 bulls, 90 cattle and oxen, 60 cows; 102 bullocks; no heifers of three years old; 52 stirks (yearling bullock or heifer); 12 heifers of two years old; no one year old calves; 6 this year's calves. It also records the overall sale of cattle and lamb at £23 10s with 10s. 4d being paid for the cattle skins. Together, there are 19 surviving Instaurer Accounts dated from between 1430-1 and 1517-18. These accounts show a minimal shift in the levels of production of cattle from this period, with only slight variations of less than 20 cattle occurring by 1515. This would suggest that the bishops' cattle farming enterprise was well-developed and effectively managed, with parks able to support this number of cattle. In some accounts (i.e. CCB B/81/17 (190191) and CCB B/81/9 (190259)) there are references to the purchase of cattle from markets. This implies a deliberate attempt to acquire new stock to refresh and invigorate cattle bloodlines.

Unlike the bishops of Durham, the bishops of Carlisle had a less productive cattle industry. Their sale of cattle in 1702 (DRC 2/146) reveals that Rose Park supported cattle. The sale of cows in calf, oxen and heifers demonstrates evidence of a productive industry. In 1598 however, all the cattle and horses owned by the Bishops of Carlisle at Rose Castle were stolen or killed during Scottish raids (Summerson 2018). This had a devastating impact on the financial prosperity of the bishops who had already been decimated through ongoing payments of charity during the plagues which had affected Cumbria throughout 1597. From surviving account information, it is unclear how well the Bishops of Carlisle recovered from this event, but it is at least clear that both bishoprics recognised cattle as a fiscal asset.

So far, this section has only explored domestic herds of cows, but Auckland Castle also maintained a wild herd of white cattle. Linda Drury (2017: 151) has speculated that these cows appeared within the park in the early-14th century. The Parliamentary Survey of 1647 reveals that only two of three 'wilde

bulles or bisons' remained (CCB/B162/2), suggesting that they had been killed during the Civil War. Drury (2017: 151) has further speculated that these cattle had been removed earlier, due to incidental reports of white cattle being spotted in nearby parks. The practice of maintaining a wild herd is not unusual, with Chillingham Park being the most famous example today. However, Auckland Park appears to have been the only park which maintained a wild herd in this study, and the cows are referred to specifically in some accounts for example in 1479-80 when 'the other half [of the Park] is occupied and depastured by wild cattle and other untamed animals, along with the horses of my Lord's servants' (Raine 1852, 55; CCB, B/83/7 6 190033). Their uniqueness hints at their purpose in the landscape; these were for most part ornamental beasts to be admired and commented upon.

Sheep farming was also popular across most episcopal estates. Instaurer Accounts for the Bishops of Durham record the sale of sheep as profitable commodities, both for meat, dairy and wool. For example, the Instaurer Account for 1469-70 records a combined stock of 4 rams, 169 wethers, 152 ewes, 25 hogs and no lambs (CCB B/81/5 (190108)). For that account, the bishops received no profit from the sale of wool or ewe's milk. Nevertheless, sheep required yearly shearing and it is recorded that in 1549, 148 sheep were sheared by a team of 8 women in Auckland Park and that the sheep were then branded by two men (CCB B/74/4 (188826)). That source highlights both the quantity of sheep kept within the park at Auckland, and the role of the wider community in their maintenance. Like cattle, sheep were able to live and thrive in a variety of terrains and climates and produced not only meat and wool, but also milk which could turned into cheese and other products such as dung. Flocks kept within parks adjoining episcopal residences were probably dedicated towards meat as milk and wool were both readily imported. Some of the milk from the Auckland flock was let out and payments for wool were also received, for example in 1473-4 (Raine 1852, 53). Dung, which could be burnt as fuel or used as a building material (Bond 2004: 57) is perhaps less likely to have occurred at episcopal residences where wood, stone and other resources were otherwise plentiful, unless to insulate internal partitions within buildings. Presumably it would not have been purchased either so is unlikely to be accounted for.

Studies of sheep herding practices throughout the later medieval and early post-modern period (Kissock and Johnston 2007) have shown that herd transhumance between upland and lowland areas was a common practice in those parts of Britain able to support the practice. Within episcopal parks, however, there is nothing to suggest that sheep were being moved long distances between pasture. Otherwise, it was common to rotate pastures to encourage and stimulate grass growth. Flocks were only modest in size: there were 397 sheep, 406 ewes, 92 two-year old ewes, 87 hogs and 16 lambs across the Bishop of Durham's parks at Auckland, Evenwood, Middleham and Stockton in 1479-80 (Raine 1852, 55). What is clear however, although it is not a key focus of this thesis, is that sheep numbers fluctuate dramatically between 1430-1518, with the bishops owning far fewer sheep by

1500. It has been speculated that this was because of changes to the demesne arrangement as leasing land became more popular. This then affected the overall total of animals that the bishops were directly responsible for, though it is quite possible that these landscapes accommodated the same quantity of stock.

5.4.3 Horses, dogs and rabbits

Horses and dogs were essential in the daily lives of the later medieval and early modern elite. Predominantly used for hunting, dogs were a vital commodity, while horses were used for hunting, transport and agriculture, among other activities. They are rarely mentioned specifically but a greyhound did allegedly take down ('choking') a cow in Auckland Park in 1475-6 (Raine 1852: 53). Like other livestock, these animals were bred and managed. Faunal evidence from the 2012 excavations at Darlington Manor (ASUD 2012) uncovered the remains of disarticulated and butchered horse carcasses and dog bones dating from late 15th century contexts (see Appendix 3). Often knackered to provide food for the dogs (Wilson and Edwards 1993), it is likely that the horse bones recovered there were for that purpose. Given the relatively high quantity of dog remains at Darlington, the rearing and cultivation of horses and dogs seems very likely (Smith and Graves 2017), with injured or elderly horses being fed to the dogs. Located centrally within the diocese, Darlington was best positioned to deliver animals to other parks where necessary (Figure 5.8).

Moreover, being located on the main thoroughfare south from Durham, Darlington was a sensible stopping point to acquire new horses for travel. It might be reasonably presumed that horses occurred across all sites due to their necessary ubiquity. In documents related to a sale of goods and animals from Rose Park in 1702 (DRC 2/146), horses account for a quarter of the objects sold. A '*lame mare'*, '*Barrick-horse'*, '*black colt'* and '*young Bay-mare'* are all among the named animals. Probably these horses grazed in the park there and this is perhaps unsurprising given the overall paucity of parkland owned by the Bishops of Carlisle.

Unlike other animals, horses and dogs required stabling and kennelling. Kennels would similarly have been positioned away from residences because of noise and would have been found at those sites used for hunting. Hunting dogs were used to assist in chases and to quarry prey but large quantities of dogs were needed for this, with packs often numbering around 20-30 dogs. There are no surviving traces of kennels at any of the study-sites, and few have been subject to archaeological investigation in England and Wales (Wilson and Edwards 1993). For the same reasons as stables, these buildings were often ephemeral and their situation deep within parkland rendered them liable to redeveloped after parks

were dissolved. It would be expected that dogs would have been kept at Rose Park, Stanhope Park, Auckland Park, Evenwood Park and Wolsingham Park.

At sites which saw many visiting guests, such as Auckland Castle, the stables would have accommodated periodic influxes of large numbers of riders. In the 1641 sketch plan of Durham Place in London, there are explicit references to stables. The sketch plan (see image in Appendix 8) shows these to have been located along the Strand street frontage. Reconstructions of Howden Manor (Appendix 6) show the stables similarly positioned within the central courtyard. At Rose Castle, the 1671 depictions of the site show them to have been positioned near the gateway, away from the central building complex (Figure 5.9). At all sites, none of these buildings have survived. Likely built from timber, these structures were more ephemeral and became redundant in modern times.

Rabbits were a readily accessible form of meat and pelts as they could be effectively bred *en masse* in pillow mounds. Pillow-mounds consist of deliberately mounded earth which is often sandy or deliberately friable and remained the key form of rabbit cultivation from the 12th-17th centuries. Beneath the pillow-mound, there is sometimes a layer of stony/hard soil through which a rabbit could not easily burrow through. Deliberate stone-lined channels are often created inside the pillow mounds, often with a larger central area. In this way an ideal rabbit habitat is created with a known internal structure which enables easy hunting of rabbits using dogs and nets. Pillow mounds vary in size and shape, with many exceeding over 10m in length, and they are notoriously difficult to date (Dyfed Archaeological Trust 2013).

The Bishops of Durham are known to have had multiple sites where rabbits were bred. These include: Bishop Middleham Castle, Howden Manor and Crayke Castle among others. The documentary evidence for rabbit warrens at Auckland Castle are illuminating and provide some insight into their creation and period of use. For example, in Instaurer Accounts for 1406-7, John Catlinson, William Seme and John Ronkton and their fellows were paid 4l.2s.6d. to create a new warren on the south side of the Wear between the west end of an earlier warren made by William Forster of Auckland and west mill on the Wear which controlled water flow from the dam to the corn mills on the Wear. The 1647 Parliamentary Survey (Kirby 1971) details that there were warrens were in an area named the 'Hagge' beneath the castle walls. Although we cannot be completely sure where this relates to, it seems likely that these warrens were located close to where the fishponds are today. It is probable that any trace of these warrens has been removed in later park landscaping.

A walkover survey conducted for this thesis by the author identified the presence of two earthworks morphologically consistent with pillow-mounds located immediately west of the golf course. In the immediate landscape there are additional uncharacterised earthworks which may be additional, degraded, pillow-mounds or associated features. This area would greatly benefit from a more

extensive earthwork survey and detailed archaeological examination. In addition, one larger oval feature, consistent with a pillow-mound, was located in the 'High Park' area of Auckland Park.

5.4.4 Swans, wetland fowl, chickens and doves

Swans and the wetland fowl require specific natural landscapes to thrive. Unlike the other animals discussed above, wetland-loving birds are wild and migrate between habitats. Swans, which were often given as gifts and therefore considered a possession, might have their wings clipped to keep them close by, but they also required specific habitats to thrive. Animals like these can only be exploited within landscapes that can attract them, and this limits the range of parks able to support them. Both swans and other wetland birds (i.e. storks, cranes, herons, wild geese and ducks) were edible, and both medieval and post-medieval cookbooks list recipes for a range of wetland-loving birds (Albarella and Thomas 2002). Often hunted in wetland environments using birds of prey (Albarella and Thomas 2002), hawking and fowling were also a popular form of hunting across later medieval and post-medieval Britain.

Although swans are recorded as nesting near the moat at Northallerton Castle (CCB B/84/3 (189357A) and at Auckland Castle (CCB, B/75/6 190049), they are particularly associated with Bishop Middleham Park which included large areas of carr/marsh land. The Manor of Bishop Middleham was used to produce hay (CCB B/73/1-9) and long grasses and sedges would have proliferated in this environment. The accounts record substantial and regular expenses for flooding and ditching (CCB B/73/1-9), suggesting that this natural landscape was adapted to provide adequate water meadows suitable for the cultivation of swans and high quality hay in the meadowland there. There are reports of poachers killing one swan and six cygnets in 1491-91 (CCB B/73/13 (188873)), and annual payments being made to a rat catcher (CCB B/73/1-9) suggest an ongoing attempt to provide safe environments for the swans and other breeding wild fowl. Most accounts relating specifically to Bishop Middleham Park significantly post-date the abandonment of Bishop Middleham Castle in *c.*1380, suggesting that its continued value as a habitat for the cultivation of swans was prized by the Bishops of Durham. Elsewhere, there are no other references to swans in the parks of the Bishops of Carlisle, Glasgow or St Andrews.

The wetland landscape at Bishop Middleham Park would also have made it suitable for the hunting of wetland fowl, like herons, cranes and ducks. Today, the area which comprises Bishop Middleham Park is partly a wetland reserve (Durham County Council 2012). Recent excavations conducted through the summer of 2019 at Bishop Middleham Castle did not yield any remains of wetland birds, despite its proximity to the parkland. However, excavations conducted in 2012 at Darlington Bishops' Manor located on the banks of the River Skerne with its extensive parkland beyond, did uncover the remains of both crane and heron from contexts dated between 1445-1631 (ASUD 2012). Typically,

hunting wild fowl involved the use of birds of prey, retrieval dogs and bow and arrows (Albarella and Thomas 2002). Wildfowling is strongly associated with elite hunting practices, with wild bird bones rarely being found on lower status medieval and post-medieval sites (Albarella and Thomas 2002). Naomi Sykes (2004) has investigated the changing attitudes towards wildfowl as symbols of elite consumption over the early medieval and later medieval periods. Her findings demonstrate that their prestige climaxed in the 13th and 14th centuries, as hunting became inextricably embedded within the social confines of courtly behaviour and power manifestation. As examples of animals attracted to private landscapes but definitively wild, their value was enhanced. It is therefore significant that these birds bones should be found at Darlington Manor, which by the study period was a less favoured residence (Chapter 2). So far, no wildfowl remains have been discovered in excavations of Auckland Castle, which was in more regular use as an episcopal residence at this time, but this may change as the post-excavation process gets underway in 2020. In 1583 payment was made for one 'pare of signetts' which were brought from Howden – so some archaeological evidence might be expected (Raine 1852, 72).

Domestic fowl including chickens and geese were a mainstay at episcopal sites. These birds do not occur regularly in Reever, Forester or Instaurer accounts, suggesting that they were not kept in parks or bred and sold for profit. Chickens and geese are, however, regularly recorded as rental payments, both for the Bishops of Durham and Carlisle. Among faunal assemblages, including those recovered in multiple excavations at Auckland Castle, chicken remains were recovered. Of note, during the most recent 2019 excavation at Auckland Castle, butchered chicken bones and cockspurs were found, indicating that poultry and eggs were all consumed on site (Figure 5.10). The 1628 inventory of Auckland Castle lists a chicken coop present in the 'New Kitchens'. Similarly, in the 1671 plan of Rose Castle before its partial demolition during the Civil War, a '*shed for poultry'* (see Figure 5.9), is recorded in the Great Hall, opposite the central fireplace. In both cases, it could be reasonably presumed that the chickens were being kept inside for egg production or for immediate consumption. Indoor cages like these would have housed only a few birds and none are recorded at Durham Castle or Durham House, the only other sites with comparable inventories or known floor plans. Certainly the cages do not account for the high numbers of birds acquired by the Bishops of Durham through annual rents and payments. Indeed, research conducted for this thesis did not uncover clear evidence of any outdoor buildings or spaces known to be used for keeping poultry. Even at sites where other birds are known to have been kept, such as the swans at Bishop Middleham Park, there are no references to dedicated buildings or housing. Some of these chickens might perhaps have been kept ferally across episcopal residences, either that or their enclosures were sufficiently impermanent not to warrant mention in accounts or building surveys.

There are occasional mentions of the keeping of doves or pigeons, for example a 'polecattez' got into the dovecote at Auckland in 1471-2 and new birds were brought from Howden (Raine 1852: 53) and there was payment for the same dovecote to be cleaned out in 1480-81 (Raine 1852, 55). Dovecotes have not survived well, however, for the most part being removed in later landscaping projects or reused as ornamental garden features (McCann 2011). An elite later medieval and early modern practice, the right to own a dovecote was restricted to monastic houses, manorial landlords and some clergy (Faull and Moorhouse 1981: 752). Like other birds, doves and pigeons were bred for their meat and eggs and the guano they generated was an additional valuable resource (Faull and Moorhouse 1981: 752). As they did not require specific natural environments, pasture or habitats, dovecotes could be installed at sites deemed unsuitable for the cultivation of other livestock. The most common references to doves are from Bishop Middleham park which had a heavily waterlogged landscape used predominantly for the maintenance of swans and for growing hay in water meadows (see above). In the fragmentary references to the use of the landscape around Monimail Tower, a 'doucattis' (dovecot) is referenced in the sale documents in 1598 (NAS GD26/3/513) and this is supported with the discovery of pigeon/dove bones from excavations of this site between 1983-2000 (Farrell 2008: 94). Unfortunately, no contemporary dovecotes at the study-sites have survived, though some (Rose Castle and Monimail Tower) had dovecotes added after the study-period (see Appendix 9).

5.4.5 Freshwater fish

The bishops were obtaining both marine and freshwater fish for regular consumption at their episcopal residences. Chapter 4 (Hospitality) includes a discussion of this which includes fish taken at sea fisheries. Freshwater fish was farmed at most major episcopal residences, particularly those located inland. Auckland Castle, Howden Manor, Bishop Middleham Castle and Rose Castle all have surviving archaeological remains of fish ponds, and there is documentary evidence for Wheel Hall having on-site fisheries (see for example CCB B/73/1-9). There are no known fishponds at any of the Scottish episcopal sites, although St Andrews Castles lies close to active sea fishing industries (Brooks and Whittington 1977: 291) and Lochwood Manor's situation on a loch might account for this lack of evidence. At Scottish sites which are surrounded by undeveloped landscapes, such as Dairsie Castle or Melgund Castle, there are no earthworks surviving which are morphologically consistent with fishponds. This is not true of other Scottish elite sites, where fishponds for the cultivation of freshwater fish for consumption have been identified. River fishing appears to have been a more significant source of fish than in England, probably because of the more abundant salmon reserves in Scotland (Hoffman 2015).

The earthworks of fishponds are all located close to building complexes. There are no instances of fishponds situated deep within park grounds. In all cases, the fishponds are located close to watercourses which supplied fresh water to these ponds, and this may account for their very similar

situations at the base of promontories on which the building complexes sat, with the exception of Wheel Hall which was not located on higher ground. Fishponds were usually cited close to houses because of their vulnerability to poaching (Currie 1990). Fish were particularly vulnerable to night-time poaching because they are attracted to light and kept in confined areas. By situating the fishponds within view of the residence, any light would likely be noticed.

Revenue from fishponds does not occur frequently in Instaurer or Reever accounts, probably because the fish were bred, farmed and consumed on site and not traded beyond. In most cases, the only references to them is in commissioned reports or accounts of maintenance. For example, the Parliamentary Survey of Rose Castle taken in 1649 notes that the '*fysh ponds about the castel are grown up with weeds'* indicating their neglect during the Civil War (Wilson 1912: 48). Throughout the 18th century, these same fishponds were preserved because they were reused ornamentally. Landscaping throughout the 1730s under Bishop George Fleming (1734-1747) resulted in the ponds being dug out and a cascade added (Wilson 1912: 32). In 1780, the same pond was again dug out and a masonry lining added (Wilson 1912: 35). Bishop John William Diggle in the early 20th century again dug out the pond and inserted an island and bridges. Today, this fishpond is still visible and entirely lined with stone and including a carved rose-shaped stone and steps into the pond, though it has lost its bridges (Figure 5.12). At Auckland Castle, there are earthworks for three fishponds immediately to the north of the episcopal complex, while at Bishop Middleham Castle there are rectangular earthworks consistent with two fishponds north of the castle promontory (Figure 5.11). At Howden Manor, the earthworks for the fishponds are visible in the landscape, though slightly obscured by the later insertion of a later tennis court and tree planting (Figure 5.13).

At Wheel Hall, the lack of earthworks as a result of erosion from the River Ouse may hint at the use of this site as a river fishery. A fishery on the Ouse named '*Skurthdyk/Skirthdyke'* occurs regularly in Receivers Accounts between 1448-1554 (CCB B/93), and others are accounted for at Riccall, though not at Wheel Hall suggesting that these did not fall within the land contained within the episcopal residence. Between 1448-1554 *Skurthdyk* is rented out, and the Receivers Accounts record rental payments for it in combination with other rentals which average around 50-55s.

5.4.6 Orchards, vegetable gardens and bee-keeping

Many bishop's houses had orchards and vegetable gardens. Some were ancient, such as the orchard on the Bishop of Durham's property at Auckland which is first mentioned in Boldon Book in 1191. Generally, however, they appear infrequently in accounts because of the lack of trade associated with fruit and vegetables. Most fruit would logically have been consumed nearby and they were a necessary addition at large elite residences. Fruit typically grown in British orchards included apples, crab apples, pears, cherries, hazel and walnut trees, though there was regional and geographical

variation (Bond 2004: 164). Monastic sites, particularly those in the south of England, are associated with commercial and domestic cider production which involved specialist infrastructure in the form of presses, barrels and barns (Bond 2004: 163). There is no evidence at any of the study sites of cider production and it is most likely that any orchards were producing fruit for the bishop's table.

Some incidental records help to identify the location of orchards. For example, the 1649 Parliamentary Survey of Rose Castle (Wilson 1912: 45) records '*an orchard without the south quarter of the castel containing three roods of ground'*. At Auckland Castle, Bishop Hatfield's Survey (Greenwell 1957: 241-244) from 1349 records an orchard at the site with a vegetable garden situated by the River Gaunless. Instructions to a charcoal burner reveal those tree species forbidden from use, including apple and crab-apple (The National Archives DPR DURH 3/37). At Monimail Tower, Archbishop Cardinal Beaton is alleged to have bought back fruit trees from diplomatic missions in France some of which became an established fixture at this site (MacFarlane 1750: 5-7). Although post-dating the study-period, it is worthwhile noting a reference made by Edward Walford (1878:420) to a mulberry tree in 1753 whose '*shade was nearly fifty yards in circumference, and between four and five hundred pottles of fruit were gathered off it in one summer, whilst all the ground under and around the tree looked as if soaked with blood'*. A 'pottle' is a conical basket used to carry small fruits. Mulberry trees were introduced across London during the Tudor and Jacobean periods in efforts to introduce a silk industry to England and were considered elite status symbols (Jarvis 1973). Mulberry trees have long lives, and some of these original mulberry trees still survive in London today. The mulberry tree in the garden of the Carlisle Place has not, but its alleged size suggests this was already an old tree by 1753 and it is possible that the tree had been planted and bore fruit during the study period. Although mulberries were common in London, these fruits were still uncommon beyond London, and its inclusion within the grounds of Carlisle Place would have been a novelty.

Similarly under-represented in the historical documentation are bees and the products from them. Honey and beeswax are both commonly found in later medieval cuisine and daily life. Beeswax was used for making candles, while honey remained a major food sweetener before the mass importation of sugar and could be used for making mead. There are no regular accounts which detail a purposeful and managed cultivation of honey, although woven bee-skeps and bee-boles existed (Bond 2004:161). Irregular references in accounts suggest that resources from bees were an occasional acquisition and likely the result of the discovery of wild hives which were then harvested. For example, from the Master Forester Accounts for the Bishops of Durham between 1438-1536 (CCB/83), there is a regular section for the sale of honey, wax, broom and ling (or heather), though often the profits are listed at nothing. This suggests that these are not regular commodities. Crayke Park similarly records the profits from honey and wax (CCB B/106/23 (189905)). Alternatively, the lack of associated income

might indicate that these resources were not being sold beyond the diocese and are therefore being consumed by the household in their entirety.

5.4.7 Timber

Wood and timber are regularly mentioned. In Auckland Park there is mention of cleaving of firewood in 1471-2 (Raine 1852: 53), lopping and topping trees, as well as felling them. 499 oaks alone were felled in Auckland, Birtley and Nuffield woods by the Bishop of Durham's men 'for making anew of the paling around the park of Aukeland this year' (Raine 1852: 60). The bark too was sold, presumably for tanning, but much of the timber was used to make useful products for the bishop's estates –park pale repairs were a continuous expense. After 1471-2, further repairs were needed at Auckland five years later in 1476-7, again in 1480-81 when 30 rods (about 150m) needed work and again in 1494 when much more substantial refurbishment was required including a massive 1623 roods (about 8000m) of ditch were dug around the pale and 100 oaks were felled to make the 'paleboards' (ie oak paling); Raine 1852: 54-8), the making of park gates and 'flode' gates in 1478 (Raine 1852: 54) and a new 'Coundon gate' in 1512-3 (Raine 1852: 62). In short, woodland was clearly fully managed and exploited and not always legally – 17 tenants were fined for cutting down and carrying away fuel from Auckland in 1513, though the fine was forgiven by the bishop (Raine 1852: 62).

This chapter has covered the role of parks belonging to the study-dioceses throughout the study period. A fuller discussion of the implications of this research is covered in the next chapter.

6

In absentia: when bishops were not in residence

6.1 Introduction

During the events of the 16th and 17th centuries in England and Scotland a variety of new and surprising occupants came to occupy episcopal properties. These occasions included the leasing of episcopal property to private individuals as a result of financial pressure from Elizabethan tax reforms, the forced exchange of London episcopal houses, the abandonment and sale of episcopal property during the Civil War and Commonwealth period in England, and the abandonment of episcopal property following the abolition of episcopacy in Scotland. Up until this point, bishops' houses had remained exclusively within episcopal ownership, and their form reflected the particular needs and requirements of a later medieval episcopal lifestyle. In many ways, they resembled secular noble houses with great halls and accommodation ranges designed to support large households, feasting, hunting and hosting. The special religious requirements of these houses can be seen in the presence of chapels, their location at diocesan centres or adjacent to cathedrals and sometimes their

connection with college communities. With the arrival of their new occupants, who were normally unconnected with the episcopacy, buildings were adapted to a new range of uses, functions and ideologies. This chapter uses case studies drawn from the dioceses for an in-depth analysis of those physical changes and sets out to use bishops' houses as a meaningful dataset for exploring contemporary social and religious attitudes.

6.2 The exchange and royal appropriation of episcopal houses in London 1536-1539

All dioceses in England and Wales owned a property in London after the mid-14th century. Most of these residences were on the Strand, or nearby (Schofield 2017). As with monastic lands, the Crown acquired ultimate ownership over episcopal property when Henry VIII assumed the role of Head of the Church of England. This episcopal property on the Strand had clear functional and strategic benefits for the Crown; the residences were sizeable, located in a desirable area of London and could be used to house religious and political allies. They were therefore valuable assets.

Five dioceses, including Durham and Carlisle, had their London houses removed from their possession through enforced exchange. Many other bishoprics had already lost their London residences before this time due to other acquisitions, exchanges or events. In short, due to the fractious relationship between the Church and Crown in the years immediately following the Act of Supremacy (1534) enforced exchange could be viewed a strategic powerplay designed to exert newfound royal control over the Church and destabilise the episcopal epicentre on the Strand. By deconstructing their heartland in London and removing the bishops from their historic residences, the social landscape of London was fundamentally transformed. Similarly, in the case of those properties which had been held by their bishopric for centuries, their removal signalled a dramatic shift in established habits and lifestyle practices. There were also other practical considerations. Many London residences were conveniently located with riverside landings for easy transport to and from faraway dioceses, a privilege which was often stripped away when properties were exchanged. For some bishops, their residences they received in compensation for their medieval Strand houses were in no way comparable.

The different stories of how properties fell out of episcopal ownership has been well summarised by Patricia Croot (2014). She suggests that for many bishops the costs of maintaining large medieval houses had already become prohibitive after the Reformation. With their reduced wealth following the Act of Supremacy, she argues, the routine costs associated with maintaining these buildings would have been substantial. Once any need to renovate these predominantly medieval buildings to meet new functional and stylistic demands is factored in then this may have rendered them financially untenable. On that basis, Croot (2014: 95) argues that the sale and exchange of houses may actually

have been received positively by some bishops as it allowed them to shed outdated and expensive assets. Their acquisition by, and reallocation to, courtiers pushed forward their repair and modernisation in ways that bishops could not afford, and in ways that the courtiers themselves would have been reluctant to undertake on leased properties. In many ways therefore, exchanges like this offered ways to preserve and refresh prime property in London while allowing bishops the opportunity to reside in comfortable houses.

In 1536, Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall agreed to the exchange of Durham House on the Strand with Coldharbour Place on the north-bank of Thames, near the Tower of London and London Bridge (Croot 2014). In 1539, Bishop Aldrich agreed to a deal in which the Bishops of Carlisle acquired La Place (latterly renamed Carlisle Place), the former residence of the Bishops of Rochester in Lambeth, while Carlisle House on the Strand was granted to Lord John Russell (Croot 2014). The Bishops of Carlisle never regained Carlisle House, remaining at Carlisle Place until its sale in the 19th century. The Bishops of Durham however, were granted back Durham House in 1603 upon the accession of James I/VI, although documentary evidence indicates that it was frequently used for royal and diplomatic purposes thereafter signalling its end as a dedicated episcopal residence.

The effects of these exchanges of London episcopal residences were multi-scalar, impacting numerous parties at the time and since. On the one hand, the bishops who had been displaced were directly affected by a change in their practical circumstances, such as the loss of household amenities, and symbolically they became detached from their seats of historic power in London. The collective disbanding of all medieval episcopal palaces from the Strand must have loosened customary ties at household level too such as the sharing of provisions and providers. On the other hand, for those who acquired the Strand palaces, their everyday practices must have been shaped by the past role of these buildings. To begin with, the buildings were themselves overwhelmingly ancient; depictions of Durham House show it to have been crenelated (see below for references). It stands to reason that other London episcopal residences would have been embellished in similar ways in evocation of their bishoprics so the new owners certainly inherited buildings which echoed aspects of their episcopal past.

Similarly, through the acquisition of their ‘new’ residences, bishops were given novel opportunities to craft a sense of their identity within buildings which were not burdened by the legacies of their predecessors. Given that most episcopal residences were established between the 11th-13th centuries and so few entirely new episcopal residences were founded after the mid-14th century, this situation was novel. This is the first time in the history of bishop’s houses that so many ‘new’ houses were made available to bishops for their use. In many ways, this was a unique opportunity for bishops to exercise and experiment with aesthetic and functional building developments.

None of the London houses lived in by the bishops being studied here (Durham House, Coldharbour Place, Carlisle House and Carlisle Place) survive as visible above-ground buildings today. All four sites have been totally redeveloped rendering any archaeological investigation of them unlikely in the near future. However, using a combination of textual and visual sources, it is still possible to identify some key episodes of construction, change and continuity.

6.2.1 The Medieval Strand houses: life after episcopal ownership

Documentary references to Durham House during its royal ownership reveal it to have been a vibrant place. Soon after its exchange, it was the setting for three important weddings, including that between Lady Jane Grey and Guildford Dudley in 1553 (Taylor 2004: 162). Reports of jousts, feasts and entertainment hosted by Henry VIII at Durham House speak of its value, size and social status (Wriothesley Chronicle 117) and it took on special significance for Elizabeth I who negotiated it as part of her inheritance settlement. The Queen lived there intermittently and latterly used it to house Sir Walter Raleigh during much of the 1590s (see Gater and Wheeler 1937 for a full discussion). These events all took place within a limited time window; Durham House was in royal possession for only 67 years before it was officially restored to the Bishops of Durham in 1603 at the coronation of James I/VI in England. It had also been briefly restored to the Bishops of Durham during the Marian Counter-Reformation (1553-58).

A 1626 sketch of Durham House provides some valuable insights. The L-shaped arrangement of the two visible ranges is reminiscent of other medieval episcopal residences, including those owned by the Bishops of Durham (see Smith 2016), while the central Great Hall with its service and accommodation areas extending from opposite ends follows the established floor plan of medieval manor houses, medieval town houses and inns (Pantin 1962; Faulkner 1970; Gardiner 2000). The only obvious departure from the layout depicted in the earlier Agas Map of 1561 is the introduction of a nested arrangement of internal courtyard walls (Figure 6.1). This subdivision of exterior spaces into compartments, using walls which were sometimes perforated with windows or openings to allow glimpses between the courtyards, was a fashionable 17th century trend in garden landscaping which evoked Italian Renaissance ideals and was implemented at élite residences nationwide (Dixon Hunt 1986), including at other sites under study here (eg. Auckland Castle). These additions are best summarised as a more general attempt to modernise the complex, rather than to transform the existing layout radically.

The Agas Map of 1561 (Figure 6.1), and an anonymous painting dating from *c.* 1630 (Figure 6.2), reveal portions of existing medieval stone fabric visible at the time. In the Agas Map, Durham House is depicted as a crenelated square-shaped enclosure adjacent to the River Thames, with buildings occupying only a small part of a larger plot. Along the street-front, a row of small buildings conceals

the palace behind. Evidently there were three essential components within the plot: the square-shaped palace building of Durham House, the street-frontage buildings and a square-shaped walled enclosure to the east which was probably a garden or otherwise productive space. In contrast, the *c.*1630 anonymous painting provides a detailed record of its south waterfront façade. The stone construction, crenelations, blocked pointed gothic arches on the southern façade of the Great Hall and use of a stringcourse are entirely consistent with a late-13th/14th century date but strikingly different from the neighbouring Salisbury and Worcester houses which conform to a Tudor palatial aesthetic in which brick is the primary building material and there are cupolas on the roof. Clearly, the fabric of the ancient episcopal building was retained in large part under royal ownership; there was no obvious attempt to modernise or update its exterior façade nor, it would seem, radically alter its floor plan.

Carlisle House, situated immediately east of Durham House, has a very different post-episcopal biography which was shaped by deliberate demolition and redevelopment. Following its exchange, Carlisle House became the property of Lord John Russell, 1st Earl of Bedford. Carlisle House then became known as Russell Place. In 1541 - as part of a larger package of properties and land - Russell acquired land that had previously belonged to a convent on the south-side of the Strand, a block of land referred to as 'Friars Pyes' and 'Long Acre', which had all been surrendered by the Church during the Dissolution of the Monasteries (Sheppard 1970). This land is modern-day Covent Garden. Very little is known about any of the changes which Russell might have made to Carlisle House beyond its name change, though the Agas Map of 1561 (Figure 6.1) does date to the period of his occupation. The map shows a haphazard arrangement of buildings with apparently different stylistic features reflecting its multi-period development. Those areas closest to the street frontage are comprised of the 'Carlisle Rents' which had been independently leased by the Bishops of Carlisle since the early 15th century (see Appendix 11). The main bulk of the episcopal palace buildings was clustered along the riverfront. There are no clear stylistic features which can be confidently dated to its occupation by Russell, although the oversized 'B' on the gateway might possibly be an artistic shorthand to denote the presence of the Bedford coat-of-arms. Through its incorporation into Russell's larger complex, Carlisle House ceased to exist as an independent physical entity and became one component of the wider complex which was split either side of the Strand. Ultimately, Carlisle House was entirely demolished *c.*1600 after passing between multiple members of the extended Bedford family and assuming numerous different names, including Worcester House and Bedford House.

This evidence suggests that, in the decades immediately following their exchanges, these particular residences underwent minimal modification, with most of the near-contemporary medieval buildings being retained and in active use by their new owners throughout the mid-late 16th century. On the face of it, the properties held clear value *despite* their age and historic allusions, something which is

perhaps not entirely surprising in the light of the religious climate in England at the time. Their houses carried none of the obvious unfavourable connotations which might have affected episcopal houses elsewhere, despite their aging fabric and architectural unfashionableness by the mid-16th century. Their survival throughout the 16th century is likely a result of their particular circumstances. Shortly prior to its exchange, Durham House was actively used by Cardinal Wolsey during his brief interim episcopate as Bishop of Durham alongside his role as an advisor to Henry VIII (1523-29). Wolsey was moving furniture and goods between the two sites (Appendix 8 for details of this inventory), indicating that he was actively using both residences. Given his religious and political status, it is likely that Durham House was well maintained by Wolsey. In contrast, the next owner of Carlisle House was arguably the driving force behind its survival. John Russell, the 1st Earl of Bedford was a first-generation courtier who had ingratiated himself with the King through chance circumstance (Willen 2008). Although his family were independently wealthy merchants, they were not of noble origin (Willen 2008). The purchase of Carlisle House signalled a momentous shift in Russell's family fortunes and provided a ready-made symbol of his newly acquired position in courtly life. Practically, Russell came from and owned property in the county of Dorset and Carlisle House provided a serviceable means of continuing his lifestyle in the capital.

6.2.2 The Bishop's new properties: similarities, differences and adaptations

Both Coldharbour Place and La Place were established medieval properties when the bishops under study here first acquired them. Their locations, physical assets and attributes, sizes and styles differed considerably, both with each other and in respect to previous episcopal properties. While the bishops of Durham and Carlisle had once been neighbours on the Strand, their new properties launched them into opposing areas of London into different kinds of houses which would have profoundly altered the ways in which they lived. Coldharbour was a prominent medieval townhouse, constructed *c.*1300 and previously lived in by merchants, the Mayor of London, Henry V (as a prince), the College of Arms and Lady Margaret Beaufort. Described by John Stow in 1598 (Thoms 1876: 211) as '*a right faire and stately house'*, Coldharbour was a fixture among early modern London mansions (Kingsford 1921). Some idea of its size and prominence on the London skyline can be gleaned from the Visscher Panorama (Figure 6.3). Standing roughly five storeys tall, Coldharbour dwarfed the neighbouring properties, and might in fact have afforded more room to the Bishops of Durham than they had ever enjoyed at Durham House. With its landing facilities, Coldharbour was as easily accessible for the bishops, and its geographically central position offered new benefits and opportunities.

In contrast, the Bishop of Carlisle's new residence at La Place (renamed Carlisle Place) had been occupied previously by the Bishops of Rochester. Established in the 13th century, this property appears to have been little used. Stow comments in his survey of London that it *'long time hath not been frequented by any bishop, and lieth ruinous for lack of reparations'* (Thoms 1876: 342). Carlisle

Place was situated south of the Thames in Lambeth, far from the Bishop of Carlisle's residence on the Strand. Being inland, it lacked landing facilities on the river, though analysis of the modern-day street plan does suggest that it had easy access to the water (see Appendix 11). Its nearest neighbour was Lambeth Palace, the London residence of the Archbishops of Canterbury, and what it lacked urban convenience it compensated for in outdoor space and its sizeable land assets. Rose Castle was the only residence with its own park. Carlisle Place therefore provided a new kind of residence, with added amenities. Although the buildings were demolished in the 19th century, the boundaries of the estate remain fossilised in the modern-day street layout.

Very little is known in detail about the ways in which the bishops modified their new houses (Chapter 2). The Bishops of Durham only occupied Coldharbour Place for 69 years, until Durham House was restored to them in 1603. During this time, Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall was confined there under house arrest (Newcombe 2013). Its earlier sequence of owners would suggest that it was probably in good condition. Conversely, Stow's description of Carlisle Place indicates that it was in a poor state of repair shortly before its exchange. Some indication of this can be gleaned from its sale 1647 by Parliamentary Commissioner to Matthew Hardy for just £220 (Allen 1837: 440); a modest sum when compared to other episcopal properties being sold by the Parliamentary Commissioner at that time. A single parcel of land at the manor of Acombe and Fosseway owned by the Archbishops of York sold for a comparable sum of £226 13s 4d, while the White Hart in Paternoster Row in London, a court consisting of tenements and shops belonging to the Bishops of London, was sold for £248 (Allen 1837: 440). In all probability, given that these two properties were minor estates with no dwelling house of any significance, the price of Carlisle Place must reflect its structural condition at the time.

6.3 Leased properties

The leasing of elite property was a well-established process in later medieval and early modern England (Hoyle 1990). Following the Act of Supremacy in 1534, and subsequent depletion of Church wealth through increased taxation and the seizure of Church assets, there began a widespread trend for leasing lesser-used episcopal properties. This was financially and practically beneficial for the diocese. Not only did it generate new revenue streams through rent but it also absolved the diocese of much of the responsibility and costs associated with maintenance and upkeep. The dioceses always retained their legal ownership and identified for this purpose those ancillary residences which had witnessed only sporadic or irregular habitation by bishops and their household throughout the later medieval period. Analysis of the differential development of medieval bishop's houses belonging to the Bishops of Durham (Smith 2016; Smith and Graves 2017) has found that, from the early-14th century, the process of routinely travelling between episcopal residences scattered through the diocese shifted toward a style of episcopacy based on fewer residences with less travel between them. This shift saw greater investment and faster architectural development at those sites occupied most

frequently and, relatively speaking, neglect at those sites which were occupied less often. As a rule, the houses that came to be leased are those with the least later medieval development and therefore usually have simpler plans arranged around a central Great Hall. Given that such houses rarely accommodated large households, they are usually significantly smaller than other residences in the diocese.

Of 16 properties in use by the Bishops of Durham during the study-period, a total of five were leased at some point during the study-period. Among the five residences in use by the Bishops of Carlisle, four (80%) were leased during the same period. The tradition of leasing episcopal properties was never readily adopted in Scotland, however. Consequently, all residences examined in this section are derived from the English study-dioceses and there is no analysis of the impacts of lessees after the sale of episcopal property after 1646. Of those buildings under study here, some exist today in standing form, either as above-ground ruins or converted into private homes, while others have undergone total demolition or redevelopment, with no above-ground remains surviving at all. None are intact; all have experienced some damage in their post-medieval history which has, in some cases, significantly affected their medieval building fabrics, particularly during and after the Civil War and Commonwealth. This has often obscured any building changes made during their periods of lease, an added complication when combined with the overall paucity of written sources.

Unfortunately, archaeological datasets have done little to shed light on the scale and nature of occupation at these residences during periods of leasing and there has been no sustained attempt to understand wider scale patterns of use and building adaptation. Partly there has been little interest in exploring and investigating lesser episcopal residences but it is also true that most archaeological attention has focused on understanding and establishing their later medieval development, largely neglecting their post-medieval occupation.

6.3.1 The tenants

At one extreme are very high-status individuals such as Queen Elizabeth who leased Crayke Castle as part of a wider campaign of acquisition in which she acquired numerous episcopal properties nationwide (Manning 1971). Generally understood to have been a tactful way to exploit Church wealth and assets without undermining the institution of episcopacy, these exchanges were often not optional for the bishops (Heal 1980; Bourgeios 1995; Walker 1960). Bourgeios (1995) recounts an intense exchange of letters and diplomatic manoeuvring between Bishop Cox of Lincoln, the Queen and Lord North to facilitate the lease of multiple manors held by the diocese which Cox was reluctant to relinquish. This exchange highlights the complexity of the process and provides valuable insight into the thoughts and motivations of the parties involved. It is clear that, for some bishops, the leasing of episcopal property was not always a desired outcome; elite lay people stood to gain considerably

from the release of Church property. The exchanges described by Bourgeios (1995) bear similarities with the lease of Crayke Castle, a residence of the Bishops of Durham. In both cases, Elizabeth facilitated the leases thereby enabling a member of her court to benefit from it. At Crayke Castle, that individual was her private secretary, Sir Francis Walsingham (Adams et al 2009). The haste with which Walsingham then sublet his leased house suggests that he spent very little, if any, time at the property (see Appendix 5). A similar situation was replicated at Horncastle Manor where Lord Edward Clinton appears to have rarely been in residence (Patent Roll, 6 Edward VI., pt. iii, m. 1) (Figure 6.4).

Mid-level and local elites were an occupant group that benefited considerably from leasing. The Machells were an ancient elite landowning family with close connections to the Bishops of Carlisle and an active local presence in Cumbria (Bellasis 1885). Similarly, Abigail Snoden, widow of Bishop Robert Snoden of Carlisle (1616-21), was granted the lease of Horncastle Manor by her husband's successor in 1623 following a petition by Abigail (Walters 1908). While unusual (see Chapter 6 for a discussion on this), her status as a bishop's wife perhaps encouraged others to see her as elite, akin to that of a noble. In both instances, their residences served different functions for their new tenants. For the Machells, Bewley Castle added to their portfolio of lands and manors around Cumbria which had been diminishing since the later medieval period (Bellasis 1885: 438). Bewley would have been viewed as a welcome addition to their existing estates, with both the residence and its wider landscape remaining in active use by the Machells until the late 18th century when Bewley continues to be mentioned in wills and legal transfers (Bellasis 1885: 440-5). In contrast, following the death of her husband, Abigail was forced to vacate her episcopal residences, and her husband's poverty (Walters 1908) and youth of her children made her situation precarious. Through her lease of Horncastle Manor, she was able to avoid hardship and to maintain a connection with the diocese, while the bishops were in turn able lease their residence and extend charity and hospitality to a bishop's widow. The circumstances are very different but they demonstrate how the leasing of episcopal residences benefited members of the mid-level and local elites by providing high-quality housing to people mid-level of elites without suitable residential options.

The main group of tenants were ordinary lay people. John Theker, tenant of Crayke Castle, was a farmer (CCB B/24/43/30). Similarly, Robert Kelsey appears in records relating to his sale of produce at markets in Durham city (Old.Univ. MSS E.I.9 f.64v) suggesting that he too was primarily involved in agriculture. Crayke Castle was situated within an extensive park (see Appendix 5; Chapter 5) which remained in episcopal ownership as a functioning asset throughout its lease. Nevertheless, the wider landscape around Crayke was primarily agricultural, and Crayke Castle was well situated and a sizeable farmer's residence. The infrequent references to these men in the archival resources for the

bishopric of Durham (Chapter 2) and their relationship with agricultural supply suggests that they were directly engaged in farming practices and were not members of local nobility or gentry classes.

6.3.2 'Smaul shew of any castel': building development by lessees

There is no evidence in the written or archaeological sources of significant change to buildings being conducted by lessees or during leased periods more generally. It seems unlikely that tenants would have wished to invest in substantive building changes. Writing about Crayke Castle in the years following the Restoration, Bishop Cosin wrote unfavourably of its earlier lessee and occupier during the Civil War and Commonwealth, Charles Allenson, whom he blamed for dismantling parts of the site (GB-0033-COL 2/71). The precise ways in which the building was damaged are unclear from Cosin's account, but its condition in 1662 likely closely resembled its present state, and that recorded during the 19th century (see Appendix 5; Raine 1869), as there is little evidence to suggest that it has suffered any large-scale subsequent demolition. Allenson's alleged treatment of the site follows a pattern already established at Crayke Castle. When John Leland visited in 1536, he described *'ther remaineth at this tyme smaul shew of any castel that hath beene there. There is a haul with other offices and a great stable voltid with stone of a meatly auncyent building. The great squar tower that is thereby, as in the toppe of the hille and supplement of logginges, is very fair, and was erected totally by Neville Bisshop of Duresme',* suggesting that it was already seriously dilapidated (Toulmin-Smith 1907: 66). A survey of the site in 1560 describes the 'Old Hall' as being *'covered w(ith) slate in sore dec(ay), & ye tymber rotten in meny places'* and the adjoining kitchen with *'walles whereof cracked & in sore dec(ay), redy to fall, under proped w(ith) stayes & proppes'* and the old gatehouse with *'the rouf whereof is gon all excepte a fewe peces of tymber that is rotten; but for fier better away than remayne to lose all togyther' (*Raine 1869). The presence of two major buildings at Crayke Castle, the 'Old Hall' with its adjoining spaces (kitchen and Great Chamber), and the 'New Tower', permitted tenants to reside primarily in one building. The 1560 survey suggests that the 'New Tower' had become the primary focus for habitation. Following Allenson's tenancy, this appears to have shifted with the Great Chamber in the 'Old' part of the building being converted to the main residence, while the New Tower became derelict.

This picture of decline at Crayke is replicated elsewhere. For example, decades of neglect during leasing contributed to the eventual decision to demolish Melbourne Hall in 1595 after it was described as in *'exceeding greate decaye, especially the mansion house which is utterly ruined and not inhabitable without greate and chardgable reparacions'* (Briggs 1852). Similarly, Bishop Middleham Castle, which had been uninhabited by the bishops since *c.*1350 and was already in a poor state of repair (see Appendix 9) continued to decline during subsequent tenancies, with stone being quarried from the site for use in other buildings. Details of the 31-year lease by John Hall, Bailiff for Bishop Middleham, in which he was permitted access to the park within the wall and the well, suggest that he

might have made use of the episcopal palace buildings as his residence but possibly he occupied only a small part of the complex. Recent excavation of two buildings on the site indicate that they were probably demolished in the later medieval period (few post-medieval finds were recovered here). The archaeological deposits are entirely consistent with the systematic dismantling of the site described as having occurred during the 14th century. However, geophysical and earthwork surveys of the site have revealed that the complex was more extensive than the current scheduling boundary allows for, and that some of these additional areas may well reflect post-medieval activity at the site. Further archaeological investigation of the site may help clarify the scale and nature of its post-medieval use and occupation while it was under lease.

Taken together, most of the leased sites have some documentation made during or shortly after their lease which refers to the poor condition or dilapidation of these houses. This is in spite of the fact that many residences had undergone significant investment or remodelling in the century prior to their lease. For example, Crayke Castle underwent substantial refurbishment by Bishop Neville in 1441 (CCB B/110/1 (189881)) who added new kitchens, an undercroft, a chamber and probably also the New Tower (see Appendix 5 for a discussion on this). Bewley Castle had in turn been 'restored' by Bishop Strickland in the earlier 15th century.

The range of tenants was an important factor behind the fate of the sites. On the one hand, high-status lessees (i.e. Queen Elizabeth, Sir Francis Walsingham, Lord Chilton, Thomas Cromwell, etc) appear to have spent little time at them. Some, like Francis Walsingham, sublet to others. Others possessed multiple other residences and are unlikely to have spent much time at the leased sites under study here. Thomas Cromwell already owned several houses across England when he took on the lease of Melbourne Hall in 1530, for example, and divided his time between Wolf Hall Manor in Wiltshire and his London house (Everett 2015). Similarly, Gilbert Talbot, 7th Earl of Shrewsbury and Member of Parliament for Derbyshire, held several castles and lordships (Hicks 2008). He was known for his extravagant lifestyle which involved keeping an open house, hunting and participating in court life (Hicks 2008). However, in comparison with their other residences, some of which held clear ancestral value (i.e. Wolf Hall Manor), these leased properties were peripheral. They would have seen little active use for entertaining or habitation. For the most part, it was the wider estates and the income they provided which were the incentive for their lease in the first place.

In contrast, sites occupied by non-elites suffered from decay and disrepair. Arguably this resulted from their use and occupation by persons without sufficient means to maintain them. For example, at Crayke Castle occupation appears to have been concentrated in the smaller 'New Tower' during the mid-16th century when the site was occupied by farmers. Perhaps the site was outsized as a farmhouse and its maintenance became untenable. Certainly, in comparison with other farmhouses of the same date, Crayke was unusually large (see, for example, excavated 16th century examples from Lucas and

Regan 2003; Thorp and Alcock 2019). This may also have been true of Bishop Middleham Castle and Howden Manor. Bewley Castle appears to have survived intact and in use for the longest time, finally falling into disrepair in the late 18th/early-19th century under the ownership of the Musgrave family. Elizabeth Machell's will from 1770 details its use at this time (Bellasis 1885) and Bewley's longevity as a leased episcopal property may result from its continued occupation by the Machell family. They owned several houses around the Crackenthorpe area of Cumbria which were occupied by different members of the family (Bellasis 1885). Bewley complemented their existing housing stock and fulfilled a role as a major residence for a large and extended family.

6.4 Civil War, Commonwealth and sale of episcopal property by the Parliamentary Commissioner (1642-1660)

Following the official abolition of episcopacy in England on the 9 October 1646, episcopal property fell into the ownership of Parliament. In the immediate months and years afterwards, properties were evaluated, priced and sold by the Parliamentary Commissioner and this process has supplied an important dataset because of the surveys drawn up before their sale. Furthermore, this moment marks the point at which many bishop's houses came to be inhabited by people with no connection to the episcopacy who then had the freedom to imprint a new set of functional and stylistic ideals on these buildings. Not since the Dissolution of the Monasteries (1536-41) had so much land been seized from the Church and made available to the laity. It is important to recognise that the sale of episcopal property by Parliamentary Commissioner between 1646-9 brought onto the market a great range of property types and sizes. From the large and important episcopal palace sites with extensive parks, to the smaller 'minor' houses which were often leased beforehand, residences of all kinds now became available for purchase.

For many bishop's houses their occupation during the Civil War and Commonwealth period was pivotal to the survival of the existing buildings and landscapes, shaping the buildings we still see today. Many bishop's houses across England and Wales were profoundly affected by building changes which took place at them which often incorporated large-scale rebuilding and remodelling schemes. To date, there has been no systematic study of the physical scale and impact of Civil War and Commonwealth activity at episcopal residences. Historical work has been conducted examining the financial, economic and legal implications of this period (i.e. Heal 1984; Gentles 1980) but there is a lack of archaeological research for the post-medieval period generally (see Chapter 1). An holistic examination of the treatment of episcopal property during the Civil Wars and Commonwealth period which integrates historical, standing buildings and archaeological datasets, would have great merit.

New architecture and stylistic innovation during the Commonwealth has been similarly understudied. Mowl and Earnshaw (1995) have written the most extensive study of Commonwealth architecture

across England and Wales, and there have been other minor studies which contribute to this field (see for example Green 2018, Graves 2009; Peck 2005). These works generally focus on the architectural contributions of those who profited the most from the Civil Wars and Commonwealth government; among them prominent Parliamentarians, Civil War military leaders, and Commonwealth government politicians. Their building endeavours were often informed by their religious and social beliefs and made use, for example, of the Classical and Mannerist styles which appealed to the Puritanical beliefs of an elite centred on simplicity and the rejection of falsity in religion. These ideas were reflected in new architectural stylings based on a set of architectural premises rooted in classical mathematical design and Vitruvian ideals. The orderly nature of this aesthetic reflected and embodied many aspects of their religious and social beliefs which in turn emphasised the importance of a simplified Christian orthodoxy and way of life. Moreover, this emerging elite was small and highly interconnected, a fact which undoubtedly informed the spread of this particular kind of architectural design throughout the 1650s.

Although bishops were formally abolished in 1646 in England and Wales, in practice many had vacated their residences earlier during the Civil War because of the fluctuating territorial positions of Royalist and Parliamentarian forces. During periods of intense localised fighting, bishops fled to the safety of other houses in their possession, or else escaped the region or country altogether (see King 1968 for a discussion on this). This meant that at times episcopal residences were consciously left vacant and susceptible to both Royalist and Parliamentarian interests. Their size and available amenities made them attractive places for garrisoning armies, while castles could be used defensively (Askew 2013). Rachel Askew's detailed investigation of consumption patterns at English castles during the Civil Wars remains a valuable resource for understanding habitation practices and material culture signatures at castles re-purposed at this time. Her research, which incorporates some reused episcopal sites, demonstrates how sites were typically used for short periods of time to garrison large numbers of soldiers. Archaeological evidence varies between sites and circumstances, as Askew demonstrates, but it has considerable potential when synthesised with historical datasets.

6.4.1 Bishop's houses during the Civil Wars (1642-46)

While broad understandings of the changing military position in different parts of the country can be gained from synthetic works, the specific role of individual buildings is often invisible, and this is especially the case for minor episcopal sites. Although studies have been conducted which examine the occupation of secular castles and manor houses by Royalist and Parliamentarian soldiers (see, for example, Askew 2013; Askew 2016a; Askew 2016b; Moffet 1992), archaeological observation of this sort has rarely been deployed at bishop's houses. The potential is certainly there. Analysis of building remains, material culture and palaeo-environmental evidence reveals an array of common archaeological signatures including evidence of political iconoclasm, the destruction of built remains,

structural damage incurred during combat together with evidence of everyday occupation including the use of existing buildings, temporary encampments, and scatters of material culture and faunal remains consistent with massive and rapid influxes of people.

Five English study-sites had well established roles during the Civil Wars. Durham House, at that time leased to the Earl of Pembroke (see above; Appendix 8), was used to quarter Parliamentarian soldiers along with Somerset and Worcester houses. There was tension between Bishop Thomas Moreton of Durham over his non-payment of rent, the Earl of Pembroke over his inconvenience at not being able to reside at Durham House, and the Council of State. These accounts demonstrate that, due to its position, size and episcopal ownership and present tenure, Durham House was viewed as a strategic and convenient garrison. The historically close relationship between royalty and Durham House undoubtedly played an important role in its use during the Civil War. After its restoration to episcopal ownership in 1603, Durham House had continued to be used for royal functions. Charles I had encouraged the leasing of Durham House 1641 to ease financial burden on the bishopric due to the costs incurred with maintaining this, now old, house. It was at this time that plans were created by John Webb for its total demolition and reconstruction (Eisenthal 1985). Arguably, due to the historic interrelationship between the monarchy and episcopacy, this site was viewed as a strategically available asset for Civil War accommodation. However, there are no references to any physical damage made by the soldiers and the comprehensive redevelopment of the site makes pursuit of this impossible.

Similarly lacking in tangible evidence of their Civil War pasts are Melbourne Hall and Horncastle Manor. Both of these sites were occupied by people actively involved in the Civil Wars. Sir John Coke, the new owner of Melbourne Hall who were responsible for demolishing the existing episcopal house and constructing a new mansion on a different footprint, was an active Royalist who supported Charles I financially and served him as Secretary of State during his reign (Young 2004). Coke also accompanied Charles in Berwick during the First Bishop's War but, despite this, his two sons were Parliamentarian and Royalist respectively (Young 2016). Situated close to Derby, Melbourne Hall lay within heavily contested territories during 1642-3 (Newman 2005: 22), and Coke was forced to flee his home (Young 2016). During this time, Melbourne Hall was reportedly used to garrison Parliamentarian soldiers. However, due to the extensive remodelling and extension of Melbourne Hall during the later 17th and 18th centuries, there are few traces of surviving visible masonry dating from the 1640s, and in areas where original fabric is visible, there are no clear traces of graffiti or other evidence of military occupation. No archaeology has been conducted at the site, and the landscape surrounding Melbourne Hall was heavily landscaped in the later17th century to create elaborate formal parterre gardens. Ephemeral evidence of encampments and scatters of artefacts may well have been destroyed.

Elsewhere however, there are more visible traces of Civil War activity. At Rose Castle, the demolition of the south and west ranges is attributed to repeated attacks throughout the English Civil War. Its vulnerability likely stems from the unfortunately timing of the death of Bishop Barnaby Potter in 1642 which created a vacancy that was not quickly filled due to the political context (Hegarty 2004). The city of Carlisle was famously besieged by the Scottish army, led by General David Leslie, for nine months before surrendering in June 1645 after the population were reportedly left starving (Reid 2012; Skelton 2014). During that time, Leslie used the nearby town of Dalston, in which Rose Castle is located, as his base (Jefferson 1838: 51). Afterwards, Rose Castle was seemingly abandoned (Wilson 1912: 51) before being assimilated as a Royalist holding in 1648 when Carlisle was regained by forces loyal to the Crown (Reid 2012). Sustained Parliamentarian attacks on Royalist-held Carlisle affected Rose Castle when in 1648 the building manned by 40 Royalists was besieged by 100 Parliamentarians (Bouch 1956:125). After refusing to surrender twice, the Castle was attacked for two hours before it was eventually surrendered (Bouch 1956: 125). There is only reported fatality and yet the siege resulted in the demolition of one half of the original four-sided concentric castle. According to the text accompanying Bishop Edward Rainbowe's plan of Rose Castle (see Appendix 9), 41 of the 49 rooms at Rose Castle were lost.

Due to extensive Commonwealth-era restoration and 18th century remodelling, there is no known Civil War-era evidence for this building. Traces of musket ball shot, graffiti and burning on the exterior and interior facades of the building might perhaps be expected. However, comprehensive remodelling of much of the building has stripped away much of what may have once existed. Due to extensive terracing and landscaping in the 19th century, there are now no obvious earthworks or visible traces of the south and west ranges. The oldest portion of the building, the Strickland Tower, has survived in isolation and has not been refaced. Although there are no obvious signs of combat here, such as burning or shot marks, the building scars where it connected with other ranges do survive. Further archaeological examination of this site would likely generate more evidence of its Civil War occupation, and associated demolition phases.

At Auckland Castle, the demolition phases there are typically attributed to the Commonwealth-era (see below). Durham and surrounding areas were strongly Royalist throughout much of the Civil Wars. However, towards the end of the Civil Wars, as the tide of battle focused more extensively in Scotland and the borders region, Durham and surrounding areas witnessed greater military activity. Sir Arthur Haslerigge, who latterly purchased Auckland Castle from Parliamentary Commissioners, was active in the area and was responsible for the attack on Witton Castle, a Royalist stronghold (Ryder 2005/6). It might be expected that, given the activity in the area towards the end of the Civil War, that a higher concentration of artefacts associated with Civil War occupation would be recovered from the recent excavations at this site. Five musket balls/shots have been found in unstratified

archaeological contexts which could date from this period. At present, there are no other diagnostic finds.

The Civil Wars did not affect Scottish sites in the same way. Despite Scottish episcopacy being a central component of Scottish involvement in the Civil Wars, few battles actually happened on Scottish soil. The battles of the First and Second Bishops' Wars in 1639 and 1640 took place at Berwick-upon-Tweed (England) and Montrose (Scotland) respectively, while the Battle of Dunbar (1650) took place in Scotland. Because of this lack of military engagement on Scottish soil, this period is not associated with the destruction and demolition of episcopal sites, despite the fact that some residences are located closeby (i.e. Tyninghame, Ancrum, Stow).

6.4.2 Bishop's houses during the Commonwealth

Figure 6.4 details the sale prices and buyers of episcopal property in this study sold by the Parliamentary Commissioner. This evidence is drawn from surviving surveys and documentation associated with their sales (see Appendices). In general, there is very little surviving documentary information relating to their uses during the Commonwealth itself. As these sites belonged to individuals, there was no standardised recording procedure in place for building works as there had been under episcopal ownership. Much of our understanding of their use, treatment and occupation has therefore to be reconstructed from documentation which dates to after the Restoration and from archaeology/standing buildings evidence.

In each diocese some major episcopal residences were sold; Rose Castle (Bishopric of Carlisle), Durham Castle (Bishopric of Durham) and Auckland Castle (Bishopric of Durham) being among the most notable. Due to their survival and post-Restoration functions, these sites have the best preserved standing remains and the greatest volume of documentary evidence. Unlike those residences which had previously been leased, they had experienced unbroken occupation by the bishops until the Civil War and Commonwealth periods and their sustained use over a long period of time resulted in their development into 'palaces', featuring multiple ranges, large halls and extensive service facilities representing repeated architectural campaigns. As the primary residences of the post-14th century bishops, these major houses are in many ways to be differentiated symbolically from the other residences in the diocese. Because they were not subjected to wholesale demolition, they tend to be characterised by repeated additions to existing buildings. This created extensive multi-phased layouts in which each area of the site became imprinted with the styles and motifs relating to the bishop that had created it. In that sense, these primary residences became a physical representation of the long history of the diocese.

These three sites - Rose, Durham and Auckland - were the most expensive of the residences to be sold by the Parliamentary Commissioner, and this is reflected in their new owners. Rose Castle together

with the manors of Dalston and Linstock was bought in 1650 by Sir William Heveningham (1604-78), a regicide and profiteer from the sale of episcopal and royalist lands (see Appendix 9). Heveningham was independently wealthy having inherited 15 estates and he had been an MP during 1640 before supporting the Parliamentarian cause throughout the Civil War (Hollis 2004). Sir Arthur Haselrigge (1601-1661) acquired numerous manors and estates which had previously belonged to the Bishops of Durham for a combined sum of £19,000. Haselrigge's political and social influence in the north-east of England is reflected in his appointment as Governor of Newcastle (Durston 2004). Although both men were known associates through their active roles at Parliament and the Council of State and had gained financially from the Parliamentarian victory, their religious affiliations and temperaments differed. Haselrigge was radical in his religious beliefs, vehemently opposing the bishops and adopting staunch Puritanical views. His famed rows with Archbishop Laud and participation in the creation of bills to abolish the episcopacy speak of his pre-Civil War convictions. A military man, Haselrigge commanded factions of the New Model Army in battle, and remained engaged in political life, opposing Presbyterians in Parliament. In contrast, Heveningham was an active Presbyterian and participant member of his local Presbyterian church. Although he financially supported the New Model Army in 1642 and broadly supported their values, Heveningham refused to sign Charles I's death warrant. He participated in the Councils of State of the Commonwealth in 1649-50 (Hollis 2004) but seemed disillusioned with the cause in later years, backing away from political life. In one of his petitions for mercy after being imprisoned for regicide in 1660, he argued that he had donated money to support the royalist uprising of George Booth, a claim which likely helped spare his life.

These two men treated their newly acquired episcopal residences very differently and, fortunately, both of the incoming post-Restoration bishops, Cosin and Rainbowe, were familiar enough with the buildings in their dioceses from before the abolition of episcopacy to be able to provide a reliable account of what had happened. Indeed, Bishop Cosin's account of Haselrigge's destructive activities at Auckland Castle has been the main source of evidence for the layout of the building before 1646 (Cosin letterbooks, see Appendix 2). Cosin's descriptions of the site make it clear that Hazelrigge demolished large portions of the original medieval building and built his own house within the grounds. In 1661, shortly after the Restoration, Cosin described the need to rebuild Durham Castle '*which the Scots spoyl'd and ruined with gunpowder'* and Auckland Castle '*which the usurpers, Sir A. Haselrig and others, had ruined'* (Tanner MSS. Xcii. 10.). His estimates for repair included £1840 for lead, £1170 for timber and dales, £410 for iron and smith's work, £369 for glass, £1100 for stone and the cost of masons, £860 in carpenters' fees, £150 in joiners' and carvers' fees, £198 for lime and plasterers' fees, £168 for haire, bricks, slates, flags and wallers' work and £400 for carriages of wood and stone (total: £7202) (Tanner MSS. Xcii. 10.). In addition, Cosin allotted £100 for the repair of Darlington House (Tanner MSS. Xcii. 10). This work was completed by the year 1668, costing a combined total of £17,000 (Tanner MSS. Xcii. 4). Cosin writes that £6000 was spent *'erecting from*

the ground, and consecrating a faire, large, new chappell at Auckland Castle; the former faire chappell there having been totally pulled down by Sir Arthur Haslerigg' (Tanner MSS. Xcii. 4). In his 1663 articles of agreement with his architect John Langstaffe, who was also Haselrigge's architect, regarding Cosin's building work at Auckland Castle, some important further details relating to Hazelrigge's building work are recorded. Cosin directs Langstaffe to *'take downe the aishler in Sir Arthur Hesilridg's building and remoive it'* (Mickleton MSS. Xx. 60.). In an earlier version of this agreement conducted two months prior, it is noted that Langstaffe *'shall remove the corner, and to build and bring it to a square, at the north-east end of the new building lately begun to be erected by Sir Arthur Hesilridge'* (Mickleton MSS. Xx. 21).

Together, these references provide an impression of the demolition and building work conducted by Cosin in response to the damaged buildings he was faced with after the period of ownership of Auckland Castle by Haselrigge. Cosin clearly held Haselrigge responsible for the demolition of the existing chapel, and it was this which required Cosin to create a new one. Cosin's estimates for the repair work, which are perhaps more accurate in ascertaining the scale of the repair needed than the actual costs which included many stylistic changes to the buildings (see Appendix 2), suggest that most parts of the Castle required some kind of intervention. Lead, timber, glass, stone and flags suggest that basic structural repairs were needed while payment to plasterers indicates that the building required substantial internal repair also. Furthermore, Cosin's requests to remove the 'new building' built by Haselrigge reveal that Haselrigge had built a new structure on the site, and Langstaffe's instructions seem to suggest that this new building was placed between others which were arranged in a square-shaped configuration This might suggest a pre-existing courtyard arrangement of buildings to which Haselrigge's new building had been connected.

Recent archaeological investigations at Auckland Castle have shed light on this. Aside from confirming the location of this previously unlocated part of the medieval complex at Auckland, the excavations also reveal details of the demolition process. Firstly, very few fragments of glass, floor tile, lead, and masonry were recovered relative to a building of this size. This suggests that the building was systematically dismantled, and its materials reused. The presence of only foundations and ground-level deposits fits with Cosin's description that the building had been comprehensively demolished. One buttress appears to have been blown up with gunpowder (Figure 6.5). Additional ground penetrating radar (GPR) surveys of the area to the south of St Peter's Chapel/the former Great Hall (Figure 6.6) reveal rectilinear features beneath the ground surface which are consistent with what could be Haselrigge's house, a square-shaped feature with an internal cross-shaped feature creating four equal internal compartments. Altogether this could represent an internal arrangement of four equal rooms, or an external garden design. Without further archaeological investigation it is

impossible to be sure. In either case however, features like these are broadly consistent with the kind of residence expected to have been built by Haselrigge.

The antiquarian William Dugdale in 1666 commented that Haselrigge's house resembled that constructed by Oliver St John, Oliver Cromwell's Lord Chief Justice (Raine 1852: 89), who had commissioned architect Peter Mills (Bold 2008) to design and build Thorpe Hall near Peterborough on the site of the demolished residence of the Bishops of Peterborough which had similarly been acquired through its sale by the Parliamentary Commissioner. Thorpe Hall took only three years to build (1653-1656) and was finished at the apex of St John's political career and influence (Figure 6.7). As an active and prominent member of parliament, St John was well-known within Parliamentarian circles. His house was one of the earliest Parliamentarian houses to be completed (Mowl and Earnshaw 1995: 45), and it is therefore unsurprising that it should have been a prototype for other newly acquired Parliamentarian properties like Auckland.

In many ways, Auckland Castle was a more attractive asset than the episcopal estate at Longthorpe, where Thorpe Hall was built. The Bishops of Durham were historically wealthier than the Bishops of Peterborough, and the value of their estates reflected that. The Bishops of Peterborough owned far fewer episcopal houses during the later medieval period, almost half those in the possession of the bishops of Durham (Thompson 1998: 72). Moreover, Auckland Castle had extensive parkland attached, whereas Longthorpe did not. Very little is known about the nature and form of Longthorpe as the episcopal buildings were completely demolished in the creation of Thorpe Hall (Allen Archaeology 2014). Despite this, the geophysical evidence for Haselrigge's house at Auckland Castle shows it to have been a significantly smaller building. It is not known if Haselrigge had completed his building by the Restoration, and it is possible that what is represented on the geophysics is a partial/incomplete structure. Further archaeological investigation of this area would be needed to understand this better. Nevertheless, understanding its relationship to Thorpe Hall is useful for conceptualising a layout and understanding its form. Essential components probably borrowed from Thorpe Hall, which appear to correspond with the geophysics, include equal proportioning of rooms, symmetry between rooms and façade and a central staircase with a hallway entrance. Some of these features, including equal proportioning of spaces and symmetry, appear to be represented in the GPR images. Together, these pieces of evidence point to the creation of a house on this site which borrowed heavily from the design aesthetic of Thorpe Hall.

When Haselrigge first arrived at Auckland Castle, the buildings he saw there were centred around the 12th century Great Hall and the complex as a whole maintained the medieval domestic floor plan associated with a building of its purpose, albeit with additional attached ranges. The order of spaces promoted social differentiation through a hierarchical layering of rooms with different social permittances (see Smith 2016; Smith and Graves 2017). In this way, the bishops were aggrandised by

their environment. What Haselrigge now proposed was a radical new way of living on the same site. The spatial dynamics and access routes through compact-plan houses such as Thorpe Hall enabled free and easy movement between rooms and via a central hallway; few spaces have restrictions on access. Kimberley Skelton (2009) and others (i.e. Mowl and Earnshaw 1995) emphasise the visibility of servants inside the elite country houses of the 1650s because of the lack of designated service areas and connectivity between spaces. The differences between these two residences therefore echo different attitudes to religion and social values. In many ways, the arrangement of the episcopal residence at Auckland Castle reflected the clerical hierarchy of the Church more widely. Spatial exclusivity was a notion that permeated many aspects of later medieval religion, with churches, cathedrals and monasteries being zoned according to clerical and social ranking. Protestantism had deconstructed some of these barriers, while Puritanism was focused on the eradication of clerical hierarchy, procedure and exclusion altogether. These ideals have been mapped through patterns of iconoclasm in clerical and domestic settings nationwide (Aston 1996). Moreover, with the removal and reduced circumstances of so many noble families in England and Wales following the Civil Wars (Adamson 1987), this arguably ushered in an era of greater social fluidity and modernity. The conscious lack of social differentiation in the emerging new country houses of the 1650s arguably reflects this wider social trend (Skelton 2009).

For a short period, while they stood side-by-side, the spatial juxtaposition between Haselrigge's new house and what remained of the episcopal residence at Auckland Castle would have been visually striking. It is unclear whether Haselrigge intended to demolish the rest of the episcopal residence at Auckland Castle had he remained at the site following the Restoration, but the decision to demolish the late-13th/early-14th century chapel built by Bishop Bek could be interpreted both as a deliberate act of iconoclasm as well as something more functional - to quarry stone for the construction of his new residence alongside. Public religious buildings suffered the most from Puritanical iconoclasm across England, with the removal of fixtures and fittings and visual references to religion being stripped away in favour of simpler religious practices (Aston 1996). However, churches were rarely demolished, though new meeting houses were constructed in some places. The priority given by Haselrigge to the demolition of Bek's chapel at Auckland Castle – this being the first and only large structure removed by him – suggests a visual and symbolic statement of belief was being made about Puritanical dominance over the site.

William Heveningham's treatment of Rose Castle presents a different approach. When Heveningham acquired Rose Castle in 1650 it had been badly affected by fire during the Civil Wars (see Appendix 9). He actively restored parts of the damaged episcopal residence rather than rebuild or remodel the site. The effect was to consolidate surviving portions of the building, primarily the south and east wings, and create a habitable residence within. Unusually, some of Heveningham's accounts have

survived preserved within the accounts of the Bailiff of Dalston. This account reveals that the bulk of the building work was concentrated on Kite's Tower, and it seems that this part of the site became the main occupational area for Heveningham and his household. Special note should be taken of the insertion of new stylistic features, notably the insertion of six windows (including four French windows) and 'bringing up' of two chimneys. Unfortunately, the façade of Kite's Tower was refaced by architect Thomas Rickman in the early 19th century in the Regency Gothic style (see Appendix 9). These alterations obscure all Heveningham's exterior work, with new windows, crenelated parapet and ashlar all being added later. Tatton-Brown (2004) has analysed and produced a comprehensive stone-by-stone recording of the facade extending north-west from Kite's Tower which was not subject to revision by Rickman. His findings suggest that Heveningham did not concentrate his efforts on this part of the building, with the phasing confidently dated to 14th and 16th centuries. In the interior, significant plaster remodelling and wooden panelling inserted during the 18th and 19th centuries inside Kite Tower have similarly obscured visible traces of Heveningham's building work.

Aside from the restoration of the Kite Tower, Heveningham's impact on the rest of the building is hardly noticeable. If the accounts are to be believed that the Civil War fires caused the destruction of the south and east ranges, then the survival of the areas beyond Kite's Tower are likely also attributable to him. Significantly, this included areas strongly attributed to its episcopal occupation. For example, the chapel located in the north range survived throughout the Commonwealth period. Moreover, the gatehouse featuring the episcopal coat of arms and the monogram of the 15th century Bishop Richard Bell on the Bell Tower was retained. Heveningham made no obvious attempt to erase the visual memory of the bishops at this site, despite having the opportunity to do so. Analysis of the floor plan of Kite's Tower based on images allegedly depicting it before the Commonwealth, and its reconstructed present-day floor plan, reveal that it too has been minimally altered. In many ways, the Kite Tower existed as an independent structural entity akin to modern country houses of the 1650s.

6.5 The abolition of episcopacy in Scotland: demolition and iconoclasm (1638-1661)

As in England, the episcopacy was abolished in Scotland following the Civil Wars which had, by 1638, consumed all three nations of England, Scotland and Ireland. As in England, the episcopacy was reinstated after the Restoration in Scotland in 1661 but then again abolished in 1683. This second, and permanent, abolition is arguably the more impactful on the structural form of the buildings as we see them today. A relative abundance of 17th and 18th century documentary information means that, in many cases, it is possible to reconstruct their decline, although this same source material does not generally exist for the earlier abolition of episcopacy between 1638-1661.

Most of the Scottish houses exist only as ruins or below-ground deposits and there is little available archaeological and standing buildings evidence. Excavations at Stow Bishop's House in the bishopric of Glasgow have identified clear evidence of occupation there between the 17th-late 18th centuries, including the subdivision of the existing hall to accommodate human and animal cohabitation (Cox et al 2000). The artefact assemblage recovered during this excavation shows evidence for everyday non-elite habitation which is entirely consistent with the period (Appendix 19) and demonstrate that this residence was converted into an ordinary domestic dwelling. Unfortunately, based on the available archaeological evidence, it is impossible to say if any of these artefacts or building changes were conducted between 1638-1661, or after 1685.

Cox et al (2000) highlight how little this site appears in later medieval and early modern court records, suggesting that it was never an important residence of the Bishops of Glasgow and consequently did not host a court. This can also be inferred by its small size and the simplicity of this structure in comparison with other palace sites. This might have contributed to its survival as it lacked obvious demarcating features associated with episcopal residences and many of the 'lesser' episcopal residences appear to have survived in better states of repair in this way. For example, the bishop's residence on Edinburgh Cowgate survived intact until the late 19th century (Appendix 13). Monimail Tower, meanwhile, allegedly survived well into the 18th century, before most of the structure was purposefully ruined to create a decorative garden feature.

Surviving documentary evidence for St Andrews Castle provides the best evidence for its condition between 1638-1661 (Appendix 12). A council order from the St Andrews' Burgh Council dated from October 1654 called for the *'sleatts and timmer, red and lumps'* from St Andrews Castle to be sold to generate revenue for the repair and rebuilding of the harbour and bridges in St Andrews and surrounding areas (Rogers 1849: 62). This implies that St Andrews Castle was abandoned at this time enabling it to be plundered for resources. The involvement of the Burgh suggests that it might have been deemed to be a property of the Burgh during this period of episcopal vacancy.

While this evidence suggests that all residences in Scotland were left vacant, there was a mixed response to this which accounts in some respects for their varied preservation after 1661. By 1661, St Andrews Castle and other diocesan houses like Glasgow Bishop's Palace were ruined or in poor states of repair, a point lamented upon by the incoming bishops (Appendix 12 and 14), and their total dilapidation after 1686 was rapid, probably relating to sustained periods of neglect. This neglect, it might be suggested, relates to their overt symbolic attachment to the concept of episcopacy and therefore the status of the houses themselves. In contrast, many of the 'minor' houses had continued on in use after 1686, suggesting that they had not undergone long periods of neglect. These houses were more easily assimilated into the wider building stock

The final chapter which follows is a discussion and conclusion which reflects on the wider context of the findings of this thesis.

7

Discussion and conclusion

7.1 Introduction

This final chapter draws out the conclusions from the previous four chapters and sets the findings into a wider historical and archaeological context. Using information drawn primarily from secondary sources as comparative datasets together with the findings from this thesis, I address the main objectives of the thesis set out in Chapter 1 and assess how the changing social, religious and political context affected the development and use of bishop's houses and their surroundings.

7.2 Sources

Analysis of the available evidence in Chapter 2 indicated a substantial disparity in the types of sources available for each site and this has greatly influenced the state of knowledge about the residences in each bishopric. As we have seen, the residences of the dioceses of Durham and Carlisle are the mostly richly documented, while the Scottish residences are generally lacking due to prevailing wider social and political conditions after the Reformation. Surviving Scottish texts confirm that these kinds of sources once existed, but that they have been lost since or else deliberately destroyed. Within those

English dioceses which form part of this study, historic documents provide an exceptionally detailed resource for understanding building and landscape use and change, and the sources pertaining to the bishopric of Durham are particularly rich. Similarly, the English dioceses include a greater number of well-preserved, standing bishop's houses in comparison with the Scottish dioceses which contain none at all. Likewise, the majority of ruined buildings that have been professionally investigated are concentrated on the English side of the border. As a result, the evidence drawn from standing buildings is notably biased towards the English dioceses. On the other hand, archaeological evidence is better distributed. Most of the excavations discussed in this thesis were developer-led projects, with the great majority of them occurring in urban settings. Consequently, the urban sites relating to the (arch)bishoprics of Durham and Glasgow have received the most archaeological attention, with the residences of the bishops of Carlisle receiving the least. As we have seen, however, the quality of the excavations does vary according to their aims, what was found, and how recent the project was. Some major projects like Bishop Auckland are still underway (2018-21). In general, as we saw particularly in Chapter 4, it is the more recent archaeological projects that have yielded the more substantial artefact and ecofact assemblages, and it is these which have been the subject of more rigorous analysis. Taken together therefore, the evidence available for understanding the residences associated with the (arch)bishops of Durham, Carlisle, Glasgow and St Andrews is unbalanced according to geography, wider historic events, past and present building agendas and the modern use of sites.

There are some clear parallels and differences between the bishoprics in the ways in which their buildings developed, and their roles during the study period, and their eventual treatment. It is clear through a discussion of their topographical and landscape attributes and geographical distribution (Chapter 2 and Appendices 12, 13, 14), that the houses had and maintained specific roles which varied according to bishopric. All dioceses are associated with residences close to their diocesan centres, and ones further afield which were used as way-stations or for their hunting or military potential. Overwhelmingly, as we saw in Chapter 6, it is these houses which were most often leased during the study-period, or in Scotland they are often sold. In all the bishoprics, there is clear specialisation of episcopal residences by the beginning of the study period, mostly those within their diocesan centres and these houses received continued investment throughout the study-period. Overwhelmingly, the Scottish houses witnessed the most violence because of the events of the Scottish Reformation and this has severely impacted the survival rates of these houses (Chapter 2 and Appendices 12, 13 and 14). The post-Restoration uses for English residences follow a more rigid pattern, whereas the Scottish houses are affected by their situations more randomly. Ultimately therefore, the similarities and differences relating to the histories and developments of these sites are rooted in the stories of these sites, which are able to better inform our understanding of their wider roles.

7.3 Household and family

7.3.1 Overview

Viewed simply, the greatest change witnessed in this period is the increase in the number of rooms at episcopal residences. This change has been noted among rooms affecting all three groups of occupants; bishop, family and household. As was argued in Chapter 3, this development is a direct result of wider religious and social factors which affected the ways in which individuals lived within these buildings and the roles that they performed from them. These changes similarly fall in line with wider architectural trends throughout the 16th and 17th centuries which affected elite residences more widely (although in some respects they were in the vanguard such as the installation of fountain at Rose Castle discussed in Chapter 5). However, there are no instances of entirely new building ranges being constructed at the sites under study here at this period, and as such most building changes affecting the habitational practices of the bishop, family and household took place *within* those areas of the building previously used for these same purposes. Bishops were confined by pre-existing spaces, and their building decisions were limited accordingly.

Chapter 3 also demonstrated that not all the study-residences developed at the same pace; many houses received no attention at all during this period. Most of the large-scale building work was related to the changing lifestyles of the bishops, family and household and was concentrated on the major episcopal houses. This likely reflects trends in site preferences which began in the mid-15th century (Chapter 2; Smith 2016). Chapter 3 also considered anecdotal and documentary evidence which sheds light on the ways that spaces were lived-in and experienced by their owners. Differences were identified in the pattern of development at the Scottish and English sites, though these results are limited due to the differing quality of available archaeology, standing buildings and documentary evidence in the different regions. While purpose-built accommodation areas were installed at the Scottish residences, these differed in location and form to those at the English sites and there was a distinct lack of provision for wives and families at Scottish sites.

7.3.2 New rooms, change and the re-use of existing rooms

At all major episcopal residences, new rooms were created within pre-existing spaces which generally provided additional accommodation areas for bishops, families and members of the household. The most numerous of these new spaces visible are associated with service. In addition to the usual rooms which might be expected at elite houses during this period, such as kitchens, butteries, stables, gatehouses, bakehouses and brewhouses, more unusual spaces included candlehouses, armouries and slaughterhouses in the 1628 inventory of Auckland Castle, a '*howse for horse milne'* and a kiln house in the 1574 inventory of Stockton Manor conducted following the death of Bishop Pilkington (1561-76). In Scotland, there were icehouses at both Melgund Castle and Monimail Tower. Servants can be

identified through their living quarters; gatekeepers and porters resided in gatehouses or lodges while some maids lived in dedicated chambers. Both cooks and scullery boys had accommodation at Durham Castle (see for example the 1628 Durham and Auckland Castle inventories).

The creation of private and semi-private apartments at major episcopal residences such as Durham Castle, Auckland Castle, Rose Castle and St Andrews Castle shows a profound change in the ways that these houses were inhabited by bishops. There is a clear move away from large chamber-based accommodation, towards houses with more rooms designed for specialist purposes. The inclusion of bedchambers and studies especially for bishops and senior members of their courts demonstrates a shift away from lifestyles centred on the bishop's chamber towards a lifestyle centred on privacy. Access analysis of the bishop's chamber and the study at Durham Castle in Chapter 3 reveals that these spaces were located in spatially remote areas of the building. If spatial distance and the complexity of access routes connote exclusivity then the bishop's personal rooms can be considered among the most private of the spaces in the building.

Bishop's houses are unusual due to their, as yet unsatisfactorily explained, propensity towards a double-range layout comprising Great Hall and large chamber, sometimes equal in size to the Great Hall during the later medieval period (Rollason 2017; Thompson 1998). Michael Burger (2017) has examined the ways in which the term '*camera*' (translated as 'chamber') is used in documents dated from the 12-15th centuries relating to meetings between the bishop and clergy, such as ordinations, in episcopal houses. His research shows that English clergy often met with the bishop in small numbers (less than 10) within the chamber, suggesting that these spaces were used for official clerical matters as well as accommodation. By removing chambers from common usage at these buildings through their subdivision into other rooms, both its function as a workplace and accommodation area were profoundly altered. These changes might therefore logically suggest that the episcopal role had sufficiently changed from its later medieval function so as to not necessitate these large spaces.

Despite changes to Church hierarchy as a result of the Reformation, most episcopal duties remained largely unaltered. The bishop's role was as multifaceted and varied as it had always been. They were responsible for communicating religious instruction, either from the Vatican (pre-Reformation) or monarch (post-Reformation) to their associated religious communities, a task which was usually performed at their residences or through sermons and religious convocations. As major landowners, they were at the top of a command chain that facilitated the effective management of their estates. Meetings with the overseeing administrative officials of the bishopric took place at episcopal residences, with business also being conducted by letter, and there was the business of the household to be conducted too (Section 3.3.2). Beyond these diocesan responsibilities, bishops maintained theological careers which connected them with varied religious and intellectual circles in Britain and in Europe. For example, Bishop James Ussher of Carlisle (1642-43) authored 'Immanuel, or the

mystery of incarnation' during his one-year episcopate in Carlisle (Elrington 1847: 17). In addition, many bishops also held roles in the courts of English and Scottish monarchs, which necessitated the use of London and Edinburgh houses. For example, Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall of Durham (1530-1559) is known to have spent long periods away from his diocese, undertaking diplomatic work abroad and engaging in political affairs in London (Newcombe 2013). Despite the changing religious atmosphere in both England and Scotland, these responsibilities changed minimally from the later medieval period (see Chapter 1). It is therefore not without interest that, while the role of the bishop did not change fundamentally, their buildings did. As we have seen in Chapter 3, episcopal residences were now subdivided to create new rooms. This new 'way of living' however was not a functional requirement, nor one that was religiously motivated, rather it was driven by wider changes in domestic living arrangements in polite architecture which involved different patterns of circulation, the number of rooms listed in inventories (and quite possibly the types of goods seen in those rooms), and greater uniformity (Johnson 1993, 140-163)

Spaces occupied by wives and families are of particular interest, but less defined trends can be identified in the sample of buildings under study here. Although nurseries and mistress chambers were identified in the 1628 inventories of Durham and Auckland Castles', and they are mentioned in household inventories from Rose Castle, there is little consistency in the position and nature of these spaces. It seems most likely that they were inserted within pre-existing rooms. There is no explicit reference to *any* spaces inhabited by wives and families at Rose Castle, despite their obvious presence at these sites. Unlike spaces created for medieval queens (Richardson 2003) or nuns (Gilchrist 1999), there was no conscious attempt to install purpose-built accommodation ranges for wives and families. This inconsistency in spatial provisioning may relate to social and religious attitudes toward them. Clerical marriage was a contentious subject in early modern Britain, and the position on clerical marriage fluctuated according to monarch and national religious sentiment. The issue of clerical marriage was debated during the reign of Henry VIII, but it was not until 1547 in the reign of Edward VI that clerical marriage was legally permitted, thereby creating a new wave of clergy who were now free to marry and raise families. Evidence from this period and from deprivations made under Mary I suggests that the initial uptake of clerical marriage during the reign of Edward VI was slow, with many clergy members and lay people still being fundamentally opposed to the practice; the volatile political climate evidently promoted a sense of caution (Carlson 1992: 6-8). In the following decades, the familial freedoms first instigated by Edward VI were challenged, first during the Marian Counter-Reformation and then during the reign of Elizabeth I. In 1553, Mary I restored Church doctrine to the point it had been at during the Six Articles in 1539, thereby undoing the policies around clerical marriage. Married clergy were forced to renounce their marriages or seek exile to avoid execution (see Grieve 1940 for examples of affected clergy).

By 1559, Church doctrine had been reinstated to its position at the point of Edward VI's death, which included full reinstatement of clerical marriage. Despite its official standing, however, contemporary reports hint at Elizabeth I's reluctance over the issue (Parish 2017b; Doran 1996; Bjorklund 2003; Prior 1985; Berlatsky 1978). Eric Carlson's (1992) position that Elizabeth I exhibited no hostility towards the practice has been repeatedly challenged (Parish 2000; Prior 1985; Berlatsky 1978), most notably by Nancy Bjorklund (2003) who uses the personal testimonies of the Archbishop of Canterbury Matthew Parker (1504-75) to illustrate the ways in which the Queen's attitude perpetuated a hostile environment for clergy. Approval had to be sought from the bishop and wife's family before lower clergy were permitted to marry, and women were not permitted to enter cathedral and college precincts.

The practical implication of this for the buildings discussed in this thesis is that many clergy members were forced to live alone within the college, or else could choose to live outside it with their families (Bjorklund 2003). Although Elizabeth's appointment of married clergy to senior positions indicates that she had no theological concerns over clerical marriage, these restrictions hindered the progress of clerical marriage across the wider Church. Carlson (1992) explains Elizabeth's control over clerical marriage as an attempt to prevent scandal in the Church, while Bjorklund (2003) cites personal disaffection as the cause. In either case, until after the Restoration bishops were not able to regain the same level of freedom around marriage and family that had existed under Edward VI. On that basis, the lack of consistent provision for wives and families in episcopal residences probably relates specifically to these changing religious attitudes towards clerical marriage. Given changing attitudes as a result of the fluctuating stance on Protestantism within 16th century Britain, it is understandable that bishops might have been reluctant to install new permanent ranges or suites of rooms if the tide of social change was liable to oppose episcopal marriage. Consequently, their relative invisibility within the layout of these sites and material culture associated with them is evidence of the wider political and religious context in which they existed.

7.3.3 The lived experiences of occupants

Although in theory they fulfilled the same role, not all bishops in this sample lived the same lives. As Section 3.2 shows, there is ample historical evidence for the disparity in wealth between the Bishops of Carlisle and Durham, for example. Repeated references to the financial insecurity and poverty by the Carlisle bishops, coupled with the dilapidation of Rose Castle, demonstrate that, despite the fact that the layout of the building included many of the same spaces as Durham and Auckland Castles, the experiences of their inhabitants varied. Of particular interest in this thesis, however, is the experience of women in bishop's houses.

Studies of iconography depicting bishop's wives indicate the ways in which they were presented by the Church. Sherlock (2004: 677) uses the example of Fridesmund Barnes (neé Gifford), wife of Bishop Richard Barnes of Durham (1577-87) who died during her husband's episcopate in Durham in 1581. Fridesmund was buried at Auckland St Andrew's Church in Bishop Auckland, and Barnes erected a tombstone at her grave. On it, Fridesmund is depicted as diminutive in stature in the praying position. This particular image draws on a legacy of Christian female iconography to denote ideas of piety, devotion and modesty. Fridesmund's kneeling posture echoes the act of prayer, while her stature promotes the idea of modesty and devotion to her husband. By extension, her devotion to her husband links to the idea of devotion to the Church - a depiction which can be likened to later medieval and early modern images of nuns and female saints, who often adopt similar poses (see for example Carroll 2003). By choosing to represent episcopal wives visually within this graphic canon, there was a conscious effort to align them with a particular legacy of pious and devoted women.

In contrast, historical evidence demonstrates that bishop's wives played an active role socially within their residences, despite the position of some writers on this subject. Mary Prior (1985) argues that bishop's wives were marginalised across the social spectrum. Among the lay population, Prior argues, hostility toward change in Church hierarchy and the divine status of clergy was often projected onto bishop's wives. Under Catholicism, the semi-divine status of clergy was reinforced by celibacy and also reflective of it, whereas under Protestantism the clergy lacked the same divine ordination. No longer bound by traditional conventions surrounding sexual desire, clergy moved from a position of moral superiority to having the same level of 'virtue' as lay people. Not everyone approved of this transition, with studies of contemporary pamphlets revealing an undercurrent of distaste toward the new clergy (Prior 1985). Labelled 'reviled and crucified' (Prior 1985) and 'bitch fox whores' (Bjorklund 2003), the rhetoric used was frequently derogatory and inflammatory. Berlatsky (1978) and Prior (1985) have both noted that, during the 16th century, few women from gentry classes married bishops despite the obvious benefits that links between these two large landowning classes might have achieved. Instead, it was ordinary women who married the bishops and this in turn aggravated some opponents to clerical marriage. Many bishops married before their translations so that their wives made the upward social journey through the clerical ranks alongside their husbands.

Prior (1985) further argues that there was no clear distinction between domestic and religious duties within an episcopal household. As bishop's houses were property of the diocese and therefore constituted the place of work for bishops, the role of a typical wife would not have been appropriate within an episcopal household. Traditionally, that role might have included managing the home, raising children and acting as a proxy for their husband when he was away or incapacitated. Because of the close relationship between the domestic and working life of the bishop, Prior argues that a bishop's wife could not have performed this usual combination of duties without infringing on the

sacral duties of a bishop (Prior 1985). This might imply perhaps that the role of wife was somewhat redundant in this context. However, this does not seem to be the case among the wives of the bishops studied here.

Abigail Snoden (neé Orme) is of particular interest in this discussion (Section 6.3.1). Abigail was the wife of Bishop Robert Snoden of Carlisle (1616-21) and she took an active role in the affairs of her husband following his death and before the appointment of his successor. Among her recorded achievements is the resolution of a dispute between her husband and his ex-constable which led to a reported altercation between Abigail and Robert Lowther's wife in which she was "called a bad name" (Wilson 1912: 36). Moreover, Abigail is known to have continued the management of Rose Park in her husband's absence, leading to his successor accusing Abigail of illegal tree felling to the value of £300 (Wilson 1912: 36). Together, these acts reveal that Abigail was in a position to make high-level executive decisions, and that these were seemingly unchallenged. She acted as a proxy for her husband in a manner which was much the same as other 'elite wives'.

The experiences of Dorothy Neile (neé Dacre), the wife of Bishop Richard Neile (1617-27), further blur the boundaries between what was considered domestic or religious activity. Richard Neile met with his Durham House Group at Durham House in London (Foster 2005; Green 2017). Dorothy was central in fostering a warm and hospitable environment there which assisted in the agenda spearheaded by her husband (Foster 2005; Green 2017). She is known to have hosted members of the group alongside her husband. Her value within this group is reflected in the items that she was bequeathed by members of the group, which included plate, furniture and money (Foster 2005). These gifts speak of a woman who was both valued within her community as well as respected theologically and domestically. Similarly, following the death of Robert Snoden in 1621, Abigail was leased Horncastle Manor by Snoden's successor, Richard Milbourne, for three generations (Walter 1908: 60). While the leasing of episcopal residences was not unusual at this time (see Chapter 3 for more detail), the leasing of them to an episcopal widow and children was uncommon. Like the bequests to Dorothy Neile, this generosity hints at the importance and value inspired by Abigail.

The ways in which wives, mistresses and families were accommodated at episcopal residences is a major point of difference between the English and Scottish study-sites and this is likely to reflect different attitudes towards clerical marriage between the two countries. In Scotland, clerical marriage was permitted after 1560. Unlike England, the Scottish clergy had a long history of concubinage, with clergy from many ranks openly keeping mistresses (Ryrie 2004: 3-4). The issue of clerical concubinage was a primary point of debate in the Reformation of the 1550s and 1560s and became inflammatory for radical reformers like John Knox and George Wishart (Ryrie 2004). In the four councils led by John Hamilton, the issue of clerical concubinage was a central subject, being discussed alongside issues like nepotism and heresy as examples of moral degradation among the

clergy (Winning 1959; Ryrie 2004). Of the bishops being studied here, two had high-profile mistresses prior to the introduction of clerical marriage. Cardinal David Beaton (1539-46) was in a long-term relationship with Marion Ogilvy, daughter of James Ogilvy, 1st Lord Ogilvy of Airlie, during which they had eight children (Sanderson 1986: 57-93). James Hamilton (1546-71) similarly engaged in a long-term relationship with Grizzell Semphill, daughter of Robert Semphill, 3rd Lord Semphill, and had three children by her (Laing 1846). The noble backgrounds of Ogilvy and Semphill, together with their discussion in works by Knox (Laing 1846), indicate that these were figures well known in society at large and highlights the contrast in attitudes toward clerical marriage, relationships and families between the Churches of Scotland and England.

The openness of relationships and elite position of these Scottish mistresses contrasts with what is known about both illicit clerical relationships and clerical marriages after 1546 in England. It suggests that in Scotland the social position of the clergy was such that otherwise controversial issues in England were not as problematized there. This may be due to the generally elite backgrounds of the 16th century Scottish clergy, who often had familial connections to the dioceses and close connections with the monarchy (Chapter 1). After the introduction of clerical marriage in 1560 there was a notable uptake in marriage among the Scottish study-bishops. Given the earlier preferences of bishops to take concubines and mistresses, this trend might be a natural continuation of this practice. In any case, the legitimacy of these wives would arguably have enabled them to live in full view at episcopal residences. It is unclear whether earlier mistresses had these same freedoms. Marion Ogilvy is known to have lived at Ethie Castle, near Arbroath, a residence which was purchased for her by Beaton (Coventry 2008: 35). Knox alleged that on the night of Beaton's murder Ogilvy was at St Andrew's Castle, stating:

'And so it was in dead; for he had bene busy at his comptis with Maistres Marioun Ogilbye that nycht, who was espyed to departe frome him by the previe postern that morning' (Laing 1846: 174-5)

Given the political agenda behind Knox's writing, it is impossible to know whether this source carries any weight. However, it perhaps reveals an expectation that mistresses were permitted within episcopal residences. Altogether, this evidence reveals a fundamentally different attitude towards bishops' wives and mistresses at episcopal residences than is displayed for the English sites.

7.4 Hospitality

7.4.1 Overview

Through the physical remains of their buildings, objects and ecofacts together with documentary evidence, Chapter 4 demonstrates the varied ways in which hospitality was enacted and experienced at episcopal residences. Evidence for feasting demonstrates that, for the Bishops of Durham at least,

hospitality remained an important part of the bishop's role throughout the study period. Food-supply networks show a continuation of earlier practices and newly discovered material culture emphasises the divide between guest and host. High-status tableware, including imported glass and exotic materials of manufacture, speaks of the wealth and power exerted by the host through the visual and the tactile. This notion is similarly reflected in visual allusions to episcopacy at Durham Castle, which mimic ideas of personal cult and royal stylistic tropes and so emphasise the unique status of 15th century bishops who lived there. I have suggested here that this same idea was revived by Tunstall in the creation of his galleries which centred on images and symbols of historic episcopacy and so conveyed his personal beliefs and allegiances to an elite audience. In each case the personal ambitions of the host are intermingled with the legacy of episcopacy in Durham to create powerful visual cues which elevated the position of the bishop and provided them with legitimacy. In this way, the power dynamic between the guest and host became clear and the role of hospitality was solidified.

Elsewhere, this same dynamic is much less obvious. At both St Andrews Castle and Rose Castle, the inclusion of galleries and dining spaces is also inherently connected with hospitality but their positioning suggests greater spatial and topographic limitations and different agendas. The location of the long gallery at Rose Castle arguably served a wider less elite audience and, while the inclusion of this new space was an act of architectural modernity, its situation also underlined the physical limitations of the existing building layout. In many ways, the spatial differences observed between the galleries at Rose Castle and Durham and Auckland castles emphasise the role of the audience and hint at the specific intentions of the host. While the positioning of the galleries at Durham and Auckland arguably reflects a conscious desire to project a crafted vision of episcopacy for the furtherment of Tunstall's religious ambitions, the gallery at Rose Castle suggests a more general audience and a practical purpose as a withdrawing or reception area servicing the feast-goers. Its proximity to service areas is unproblematic as its purpose was more strictly functional.

Taken together, these findings reveal that hospitality remained an important part of episcopal life throughout the study period, and that it provided an outlet for the promotion and reflection of the self-identity of the bishop, beyond the mere promotion of their role. These findings largely correspond with established understandings around the trajectory of hospitality throughout the study period (Section 5.2.) but also reveal that feasting remained a mainstay of hospitality proceedings and that there was constant requirement throughout the study-period to enhance and update the experience of hospitality to accommodate a changing religious and social context.

7.4.2 Hospitality as a vessel for the promotion of identity, cult and wealth

The tension between our own self-identity and the ways that we manifest it outwardly has captured considerable scholarly and public attention. Identity theory and concepts of personhood have both

been successfully applied to material culture studies (e.g. Fowler 2004; Gilchrist 2000), and more sophisticated approaches under the umbrella of identity theories have been valuable in shedding light on markers of societal differentiation, such as gender, ethnicity, religion and status (e.g. Diaz-Andreu et al 2005; Insoll 2007). The expression of 'self' has also not escaped the gaze of those seeking meaning behind stylistic developments in buildings, landscapes and urban environments (i.e. Hall 2006; Casella and Fowler 2004; Belford 2011).

If we accept that self-identity is influenced by context, then the thoughts and opinions of contemporary people surely served as an important driver. At its core, hospitality is performative. The spoken and unspoken exchanges between two or more parties carries with it a range of cultural, obligatory and hegemonic meanings which can only be interpreted within the wider context in which they exist. In this case, the social, political and religious climate during the study period for this thesis was turbulent for bishops in England and Scotland. With the fluctuating stance on Catholicism, Protestantism, Anglicanism, Presbyterianism and other religious movements, the ways in which bishops tethered themselves to a religious ideal impacted on their role, the trajectory of their future careers, and the episcopacy more widely. The abolition of episcopacy in many parts of mainland Europe would have been a constant reminder of their vulnerability, while the increasing influence of radical Christian theologies in England and Scotland (e.g. Dissenters) further confused questions of religious allegiance and identity. These issues, coupled with the visual legacy of their residences which had originally been built for prominent medieval Catholic bishops, emphasised their unusual, and arguably anachronistic, position in early modern English and Scottish society compared with elsewhere in Protestant Europe. The ways that bishops chose to present themselves and their houses to visitors is therefore of the greatest importance when seeking to understand how bishops shaped their outward identities. It must be remembered too that all these challenges took place within the wider context of societal flux in the practice of hospitality, and the role of the 'home', both of which changed dramatically during this period. As landowning elites, bishops also had to negotiate the changing architectural fashions and lifestyle customs which reflected wider societal changes.

In late medieval Britain, feasting was *the* major event at which hospitality was enacted and received on a domestic level. Feasts were common place, and in earlier centuries, the primary way in which elites dined when accompanied by their Great Household (Kjær and Watson 2011). For itinerant households, which was the common practice among 11th-14th century bishops, their way of life demanded regular feasting to expend resources and feed their extensive households (Barrow 2012). Households decreased in size after the mid-14th century (Woolgar 1999: 456-9) leading to greater sedentism at fewer houses (Smith 2016), and so feasting became more irregular. The nature of feasting depended on the occasion, with special feasts celebrating religious festivals and important occasions (Davidson 2007). Although typically imagined as an elite activity, these feasts were

experienced by all societal levels in different ways. The feast provider usually sat atop a dais at the 'high-end' of the hall (see below), with their courtiers, retainers, household and guests at degrees of distance corresponding to their social position (King 2003; Heal 1990: 15-23). The layout of medieval elite residences echoed and reinforced these social dynamics. Beyond the arrangement of people within the hall, the positioning of service spaces and private rooms at opposing ends corresponded with the high and low ends which were designated by architecture and furnishings (Emery 2005). The location of these rooms informed access routes through the buildings, further reinforcing the distinctions between household members (Smith 2016). Layered and complex access routes often designated social exclusion and privacy which corresponded to social status.

The aggrandisement of the host was a pervasive ideology that underpinned the entire feasting procedure. From the host's elevated position in the hall and rigid seating plans set out before them, to the complicated enforced dining practices which involved the first procession of food through the hall to the top-table (Crombie 2011), the act of feasting contained an inescapable theatricality. At its core, feasting was an opportunity to display defined hegemony, with power and authority reinforced by the feasting protocol and the architectural environment. In this way, the entire experience could be managed to reflect and project the ideals of the host. Though feasts were by nature reciprocal events between host and guest, the understood power-dynamics emphasised the host as the controller of that power.

The archaeological and documentary evidence presented in Chapter 4, much of which relates to feasting at Auckland Castle, can be successfully viewed within this broader theoretical framework. The material culture discovered through excavation together with the Fox salt-cellar all speak of the wealth of the medieval bishop through their exotic construction materials and royal patronage. When understood in the context of a feasting environment, these objects would have probably been visually prominent on the top table. The lack of other tableware discovered through excavations at Auckland Castle arguably highlights the difference between the elite and non-elite tableware which was either made of pewter or wood and would have juxtaposed against these prestigious items. Fox's salt-cellar dates from c.1500 while the glass and knife discovered in the 2019 excavations of Auckland Castle date from 17th century contexts so this emphasises the continuing trend for elite dining. This is reflected too in documentary sources which reveal that deer were continually being sought from Weardale Forest for special events (Chapter 5).

It is generally believed that the practice of hospitality changed alongside wider scale religious changes during the 16th-17th centuries. Religious and social attitudes toward the poor rejected the paternalism of medieval Catholicism, instead adopting a more countered approach (Schen 2002; Dubois 1988). While the principles of charity and mercy were still relevant and encouraged, new laws designed specifically to aid the poor made almsgiving an official matter (McIntosh 2005), thereby mechanising

the process and stripping away the personal, and optional, element of it. Much of the social caché attached to the process of providing alms to the poor during the feast no longer applied. Moreover, while grand displays of beneficence had been an indicator of wealth and power in the later medieval period, gestures of personal aggrandisement now became more significant. In connection with this, dining and hospitality gradually moved away from the theatrical setting of the Great Hall into a series of smaller dining rooms. These spaces were more comfortable: easily heated, better lit and they offered a less pressurised environment for dining (Crowley 2003). Where they existed, Great Halls continued to be used throughout the early modern period for larger events. In many places, the move from everyday dining in Great Halls to dining rooms was prefixed by the emergence of canopies in the 15th and early 16th centuries and the insertion of fixed or moveable wooden screens which subdivided larger spaces (e.g. Smith and Riall 2002).

Material culture and building development associated with the idea of 'comfort' now flourished (Crowley 2003). An increase in the commodification of tableware has been noted (Shammas 1980) and branding and hallmarks on ceramic and metal tableware emerge as industries as trade networks proliferated (Munck 2012). The old ways of displaying and projecting wealth, power and hegemony were replaced with an equally nuanced and subtle method of communicating the same ideas through material culture, household style and interior decoration. Whereas alms-giving and enforcement of social order through conspicuous proximity to the host and displays of largesse were once the markers of a successful host, in the early modern elite house these ideas were communicated through material culture and physical proximity to the host.

To some extent the evidence presented in Chapter 4 challenges these general themes, however. While the discoveries of the 17th century tableware could be reasonably presumed to be examples of elite tableware from smaller dining experiences, their discovery in contexts containing large quantities of animal bone suggests these came from feasting contexts. While it could reasonably be presumed that smaller-scale dining events would have occurred at both the residences of the Bishops of Durham and other sites, the evidence drawn together in this thesis refutes the claim that feasting became a redundant practice. It remained an important and vibrant part of episcopal life from which self-identity was expressed through the production of food and display of high-status tableware.

7.4.3 The audience experience

Felicity Heal's (1984) exploration of clerical hospitality both pre- and post-Reformation remains the definitive work on early modern hospitality. Through her integrated approach, Heal assesses the role of bishops within the wider sphere of hospitality as experienced by all sectors of society. Although she concludes that their position more closely resembled that of lay elites, her predominantly historical research indicates that their behaviours were also informed by their religious associations,

and that during and after the Reformation, the ways in which they practiced hospitality morphed accordingly. However, while detailed and thorough, bishops and episcopal hospitality form only one segment of Heal's wider inquiry into the nature of early modern hospitality. While the architecture and setting of feasts, dining and events are all discussed contextually, the range of documentary sources employed by Heal in relation to episcopal hospitality does not take into consideration the physical or material aspects of hospitality. This is an area which merits further study.

Heal's research reveals the different audiences who experienced hospitality at bishop's residences. The poor were the main group affected by changes to feasting arrangements because of the traditional provision of almsgiving at such events. Previously, feasts had forged an important hegemonic connection between the bishop and the wider diocesan community; local secular elites, landowners, tenants and members of religious communities were all regular guests (Bennett 1992). They would have passed through the gatehouse, inner courtyard and porches to gain access to the Great Hall. This experience was designed to enhance the visitor experience directly. Imposing facades, visible heraldry, controlled views and landscape design have all been identified in recent studies of secular medieval castles and manorial residences (e.g. Jamieson and Lane 2015) as just some of the ways in which an impression of the owner was 'constructed'. The same observations apply to episcopal residences. Some guests, including contemporary elites, clergy and visiting officials, also stayed at episcopal residences for extended periods. They gained access to accommodation spaces, bedrooms and chambers in addition to other areas used by other guests. But there are some other agendas at play which seem specific to at least some of the houses under discussion here. Section 4.3 examined the role of galleries as spaces which were designed as withdrawing areas for audiences which could then also be used promote the specific agendas of their creators. The shared views and similar spatial positioning of the galleries at Durham and Auckland Castles arguably promoted Tunstall's personal agenda and circumstance by drawing on the historic legacy of the Bishops of Durham as a way of legitimising his episcopate and role. Elsewhere, the different positioning of the gallery at Rose Castle emphasises the flexibility of these new spaces, while sharing many of the same physical characteristics. All these galleries were performative spaces in which the audience was central to their function.

7.5 Landscapes

Chapter 5 examined the role of parks and outside spaces in connection to the episcopal study-sites. This shed light on the different ways in which landscapes were productive areas for the cultivation of food for the bishops' tables, productive areas for rearing animals for profit and ornamental areas which served as backdrops to the episcopal residence. Utilising both documentary and archaeological datasets it was possible to identify different foods and resources produced in these parks and assess these through time. This chapter predominantly examined the parks belonging to the Bishops of

Durham due to the availability of source material, but it is hoped that the findings here might be used as a preliminary model for future study.

The key findings from Chapter 5 are that parks continued to be highly productive landscapes throughout the study period, while those parks connected to residences were kept in use as profitable landscapes long after residences had been leased or ceased to be inhabited. No new parks were established, nor were any discontinued during the study period, though some, including the Forest of Weardale, were discontinued as leisure and hunting grounds. Bishops continued to exploit landscapes inherited from the later medieval period and the resources they obtained were both varied and specific to different landscapes and available habitats. There was no obvious slowdown in the use of parks, and documentary evidence demonstrates that sophisticated administrative networks were well established.

Both parks and forests (and later chases) require significantly further research if they are to be reliably mapped and understood. Their curving pales are hard to date archaeologically and their associated documentation is patchy and focuses on expenses rather than the fuller range of activities represented (Mileson 2018). On the whole their importance has been underestimated but they were a vital resource for medieval bishops, as they were for other aristocratic groups. Deer breeding and hunting, timber, firewood, grazing rights, fines for poaching – all these were sources of income. But as we have seen, parks, in particular, also provided grazing for horses, cattle and sheep, hay from meadows, space for fishponds and fish houses, hawking and much else. Water features of different kinds, including fountains, moats and fishponds, were popular addition and the preservation of moats at most sites which had had them installed during the later medieval period suggests a deliberate attempt to retain them for aesthetic value. The acquisition and installation of swans on these moats, as at Northallerton Castle, reveals a conscious attempt to make use of this medieval feature despite its apparent redundancy by this period. Durham bishops seem to have been especially fond of their swans, for which the more remote and better guarded parks like Auckland Castle provided sanctuary. In each case, the management of the immediate landscapes around episcopal houses shows a desire to accentuate and aggrandise the buildings there using existing medieval landscape features. Parks and forests were not simply larders – they provided access to a common culture of aristocratic hunting and the recreational appreciation of landscape.

7.6 *In Absentia*

7.6.1 Overview

The evidence presented in Chapter 6 sheds light on the varied ways in which different occupants of the study sites treated their buildings. Studying the approaches of non-episcopal owners to episcopal houses and the ways that they adapted them for new uses provided a new perspective on the meaning

of these houses within their wider communities. When viewed together, few episcopal houses were purposely demolished, despite their antiquity and social/religious connotations. Haselrigge's deliberate demolition of Bek's chapel at Auckland Castle is a clear exception and the only verified example of the systematic and deliberate destruction of an episcopal building. Moreover, this is the only example studied here of an attempt to radically transform an episcopal building and create an entirely new structure within a decade of acquiring this site. At all other sites which came under the new long-term ownership or occupation by new parties, the decades immediately following their acquisition generally show little evidence for any drastic alteration of the existing buildings.

This is a surprise. The broad historical arc of religious and social life during the later 16th and 17th centuries corresponds to a growing mistrust of established Protestant religion and the kind of royal imposition and authority which bishops represented. On that basis, it might be expected that as episcopal houses slipped into secular ownership they would be systematically stripped of 'signifiers' of their episcopal legacy. However, through the deliberate retention of episcopal fabric, including coats-of-arms and stylistic motifs denoting episcopal ownership, these new owners were clearly preserving episcopal heritage of their buildings and incorporating it within their lived experience. These findings are particularly illuminating for understanding the occupational experiences of the new owners of Durham House and Carlisle House, and for Heveningham's residency at Rose Castle. There was a tacit acceptance of the history of structures, an implied value that these did not interfere with the identities of those who lived in these buildings.

Medieval and later episcopal residences are typically characterised by repeated programmes of building addition, with remarkably few instances of the wholesale demolition of existing structures. This led to convoluted and spatially distinctive layouts that contrasted with the daily needs of their new occupants. This difference is reflected in the creation of Haselrigge's new house at Auckland Castle, Heveningham's restoration of Kite's Tower at Rose Castle, and the varied ways that occupants lived in leased properties, such as John Hall occupying one area of Bishop Middleham Castle and the focus of occupation within the New Tower at Crayke Castle. Functional and spatial concerns about layouts seem to have outweighed any anxieties about the symbolism of the sites. Moreover, the antiquity of these newly acquired houses was itself a significant factor in their fate. The general trend for the dilapidation of leased properties throughout the study-period was clearly affected by the age of these properties when they were leased.

Underpinning all these outcomes, Chapter 6 highlighted the nuanced and varied ways that bishops' houses were treated by non-episcopal owners. There can be no truly holistic understanding of the role and value of these houses within wider communities without first understanding the particular social and religious positions of their new owners. It is obvious that these residences held different meanings among different audiences, and that these fluctuated between practical and symbolic purposes. In

some instances, the power and value of these houses came from their role as episcopal houses, whether that was viewed positively as at Durham House or Carlisle House, or negatively as at Auckland Castle. At other sites, their value can be more strictly understood to have been practical. Whatever the case, this period is especially important in understanding the lives and stories of these buildings. The events discussed in Chapter 6 have had some of the most lasting impacts on episcopal buildings and affect how we view them and their associated landscapes today.

7.6.2 Decay and destruction of episcopal houses

Most of the residences discussed in Chapter 6 either decayed or were deliberate destroyed during their periods of non-episcopal ownership, although only at a handful of sites can their mistreatment be considered genuinely malicious or iconoclastic. The destruction of parts of Rose Castle at the hands of Parliamentarian soldiers and the deliberate demolition of Bek's Chapel and other parts of Auckland Castle by Parliamentarian Sir Arthur Haslerigge are the only two instances of this occurring in the study area. For the most part, however, episcopal houses were *not* targeted specifically because of their religious connection although this might seem surprising given that both County Durham and Cumbria were subject to extensive Civil War fighting, and all episcopal lands were sold by the Parliamentary Commissioner. Given the contemporary political and religious climate, it might be reasonably expected that more residences were affected both during warfare and afterwards. Nationwide analysis of all Parliamentary Surveys taken before the sale of episcopal property during the Commonwealth by Ian Gentles (1973) reveals that many bishops' houses were subject to dilapidation and looting during the Civil Wars which had left them in poor condition by the late 1640s. Although two ranges of buildings were burnt to the ground at Rose Castle and herds of cattle were destroyed in Auckland Park, the examples drawn together for this thesis appear to be rather exceptional because they survived relatively unscathed.

The sale of the major English episcopal sites to prominent Parliamentarians is also not unusual. The majority of major episcopal properties were sold to men close to Cromwell, at exceptionally low prices (Gentles 1973: 584). While these properties were officially placed for sale on the open market, in practice permitted delays enabled most significant properties to be acquired by favourites of Cromwell. In so doing, these individuals were rewarded for their loyalty and position; Durham Castle, Auckland Castle and Rose Castle were all acquired by prominent Parliamentarians. Their subsequent destruction at the hands of an overwhelmingly Puritanical cohort seems inevitable, but the evidence shows that most of the houses survived intact or have been only partially demolished. Very few were completely raised to the ground and redeveloped *unless* the buildings were in a very poor condition when sold, as was the case at Stockton Castle. The reasons for this unexpected retention of episcopal property are of some interest and, on the face of it, might appear to relate to feelings of religious or superstitious sentiment. In fact their survival can probably be attributed simply to the lack of time

most Commonwealth owners had before the Restoration; most residences were in new ownership for less than 11 years.

Finally, former bishop's houses also suffered decay and dilapidation during periods when they were leased out. At all sites that were leased, at least some level of dilapidation has been recorded. In most instances, the causes for this relate both to the age of the buildings, their size and the financial prosperity of their tenants. In most cases, it was the minor episcopal residences which were leased and these were less popular with the bishops and tended to be in a poor condition upon their lease. The process of leasing itself is a direct result of the ongoing financial pressures suffered by bishops following the Reformation (Chapter 1), wherein leasing properties was viewed as a financially prudent decision to erase an asset from the episcopal accounts, while retaining their parks and other profitable features. This action contributed significantly to the destruction of minor episcopal properties and has severely affected their state of preservation today.

7.7. Conclusions

This final section reflects on how the evidence presented in this thesis has answered the aims and objectives outlined in Section 1.2. These questions were initially developed according to recognised gaps in the current state of knowledge of bishop's houses and their ability to act as a barometer for understanding the impact of wider social, religious and political changes during the 16th and 17th centuries. Four bordering dioceses were chosen on the basis of differences in the scale and nature of their residences, financial prosperity and differing religious, social and political circumstances across England and Scotland.

7.7.1 The impact of religious change

At first glance, the impact of the English Reformation on the episcopal sites studied here appears to have been minimal. Unlike at other religious buildings where iconoclasm to Catholic imagery is the primary way in which the impact of the Reformation is observed materially, the lack of demolition at bishop's houses demonstrates that they were *not* subject to the same physical and ideological forces. All episcopal residences had been founded during the later medieval period and retained large quantities of their medieval fabric. Instead of erasing the memory of these sites, there were conscious efforts to preserve and celebrate them. At Durham and Auckland Castles, for example, not only were the personal emblems of the bishops retained, such as Fox's pelican-it-its-piety, but Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall's insertion of new galleries with its focused views over Durham Cathedral and Bek's chapel, and the construction of a new chapel at Durham all demonstrate how the legacy of Durham's religious past was drawn in to legitimise the bishop's role and visually solidify his religious position throughout the turbulence of his episcopate which spanned the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary I and Elizabeth I.

The impact of the Reformation is perhaps best viewed through the impact of the change to Church structure, financing and greater clerical freedoms as a result of the rise of Protestantism in England. The differences between the financial prosperity of the dioceses of Durham and Carlisle following the Reformation and imposition of greater Elizabethan taxation is reflected in their differing levels of investment in building work and in anecdotal evidence provided by their bishops. While the Bishops of Durham continued to prosper despite their loss of some revenue sources, the Bishops of Carlisle suffered and this affected their building trajectories. Moreover, evidence from this thesis has demonstrated that the permittance of clerical marriage in 1560, which occurred in line with Protestant Continental trends, did not stimulate a wide scale installation of accommodation for women. While there were sustained campaigns which redeveloped accommodation at episcopal residences, they were more closely aligned with building changes which affected elite residences more widely. It has been suggested in this thesis that the absence of clearly defined spaces for women and children at most sites results from the contemporary attitudes to them and the fluctuating religious environment. This point is emphasised with evidence from Scotland in which attitudes towards episcopal wives, mistresses and concubines varied from that in England and was met with hostility.

7.7.2 How others viewed and interacted with bishop's houses

The impacts of religious change were arguably most keenly felt through the destruction of episcopal property during the Civil War, including at Stockton Castle and Rose Castle. However, it is difficult to gauge the degree to which these sites were targeted because of their religious affiliation or for practical reasons, such as their vacancy and size. The destruction of Bek's chapel at Auckland Castle is a more obvious attempt at erasing the religious memory and affiliation of the place. The motivations of Arthur Haselerigge's actions can be inferred from his known religious stance and the actions of his contemporaries, such as Oliver St John. The actions of his counterpart at Rose Castle, William Heveningham, however, demonstrate that even among seemingly similar people, the treatment of episcopal property varied according to personal sentiment and ambition. There can be no holistic narrative for the treatment of these houses at this time. Furthermore, evidence drawn from residences inhabited by people *beyond* the diocese shows that general sentiment from the mid-16th century until the Civil War was not hostile towards these structures. Dilapidation of leased buildings was more likely to occur as a result of their age rather than any malicious action. Despite the changing pace of religious feeling, these buildings appear not to have been viewed negatively by an external audience. This point is also reflected in the popularity and regularity of feasting at episcopal houses throughout the study period, which shows that wider communities continued to embrace these sites.

7.7.3 Differences between regions

The greatest differences between the treatment of these residences in the English dioceses result from the varying financial positions of the bishoprics. Arguably, this is the most significant factor behind the investment in building and repair at the sites under consideration here and much of this is in turn rooted in disparities between the dioceses which were established before the study period. As a Palatinate, the See of Durham had enjoyed exceptional wealth together with legal and political influence. Throughout the medieval period, the Durham diocese had always maintained a higher number of estates, parks and residences than Carlisle, and had an established administrative network to match. A clear understanding of this can be gained from evidence relating to the number and administration of their parks (Chapter 5). With only one park and less than a third of the number of residences of the Bishops of Durham, the bishopric of Carlisle was naturally disadvantaged in the 16th and 17th centuries. This, coupled with their distance from London, emphasises the gulf in fortunes between the bishoprics, and this appears to have only been widened during the study period.

7.7.4 Differences between the English and Scottish dioceses

Differences in the treatment of the residences across the English and Scottish dioceses appear to have been minimal through the study period. In general, Scottish sites appear to have endured fewer building campaigns with fewer instances of progressive changes to the medieval arrangement of buildings. In part, this probably stems from the changing nature of religious and social attitudes towards episcopacy in Scotland. The delayed introduction of the Reformation there may have prevented the same degree of change to the episcopal role which stimulated building design in England.

Most strikingly however, this thesis has shed light on the impact of the destruction and decay of Scottish episcopal residences *after* the study period, events which have greatly diminished the number of surviving buildings today. Furthermore, the different documentary records for the dioceses of England and Scotland (Chapter 2) have resulted in fragmentary datasets which impede detailed comparison. In short, there are likely to have been more subtle differences between the English and Scottish episcopal residences which have gone unregistered in this thesis. Some of those points of difference include the sharing of some episcopal sites in a manner which does not occur among English sites (e.g. Edinburgh Cowgate), and changing social attitudes towards Scottish bishops because of their close association with the monarchy and subsequent accusations of nepotism.

7.7.5 Recommendations for future study

To conclude this thesis, the following tasks might be considered for further study:

- There is still significant scope for more work to be conducted examining **minor episcopal residences**. In particular, this thesis has shed light on the paucity of available documentary records relating to episcopal residences in Scotland but this might be addressed with an increase in the archaeological investigation of Scottish episcopal sites. Recent work has shown the contribution to be made by extensive excavation, for example at Spynie Palace (Lewis and Pringle 2002) and Fetternear Palace (Dransart and Trigg 2008).

- There is a lack of research conducted on parks in Scotland and particularly on **episcopal parks**. Although recent work (Hall et al 2014) has begun to redress this imbalance, there is still considerable scope for further work which could draw upon the full range of remote sensing methodologies now available. English parks would also benefit from more detailed investigation in order to identify monuments and park features such as lodges, deer leaps and park pales, as well as named woodland and pasture.

- Work examining the use of bishop's houses during **the Commonwealth period** has demonstrated how varied treatment was among their new Parliamentarian owners. Further work examining this nationwide might identify key trends in damage and repair and the use and development of sites.

- **Large set-piece archaeological excavations** often do much to raise the profile of a particular monument class. The current research investigations underway at Auckland Castle will involve a large set-piece excavation over a number of years (2018-21) and will target large medieval and post-medieval assemblages as well as structural remains, including in the park. The findings from this work need to be well published and promoted across the region. The north-east of England, with its recent record of excavations at Bishop Middleham and Darlington, has the potential to be at the centre of new integrated architectural and archaeological approaches.

Bibliography

Original sources and abbreviations

Andrews, G. 1850. *The injunctions and other ecclesiastical proceedings of Richard Barnes, Bishop of Durham from 1575-1587.* Durham: Publications of the Surtees Society **22**.

ASUD. 2012. Westgate Castle, Weardale, County Durham: Archaeological Investigations. Archaeological Services Durham University Report 2804, on behalf of Altogether Archaeology with North Pennines AONB Partnership and Pam and Ian Forbes. Unpublished report.

ASUD. 2014a. Proposed Riverside Park, Feethams, Darlington: Archaeological Evaluation. Archaeological Services Durham University Report 3334, on behalf of Willmott Dixon Construction Ltd for Darlington. Unpublished Report.

ASUD. 2014b. Auckland Castle, Bishop Auckland, County Durham: Archaeological Evaluation. Archaeological Services Durham University Report 3417, on behalf of Auckland Castle Trust. Unpublished Report.

Austin, D. 1982. *Domesday Book: a survey of the countries of England, Liber de Wintonia. Volume 35, supplementary volume: Boldon Book: Northumberland and Durham.* Chichester: Phillimore.

Barrow, H. 1962. *The Writings of Henry Barrow: 1587-1590.* Edited by L.H. Carlson. London: Allen and Unwin.

CAC: Carlisle Archive Centre

CCB: Church Commissioners' Box (Special Collections, Durham University)

CCC: Carlisle County Council

Cooper, C.H. and Cooper, T. 1858. *Athenae Cantabrigienses: Volume 1.* Cambridge: Johnathan Palmer.

DCC: Durham County Council

Denne, S. 1795. *Historical particulars of Lambeth parish and Lambeth palace; in addition to the histories by Dr. Ducarel in the Bibliotheca topographica Britannica.* London: John Nichols.

Dryburgh, P. and Hartland, B (eds). 2007. C*alendar of the Fine Rolls of the Reign of Henry III: Preserved in the National Archives. Volume II, 9-18 Henry III: 1224-1234.* Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.

Elrington, C.R. 1847. *The whole works of the Most Rev. James Ussher.* London: Hodges and Smith.

Greenwell, W. 1857. *Bishop Hatfield's Survey*. Durham: Publications of the Surtees Society **32.**

Hannay, R.K. (ed). 1913. *Rentale Sancti Andree.* Edinburgh: University Press for the Scottish History Society.

HER: Historic Environment Record

Innes, C.N. 1843. *Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis: Munimenta Ecclesie Metropolitane Glasguensis a Sede Restaurata Seculo Incunte XII Ad Reformatum Religionem.* Edinburgh: The Bannatyne Club.

Kirby, D.A. 1971. *Parliamentary Surveys of the Bishopric of Durham: Volume 1*. Gateshead: Northumberland Press Limited.

Kirby, D.A. 1972. *Parliamentary Surveys of the Bishopric of Durham: Volume 2.* Gateshead: Northumberland Press Limited.

Laing, D. 1846. *The works of John Knox.* Edinburgh: The Bannatyne Society.

Lambert. 1796. Palace Green Special Collections. DDR/BP/HIS/3/2.

LMA: London Metropolitan Archive

Lyte, M.H.C. 1895. *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward III, Volume 3 (1334-38).* London: His Majesty's Stationary Office.

Lyte, M. H.C. 1909. *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward III, Volume 10 (1354-58).* London: His Majesty's Stationary Office.

MacFarlane, W. 1750-1751. *Genealogical Collections Concerning Families in Scotland, Made by Walter MacFarlane, Volume 1.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Marwick, J.D. 1897. *Charters and Other Documents Relating to the City of Glasgow, 1175-1649: Part 1.* Edinburgh: Scottish Burgh Records Society.

MS/S: Mickleton and Spearman manuscripts (Special Collections, Durham University)

Mss: Machell manuscripts (Carlisle Archive Centre)

NA: National Archives, Kew

Norden, J. 1723. *Speculum Britanniæ; an historical and chorographical description of Middlesex and Hartfordshire.* London: Printed for Daniel Browne Senior and Junior.

NRS: National Records of Scotland (Edinburgh)

ODNB: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography

Ornsby, G. 1869. *The Correspondence of John Cosin, together with other papers illustrative of his life and times.* Durham: Publications of the Surtees Society **52**.

Parson, W. and White, W. 1828. *History, Directory, and Gazetteer, of the Counties of Durham and Northumberland and the Towns and Counties of Newcastle-Upon-Tyne and Berwick-upon-Tweed, Volume II.* Newcastle: Edward Baines and Sons.

Raine, J. (ed). 1839. *Historiæ Dunelmensis Scriptores Tres, Gaufridus de Coldingham, Robertus de Graystanes, et Willielmus de Chambre.* Durham: Publications of the Surtees Society, **9**.

Raine, J. 1880. *Dialogi Laurentii dunelmensis monachi ac prioris*. Durham: Published for the Society by Andrews and Co.

Simeon of Durham. 1855. *The Church historians of England. Volume 3. Part 2. The historical works of Simeon of Durham. Translated from the original Latin, with preface and notes, by Rev. Joseph Stevenson.* London: Seeleys.

Surtees, R. 1876. Survey of the Manor House of Stockton, commonly called Stockton Castle, taken after the death of Bishop Pilkington. 120-125. *Archaeologia Aeliana: or, miscellaneous tracts relating to antiquity. Published by the Society of Antiquaries of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Volume VII.* Newcastle-upon-Tyne: William Dodd.

Tanner MSS: Tanner Manuscripts, Bodleian Library

Thoms, W.J. 1876. *A Survey of London, written in the year 1598 by John Stow.* London: Chatto and Windus.

Toulmin-Smith, L. (ed). 1907. *The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the years 1535-1543, Volume 1.* London: George Bell and Sons.

Watt, D.E.R. (ed). 1998. *Volume 8: Scotichronicon by Walter Bower.* Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

Winchester, A. and Wane, M. (eds). *Thomas Denton: A Perambulation of Cumberland in 1687-8, including descriptions of Westmorland, the Isle of Man and Ireland*. Durham: Publications of the Surtees Society **207**.

Unpublished works

Allen, M.R. 1999. The Durham Mint: the control, organisation, profits and output of an ecclesiastical mint. Unpublished PhD thesis. Durham University.

Arc Architects. 2002. Monimail Tower, Fife: Architectural Research Paper. Unpublished typescript.

Askew, R.M.C. 2013. 'The House of Every One': the Consumption of Material Culture in Castles during the English Civil War. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Sheffield.

Deegan, A. 2019. Eden Petteril Caldew Transect Air Photo and Lidar Mapping and Interpretation. Historic England. Unpublished.

Dennison, E. 2004. English Heritage Buildings at Risk Project, North Yorkshire, Crayke Castle Photography Survey and Archaeological Observations. Ed Dennison Archaeological Services Ltd. Unpublished.

Dumble, W. 1978. Government, religion and military affairs in Durham during the Civil War and Interregnum. Unpublished PhD thesis. Durham University.

Hammond, N. 2013. Heritage Statement: For a Proposed Office Development, Feethams, Darlington. Archaeo-Environment Ltd for Willmott-Dixon and Darlington Borough Council.

Hester, R. 2006. A Brief History of Crayke. Unpublished typescript.

Inglis, J. 2011. Scotland's Castles: rescued, rebuilt and reoccupied, 1945-2010. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Dundee.

Leyland, M. 1994. The origins and developments of Durham Castle to AD 1217: the archaeological and architectural record. Unpublished PhD thesis. Durham University.

Maldonado, A. 2012. The Archaeology of Ancrum: Mantle Walls Project. Data structure report for archaeological evaluation at Ancrum, Scottish Borders. University of Glasgow on behalf of the Scottish Borders Council. Unpublished typescript.

Newman, C. 2014. Mapping the late medieval and post-medieval landscape of Cumbria. Unpublished PhD thesis. Newcastle University.

North Pennines Archaeology Ltd. 2006. Archaeological desk-based assessment and site visit for a proposed redevelopment at the Queen Elizabeth Grammar School Annexe, Penrith, Cumbria. Unpublished typescript.

Oxford Archaeology. 2002. Bewley Castle, Cumbria: Archaeological Watching Brief L9027. Unpublished.

Payne, N. 2003. The Medieval residences of the Bishops of Bath and Wells, and Salisbury. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Bristol.

Ryder, P. 2000. Defensible Buildings in Cumbria: A Survey October-December 2000, Part 2b Eden District. Unpublished typescript.

Ryder, P. 2005. Bishop Auckland, the Palace Chapel. Unpublished typescript.

Ryder, P. 2005/6. Auckland Castle. Medieval and Sub-Medieval Defensible Buildings in County Durham: A Survey 2005/6. Gazetteer Three. Pages 1-5. Unpublished typescript.

Ryder, P. and Degnan, S. 1998. Silver Street Gateway and Tower: Bishop Auckland Castle Precinct Wall, an archaeological assessment. Unpublished typescript.

Smith, C. 2016. The Residences of the Bishops of Durham: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives. Unpublished Masters Thesis. Durham University.

Thomson, J.A.F. 1960. Clergy and Laity in London: 1376-1531. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Oxford.

Tobyn, G.W. 2017. English Herbs and English Bodies: the promotion of native plant remedies 1548-1659, Nicholas Culpeper and his antecedents. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Lancaster University.

UNESCO World Heritage Committee. 1986. Convention Concerning The Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage: World Heritage Committee Tenth Session. https://whc.unesco.org/archive/1986/cc-86-conf003-10e.pdf. Accessed: 28/11/2019.

Watson, F.J. 1991. Edward I in Scotland: 1296-1305. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Glasgow.

Secondary sources

Abate, C.S. 2003. *Privacy, Domesticity, and Women in Early Modern England.* London: Routledge.

Aberg, F.A. and Smith, A.N. 1988. Excavations of the Castle Site, Stockton-on-Tees,176-188. In: Manby, T. (ed). 1988. *Archaeology of Eastern Yorkshire: essays in honour of TCM Brewster*. Sheffield: JR Collis Publishing.

Adams, S., Bryson, A., & Leimon, M. 2009. Walsingham, Sir Francis (c. 1532–1590), principal secretary. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-28624. Accessed 6/3/2018.

Adamson, J.S.A. 1987. The English Nobility and the Projected Settlement of 1647. *Historical Journal,* **30** (3). 567-602.

Albarella, U. and Thomas, R. 2002. They Dined on Crane: bird consumption, wild fowling and status in medieval England. *Acta Zoologica Cracoviensa,* **45.** 23-38.

Allen, T. 1837. *The History and Antiquities of London, Westminster, Southwark, and parts adjacent.* London: G Virtue.

Appleby, A.B. 1973. Disease or Famine? Mortality in Cumberland and Westmorland 1580-1640. *Economic History Review,* **26** (3). 403-432.

Askew, R.M.C. 2016a. Biography and Memory: Sandal Castle and the English Civil War. *European Journal of Archaeology,* **19** (1). 48-67.

Askew, R.M.C. 2016b. Political Iconoclasm: the destruction of Eccleshall Castle during the English Civil Wars. *Post-Medieval Archaeology,* **50** (2). 279-288.

Aston, M. 1988. *England's Iconoclasts: Volume 1, Laws Against Images.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Aston, M. 1996. Puritans and Iconoclasm, 1560-1660. 92-121. In: Durston, C. and Eales, J. (eds). 1996. *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700.* New York: Macmillan Press.

Aston, M. 2003. Public Worship and Iconoclasm. 9-28. In: Gaimster, D. and Gilchrist, R. 2003. *The Archaeology of the Reformation, 1480-1580.* Leeds: Maney Publishing.

Aston, M.A. 1993. *Monasteries in the Landscape.* Stroud: Amberley Publishing.

Barrow, G.W.S. 1994. The Medieval Diocese of St Andrews. 1-6. In: Higgitt, J. (ed). 1994. *Medieval Art and Architecture in the Diocese of St Andrews.* London: British Archaeological Association.

Barrow, G. 2004. Puiset, Hugh du, earl of Northumberland (c. 1125-1195), bishop of Durham. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-22871. Accessed: 28/05/2018.

Barrow, J. 2012. Way-Stations on Episcopal Itineraries, 700-1300. *English Historical Review,* **526.** 549-565.

Batho, G.R. 2000. Thomas Harriot and the Northumberland Household. 28-47. In: Fox, R. (ed). 2000. *Thomas Harriot: An Elizabethan Man of Science.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Beaumont James, T. and Gerrard, C. 2007. *Clarendon: Landscape of Kings.* Oxford: Windgather Press.

Bellasis, E. 1885. The Machells of Crackenthorpe. *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, **8**. 416-466.

Belford, P. 2011. Archaeology, Community and Identity in an English New Town. *The Historic Environment: Policy & Practice,* **2** (1). 49-67.

Bennett, F.M. 1992. Conviviality and charity in medieval and early modern England. *Past & Present,* **134** (1). 19-41.

Berlatsky, J. 1978. Marriage and Family in a Tudor Elite: familial patterns of Elizabethan bishops. *Journal of Family History*, 3 (1). 6-22.

Biddle, M. 1968. Wolvesey Palace, in Excavations at Winchester, 1967: Sixth Interim Report. *The Antiquaries Journal*, **48**. 280-84.

Biddle, M. 1969. Wolvesey Palace, in Excavations at Winchester, 1968: Seventh Interim Report. *The Antiquaries Journal*, **49**. 323-26.

Biddle, M. 1970. Wolvesey Palace, in Excavations at Winchester, 1969: Eighth Interim Report. *The Antiquaries Journal*, **50**. 322-25.

Biddle, M. 1972. Wolvesey Palace, in Excavations at Winchester, 1970: Ninth Interim Report. *The Antiquaries Journal*, **52**. 125-30.

Biddle, M. 2005. *Nonsuch Palace: the material culture of a noble Restoration household.* Oxford: Oxbow.

Bilson, J. 1915. The manor house of the Bishops of Durham at Howden. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* **22.** 256-269.

Birrell, J. 1992. Deer and Deer Farming in Medieval England. *Agricultural History Review*, **40.** 112-126.

Birrell, J. 2006. Procuring, Preparing and Serving Venison in Late Medieval England. 176-190. In: Woolgar, C.M., Serjeantson, D. and Waldron, T. (eds). 2006. *Food in Medieval England: Diet and Nutrition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bjorklund, N.B. 2003. 'A Godly Wyfe Is an Helper'. Matthew Parker and the Defense of Clerical Marriage. *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, **32** (2). 347-365.

Blunt, J.H. 1866. St Cuthbert and His Patrimony. *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, **22** (4). 420-442.

Bold, J. 2008. Mills, Peter (bap. 1598, d. 1670), surveyor and architect. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-37769. Accessed: 3/09/2018.

Bond, C.J. 1979. The Reconstruction of the Medieval Landscape: The Estates of Abingdon Abbey. *Landscape History*, **1** (1). 59-75.

Bond, C.J. 1981. Woodstock Park Under the Plantagenet Kings: the exploitation of wood and timber in a medieval deer park. *Arboricultural Journal: The International Journal of Urban Forestry*, **5** (3). 201-231.

Bond, J. 2004. *Monastic Landscapes.* Stroud: Tempus.

Bonner, E. 1996. The Recovery of St Andrews Castle in 1547: French Naval Policy and Diplomacy in the British Isles. *English Historical Review*, **111** (442). 578-598.

Bonner, G. Rollason, D.W. and Stancliffe, C. 1989. Introduction. xxi-xxiii. In: Bonner, G. Rollason, D.W & Stancliffe, C. (eds). 1989. *St Cuthbert, His Cult and Community to AD 1200.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Bouch, C.M.L. 1948. *Prelates and People of the Lake Counties: a history of the diocese of Carlisle, 1133-1933.* Kendal: Titus Bouch.

Bouch, C.M.L.1956. Rose Castle. *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society,* **56**. 132-141.

Bourgeios, E.J. 1995. The Queen, a Bishop, and a Peer: A Clash for Power in Mid-Elizabethan Cambridgeshire. *The Sixteenth Century Journal,* **26** (1). 3-15.

Brears, P. 1985 *Food and cooking in 17th century Britain. History and recipes*, English Heritage.

Breeze, D.J. 1987. *A Queen's Progress.* Edinburgh: HMSO.

Brickstock, R.J. 2007. *Durham Castle: Fortress, Palace, College.* Huddersfield: Jeremy Mills Publishing.

Briggs, J.J. 1852. *The History of Melbourne, in the county of Derby, including biographical notices of the Coke, Melbourne, and Hardinge families.* London: Whittaker & Co.

Brooks, F.W. 1966. *The Council of the North.* London: Historical Association.

Brooks, N.P. and Whittington, G. 1977. Planning and Growth in the Medieval Scottish Burgh: The Example of St Andrews. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* **2** (3). 278-295.

Brown, A.L. 1972. The Priory of Coldingham in the Late Fourteenth Century. *Innes Review,* **23** (2). 91-101.

Brown, M. and Stevenson, K. 2017. *Medieval St Andrews. Church, Cult, City.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Brown, P.H. 1891. *Early Travellers in Scotland.* Edinburgh: D. Douglas.

Buchanan, P.H. 1985. *Margaret Tudor, Queen of Scots.* Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

Bulman, C.G. 1958. Rose Castle. *The Archaeological Journal*, **115**. 246-7.

Burger, M. 2017. Evidence regarding bishops' use of hall and chamber in later 13th century England, with observations regarding notarial influence. 216-224. In: Rollason, D.W. (ed). 2017. *Princes of the Church: Bishops and their Palaces.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Cambridge, E. 1977. The Early Building History of St Andrews Cathedral, Fife, and its Context in Northern Transitional Architecture. *Antiquaries Journal,* **57** (2). 277-288.

Cameron, J. 2004. Beaton, James (c. 1473–1539), administrator and archbishop of St Andrews. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-1824. Accessed 15/7/2018.

Campbell, M. 1999. Bishop Fox's Salt. In: Ellory, C., Clifford, H., Rogers, H. (eds). 1999. *Corpus Silver: Patronage and Plate at Corpus Christi College, Oxford.* Oxford: Needwood Press. 133-144.

Cant, R.G. 1970. The Development of the Burgh of St Andrews in the Middle Ages. *St Andrews Preservation Trust Annual Report.*

Cantor, L. 1983. *The medieval parks of England: a gazetteer.* Loughborough.

Cantor, L.M. and Hatherly, J. 1979. The Medieval Parks of England. *Geography,* **64** (2). 71-85.

Carlson, E.J. 1992. Clerical Marriage and the English Reformation. *Journal of British Studies,* **31** (1). 1-31.

Carmichael, T.A. 1927. Bewley Castle. *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society* **27**. 184-188.

Carroll, J. L. 2003. Woven Devotions: Reform and Piety in Tapestries by Dominican Nuns. 182-202. In: Carroll, J.L. (ed). 2003. *"Saints, Sinners, and Sisters": Gender and Northern Art in Medieval and Early Modern Europe.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Casella, E.C. and Fowler, C. 2004. *The Archaeology of Plural and Changing Identities: Beyond Identification.* New York: Springer.

Chapman, H., Coppack, G. and Drewett, P.L. 1975. *Excavations at the Bishop's Palace, Lincoln, 1968-72.* Monograph of the Lincolnshire Historical Archaeology Society.

Clark, E. 2002. Institutional and Legal Responses to Begging in Medieval England. *Social Science History,* **26** (3). 447-473.

Clark, M.A. 1996. Reformation in the Far North: Cumbria and the Church, 1500-1571. *Northern History,* **32** (1). 75-89.

Clarke, M. and Thomson, M. 1987. Cathedral Square, Bishop's Castle: tower, wall, drain, medieval and later potter'. *Discovery Excavation Scotland, 1987.* 50-1.

Charleston, R. 2001. Vessel Glass. 237-264. In: Blair, J. and Ramsey, N. (eds). 2001. *English Medieval Industries.* London: The Hambledon Press.

Coghill, H. 2008. *Lost Edinburgh*. Edinburgh: Berlinn Limited.

Cookson, G. 2003. *The Townscape of Darlington*. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer.

Coope, R. 1984. The Gallery in England: names and meanings. *Architectural History,* **27**. 446-455.

Coope, R. 1986. The 'Long Gallery': Its Origins, Development, Use and Decoration. *Architectural History*, **29.** 43-84.

Cooper, G.J. and Shannon, W.D. 2017. The Control of Salters (deer-leaps) in private deer parks associated with forests: a case study using at 1608 map of Leagram Park in the Forest of Bowland, Lancashire. *Landscape History,* **38** (1). 43-66.

Cooper, S.M. 2005. Service to Servitude? The decline and demise of life-cycle service in England. *The History of the Family,* **10** (4). 367-386.

Coventry, M. 2008. *Castles of the Clans: the strongholds and seats of 750 Scottish families and clans.* Musselburgh: Goblinshead.

Cox, A., Dixon, P. and Parker, M. 2000. An excavation at the Bishop's House, Stow, Scottish Borders. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland,* **130**. 677-704.

Crawford, P. 2004. *Blood, Bodies and Families in Early Modern England.* London: Routledge.

Creighton, O. 2009. *Designs upon the Land: Elite Landscapes in the Middle Ages.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Creighton, O. and Liddiard, R. 2008. Fighting yesterday's battle: beyond war or status in castle studies. *Medieval Archaeology,* **52** (1). 161-169.

Crombie, L. 2011. Honour, Community and Hierarchy in the Feasts of the Archery and Crossbow Guilds of Bruges, 1445-81. *Journal of Medieval History,* **37** (1). 102-113.

Croot, P. 2014. A Place in Town in Medieval and Early Modern Westminster: the origins and history of the palaces on the Strand. *The London Journal* **39** (2). 85-101.

Crossley, M.L. 2000. Narrative Psychology, Trauma and the Study of Self-Identity. *Theory & Psychology*, **10.** 527-546.

Crowley, J.E. 2003. *The Invention of Comfort: sensibilities in design in early modern Britain and early America.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Cunningham, H. 2005. *Children and Childhood in Western Society Since 1500.* London: Routledge.

Cunningham, J.A. 1990. Auckland Castle: Some Recent Discoveries. 81-90. In: Fernie, E. and Crossley, P. (eds). 1990. *Medieval Architecture and Its Intellectual Context: Studies in Honour of Peter Kidson.* London.

Curry, I. 2009. *Hugh de Puiset, bishop of Durham 1153-1195: an account of the life and works of the famous twelfth-century patron of the art of architecture.* Sunderland: the author.

Davidson, C. 2007. *Festivals and Plays in Late Medieval Britain.* London: Routledge.

Dawson, J.E.A. 1993. The Scottish Reformation and the Theatre of Martyrdom. *Studies in Church History*, **30**. 259-270.

Denton, B. 1997. *Only in Heaven: Life and Campaigns of Sir Arthur Hesilrige, 1601-61.* Sheffield: Continuum International Publishing Group.

De Vries, J. 1994. Between purchasing power and the world of goods: understanding the household economy in early modern Europe. 107-154. In: Brewer, J. and Porter, R. (eds). 1994. *Consumption and the World of Goods.* London: Routledge.

Diaz-Andreu, M., Lucy, S., Babic, S., Edwards, D.N. 2005. *The Archaeology of Identity: approaches to gender, age, status, ethnicity and religion.* London: Routledge.

Dixon, P. and Marshall, P. 1993. The Great Tower in the Twelfth Century: The Case of Norham Castle. *The Archaeological Journal*, **150**. 410-432.

Dixon Hunt, J. 1986. *Garden and Grove: The Italian Renaissance Garden in the English Imagination, 1600-1750.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Dobson, R.B. 1983. Cathedral Chapters and Cathedral Cities: York, Durham and Carlisle in the Fifteenth Century. *Northern History* **19** (1). 15-44.

Dobson, R.B. 2005. *Durham Priory 1400-1450.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doggett, N. 2001. The Demolition and Conversion of former monastic buildings in post-Dissolution Hertfordshire. 165-174. In: Keevill, G. Aston, M. and Hall, T. (eds). 2001. *Monastic Archaeology.* Oxford: Oxbow.

Donkin, R.A. 2003. *Between east and west: the Moluccas and the traffic in spices up to the arrival of Europeans.* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

Doran, S. 1996. *Monarchy and Matrimony: the courtships of Elizabeth 1.* London: Routledge.

Doughty, D.W. 1975. Renaissance books, bindings and owners in St Andrews and elsewhere: the humanists. *The Bibliotheck: a Scottish Journal of Bibliography and Allied Topics* **7** (5). 117-127.

Doyle, I. 1991. *John Cosin, 1595-1672, as a library maker.* London: The Book Collector.

Dransart, P. 2017. Bishops' Residences, Saints' Cults, and the Legacy of the Sacred Authority in the Medieval Dioceses of St Andrews and Glasgow. 81-98. In: Rollason, D.W. (ed). 2017. *Princes of the Church: Bishops and their Palaces.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Dransart, P. and Trigg, J. (eds). 2008. *The Bishop's Palace, Fetternear, 2005-2006.* Lampeter: Scottish Episcopal Palaces Project.

Driscoll, S.T. 2002. *Excavations at Glasgow Cathedral 1988-1997.* London: Society for Medieval Archaeology.

Drury, J.L. 2017. The Bishop of Durham's Park at Auckland Castle in the Middle Ages. 142-158. In: Rollason, D.W. (ed). 2017. *Princes of the Church: Bishops and their Palaces.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Dubois, E. 1988. Almsgiving in post-Reformation England. *History of European Ideas,* **9** (4). 489-495.

Dugdale, W. 1817. *Monasticon Anglicanum: a history of abbies and other monasteries, hospitals, friaries, and cathedrals and collegiate churches. Volume 1.* London.

Dugdale, W. 1846. *Monasticon Anglicanum: a history of abbies and other monasteries, hospitals and friaries, and cathedral and collegiate churches, with their dependencies in England and Wales*. London: James Bohn.

Dunbar, J.G. 1984. Some aspects of the planning of Scottish royal palaces in the sixteenth century. *Architectural History*, **27**. 15-24.

Duncan, A.A.M. 1998. The monk and the medieval archives of Glasgow cathedral. *Innes Review*, **49** (2). 143-6.

Dunning, R. (ed). 2010. *Jocelin of Wells: bishop, builder, courtier.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Durston, C. 2006. Hesilrige [Haselrig], Sir Arthur, second baronet (1601-1661), army officer and politician. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-13123. Accessed: 06/05/2017.

Dyer, C. 2003. The Archaeology of Medieval Small Towns. *Medieval Archaeology*, **47** (1). 85-114.

Eastop, D. 2015. Garments Concealed within Buildings: Following the Evidence. 131-146. In: Hutton, R. (ed). 2015. *Physical Evidence for Ritual Acts, Sorcery and Witchcraft in Christian Britain.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Edmonds, F. 2014. The Emergence and Transformation of Medieval Cumbria. *Scottish Historical Review* **93** (2). 195-216.

Eisenthal, E. 1985. John Webb's Reconstruction of the Ancient House. *Architectural History*, **28.** 7-30.

Ekelund, R.B., Hébert, R.F. and Tollison, R.D. 1989. An Economic Model of the Medieval Church: usury as a form of rent seeking. *Journal of Law, Economics & Organisation,* **5** (2). 307-331.

Ellory, C., Clifford, H., Rogers, H. 1999. *Corpus Silver: Patronage and Plate at Corpus Christi College, Oxford.* Oxford: Needwood Press.

Emery, A. 1996. *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales, 1300-1500.Volume 1, Northern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Emery, A. 2005. Late-medieval houses as an expression of social status. *Historical Research,* **78** (200). 140-161.

Erikson, M.H. 2013. Doors to the dead. The power of doorways and thresholds in Viking Age Scandinavia. *Archaeological Dialogues*, **20** (2). 187-214.

Everett, M. 2015. *The Rise of Thomas Cromwell: Power and Politics in the Reign of Henry VIII.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Farrell, S. 2008. Monimail Tower: its history, architecture and archaeological investigations 1983-2000. *Tayside & Fife Archaeological Journal,* **14**. 69-98.

Faulkner, P.A. 1970. Some Medieval Archiepiscopal Palaces. *Archaeological Journal,* **127** (1). 130-146.

Faull, M.L. and Moorhouse, S.A. 1981. *West Yorkshire: and archaeological survey to AD 1500: Volume 3.* Wakefield: West Yorkshire Metropolitan County Council.

Ferguson, C.J. 1874. The development of domestic architecture: Rose Castle and Dalston Hall. *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, **2**. 152-65.

Ferguson, R.S. 1885. The Episcopal Residences of the Bishops of Carlisle, No.1. Buley or Bewley Castle. *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Archaeological Society*, **8**. 413-415, 461

Fincham, K. 1990. *Prelate as Pastor: the Episcopate of James I.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Finnie, E. 1985. The House of Hamilton: Patronage, Politics and the Church in the Reformation Period. *The Innes Review* **36 (**1). 3-28.

Fissel, M.C. 1994. *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's Campaigns Against Scotland, 1638-1640.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fletcher, A. 1983. National and Local Awareness in the County Communities. 151-174. In: Tomlinson, H. (eds). 1983. *Before the English Civil War.* London: Palgrave.

Foister, S. 1981. Paintings and Other Works of Art in Sixteenth-Century English Inventories. *The Burlington Magazine,* **123** (938). 273-282.

Foster, A. 2005. Durham House group (act. 1617–1630). *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ ref:odnb/ 9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-72182. Accessed: 8/08/2018.

Fowler, C. 2004. *The Archaeology of Personhood: an anthropological approach.* London: Routledge.

Francis, J. 2008. Order and Disorder in the Early Modern Garden, 1558-c.1630. *Garden History,* **36** (1). 22-35.

Franklin, R.M. 2004. Farnham, Nicholas of (d. 1257). *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. From https://doiorg.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/20089. Accessed: 24/12/2019

Fraser, C.M. 1956. Edward I of England and the Regalian Franchise of Durham. *Speculum,* **31** (2). 329-342.

Fraser, C.M. 1959. Prerogative of the Bishops of Durham, 1267-1376. *English Historical Review,* **74** (292). 467-476.

Friedman, A. T. 1992. Wife in the English country house: gender and the meaning of style in early modern England. 11-25. In: Lawrence, C. (ed). 1997. *Women and Art in Early Modern Europe: Patrons, Collectors and Connoisseurs.* Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania University Press.

Gaimster, D. and Gilchrist, R. (eds). 2003. *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* London: Routledge.

Gajewski, A. and Seeberg, S. 2016. Having her hand in it? Elite women as 'makers' of textile art in the Middle Ages. *Journal of Medieval History,* **42** (1). 26-50.

Gannon, P.J. 1930. Martin Luther and John Knox. *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review,* **19** (74). 309-320.

Gardiner, M. 2000. Vernacular Buildings and the Development of Later Medieval Domestic Plan in England. *Medieval Archaeology,* **44** (1). 159-179.

Gardiner, M. 2008. Buttery and pantry and their antecedents: idea and architecture in the English medieval house. 37-65. In: Kowaleski, M. and Goldberg, P. J. P. (eds). 2008. *Medieval Domesticity: home, house and household in medieval England.* Cambridge: CUP.

Gater, G.H. and Wheeler, E.P. (eds). 1937. Survey of London: Volume 18, St Martin-in-The-Fields II: the Strand. London: London County Council. *British History Online.* 16 March 2020. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol18/pt2.

Gee, H. 1928. General History of the City. 1-52. In: Page, W. (ed). *The Victoria County History of Durham, Volume 3.* London: St Catherine Press.

Gentles, I. 1973. The Sales of Crown Lands during the English Revolution. *The Economic History Review,* **26** (1). 614-635.

Gentles, I. 1980. The Sales of Bishops' Lands in the English Revolution, 1646-1660. *English Historical Review,* **95** (376). 573-596.

Gerrard, C.M., Graves, C.P., Millard, A. Annis, R., Caffell, A. 2018. *Lost Lives, New Voices: Unlocking the Stories of the Scottish Soldiers from the Battle of Dunbar 1650.* Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Gerrard, D.M.G. 2016. *The Church at War: The Military Activities of Bishops, Abbots and other Clergy in England, c. 900-1200.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Gilchrist, R. 1999. *Gender and Archaeology: contesting the past.* London: Routledge.

Gilchrist, R. 2000. Archaeological Biographies: realizing human lifecycles, -courses and -histories. *World Archaeology,* **31** (3). 325-328.

Gilchrist, R. 2012. *Medieval Life: Archaeology and the Life Course.* Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

Goetz, B. 1990. Montbellard-Caberet de L'Hotel de Ville: Verrerie du premier XVII siècle. *Verrerie de l'est de la France XII-XVIIIc siecles: Fabrication, consummation: Revue Archaeologique de l'Est et du Centre-est.* Dijon.

Goldberg, P.J.P. 2011. Space and Gender in the Late Medieval House. *Viator* **42** (2). 205-232.

Graves, C.P. 2009. Building a New Jerusalem: The Meaning of a Group of Merchant Houses in Seventeenth-Century Newcastle-upon-Tyne, England. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology,* **13** (4). 385-408.

Greaves, R.L. 1973. John Knox and the Covenant Tradition. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* **24** (1). 23-32.

Green, A. 2016. *Building for England: John Cosin's architecture in Renaissance Durham and Cambridge.* Toronto: Pontifical Institute for Medieval Studies.

Green, A. 2017. Auckland and Durham Castles in John Cosin's time. 332-348. In: Rollason, D.W. (ed). 2017. *Princes of the Church: Bishops and their Palaces.* London: Routledge.

Green, A. 2018. The Big House in the English Provincial Town. 116-143. In: Hinks, J. and Armstrong, C. (eds). 2018. *The English Urban Renaissance Revisited.* Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Green, A. 2019. Law and Architecture in early modern Durham. 265-291. In: Lobban, M., Begatio, J. and Green, A. (eds). 2019. *Law, Lawyers and Litigants in Early Modern England: essays in memory of Christopher W. Brooks.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Greenhall, M.R. 2012. Economic Causes and Consequences of the Scottish Invasions of North-East England, 1637-47. *Northern History,* **49** (2). 265-280.

Greenthorne, W. 1928. *History of Partick: 550-1912.* Glasgow: John Tomlinson Ltd.

Grierson, J. 1807. *Delineations of St Andrews: Being an particular account of every thing remarkable in the history and present state of the city and its ruins.* Edinburgh: Peter Hill.

Grieve, H.E.P. 1940. The Deprived Married Clergy in Essex, 1553-1561. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* **22**. 141-169.

Gwyn, P. 2002. *The king's cardinal: the rise and fall of Thomas Wolsey*. London: Pimlico.

Hall, D., Malloy, K., Oram, R. 2014. Preliminary Fieldwork and Analysis of Three Scottish Medieval 'Deer Parks'. 240-247. In: Sykes, N., Baker, K., Carden, R. and Madgwick, R. (eds). 2014. *Deer and People.* 2014. Oxford: Windgather Press.

Hall, M. 2006. Identity, Memory and Countermemory: The Archaeology of an Urban Landscape. *Journal of Material Culture,* **11** (1). 189-209.

Hardwick, P. 2011. *English Medieval Misericords: The Margins of Meaning.* Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.

Hare, J. 2017. Why so many houses? The varied function of the episcopal residences of the see of Winchester, c. 1130-c. 1680. 195-215. In: Rollason, D.W. (ed). 2017. *Princes of the Church: Bishops and their Palaces.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Heal, F. 1974. The Bishops and the Act of Exchange of 1559. *Historical Journal,* **17** (2). 227-246.

Heal, F. 1980. *Of Prelates and Princes: A Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate.* Cambridge: CUP.

Heal, F. 1984. The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England. *Past & Present,* **102.** 66-93.

Heal, F. 1987. Hospitality and honor in early modern England. *Food and Foodways: explorations in the history and culture of human nourishment,* **1** (4). 321-350.

Heal, F. 1990. *Hospitality in early modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Heal, F. 2008. Food gifts, the household and the politics of exchange in early modern England. *Past & Present,* **199**. 41-70.

Hegarty, A.J. 2004. Potter, Barnaby (bap. 1577, d.1642), bishop of Carlisle. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-22605. Accessed: 01/08/2018.

Herlihy, D. 1985. *Medieval Households.* London: Harvard University Press.

Hicks, M. 2008. Talbot, Gilbert, seventh earl of Shrewsbury (1552–1616), landowner. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-26930. Accessed: 28/05/2018.

Hill, E. 2013. Archaeology and Animal Persons: toward a prehistory of human-animal relations. *Environment and Society,* **4** (1). 117-136.

Hoffman, R.C. 2015. *Salmo salmar* in late medieval Scotland: competition and conservation for a riverine resource. *Aquatic Sciences,* **77**. 355-366.

Hollis, D. 2004. Heveningham, William (1604-1678), regicide. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-13142. Accessed: 04/03/2019.

Hoskins, W.G. 1953. The Rebuilding of Rural England, 1570-1640. *Past and Present,* **4**. 44-59.

Hoskins, W.G. 1976. *The Age of Plunder: the England, 1500-1547*. London, New York: Addison-Wesley.

Houston, R.A. 2010. What Did the Royal Almoner do in Britain and Ireland, c.1450-1700? *English Historical Review,* **125** (513). 279-313.

Houston, R.A. 2011. Custom in Context: medieval and early modern Scotland and England. *Past & Present,* **211** (1). 35-76.

Howden Civic Society. 2020. http://howdencivicsociety.co.uk/bishops-palace-excavation/. Accessed: 16.3.2020.

Hoyle, R.W. 1990. Tenure and Land Market in Early Modern England: Or a Late Contribution to the Brenner Debate. *The Economic History Review,* **43** (1). 1-20.

Hunt, A. 2010. The Reformation of Tradition: The Coronations of Mary and Elizabeth. 63-79. In: Hunt, A. and Whitelock, A. (eds). 2010. *Tudor Queenship: Queenship and Power*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hutchinson, W. 1785. *The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham, Volume 1*. Newcastle: Mr S Hodgson.

Hutchinson, W. 1886. The ancient manor house of the bishops of Durham at Howden, Yorkshire. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal,* **9**. 384-393.

Hutchinson, W.M. 1794. *The History of the County of Cumberland: Volume 2.* Carlisle: E. Jollie.

Hutchinson, W.M. 1823. *The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham, Volume III.* Durham: G. Walker.

Insoll, T. 2007. *The Archaeology of Identities: a reader.* London: Routledge.

Jacobs, L.F. 2017. *Thresholds and Boundaries: Liminality in Netherlandish Art (1385-1530).* Abingdon: Routledge.

James, T.B. 1990. *The Palaces of Medieval England c. 1050-1550: royalty, nobility, the episcopate and their residences from Edward the Confessor to Henry VIII.* London: Seaby.

James, T.B. 2018. Medieval palaces and royal houses. 371-385. In: Gerrard, C.M. and Gutierrez, A.G. (eds). 2018. *The Oxford Handbook of Later Medieval Archaeology in Britain.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jamieson, E. and Lane, R. 2015. Monuments, Mobility and Medieval Perceptions of Designed Landscapes: The Pleasance, Kenilworth. *Medieval Archaeology,* **59** (1). 255-271.

Jarvis, P.J. 1973. North American Plants and Horticultural Innovation in England, 1550-1700. *Geographical Review,* **63** (4). 477-499.

Jefferson, S. 1838. *History and Antiquities of Carlisle: with an account of the castels, gentlemen's seats, and antiquities, in the vicinity, and biographical memoirs of eminent men.* Carlisle: G and T Coward Printers.

Johnson, M. 1993. *Housing Culture. Traditional architecture in an English Landscape*. London: UCL Press

Johnson, M. 1996. *The Archaeology of Capitalism.* London: Routledge.

Johnson, M. 2002. *Behind the castle gate: from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance.* London: Routledge.

Jones, B. 1981. Some Cumberland Builders, 1654-1678. *Transaction of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, **81**. 163-164.

Jones, E., Crone, A., Cross, M., Franklin, J., Haston, S., Holmes, N.M., Lancaster, S., Mighall, T., Reilly, E., Thomas, C., Timpany, S., Tourunen, A. 2011. Through the Cowgate: life in 15th-century Edinburgh as revealed by excavations at St Patrick's Church. *Scottish Archaeological Internet Reports,* **42.**

Jones, G. 2017 Pre-Conquest Regalian Roots of Episcopal Forests and Chases. 101- 114. In: Rollason, D. (ed). 2017. *Princes of the Church: Bishops and their Palaces.* London: Routledge.

Jones, J. 2017. Being, Belief, Comprehension and Confusion: An Exploration of the Assemblages of English Post-Reformation Parochial Religion. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal,* **27** (1). 141-154.

Jones, N.R. 2005. *Architecture of England, Scotland and Wales.* London: Greenwood Press.

Jones, W.T. 1928. The Castle. 64-91. In: Page, W. (ed). 1928. *The Victoria County History of Durham, Volume 3.* London: St Catherine Press.

Jørgensen, D. and Quelch, P. 2014. The Origins and History of Medieval Wood-Pastures. 55-69. In: Hartel, T. and Plieninger, T. (eds). 2014. *European Wood-Pastures in Transition: A Socio-Ecological Approach.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Kaner, J. 1993. Crayke and its boundaries. 103-111. In: Le Patourel, H.E.J. , Long, MH., Pickles, M.F.(eds). 1993. *Yorkshire Boundaries*. Leeds: Yorkshire Archaeological Society.

Keevill, G.D. 2000. *Medieval Palaces: an archaeology.* Stroud: Tempus.

Kenyon, J.R. 1990. *Medieval fortifications.* Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Kerscher, G. 2017. Ubi Papa ibi Roma: the Bishop of Rome's residence in fourteenth century Avignon. 249-266. In: Rollason, D.W. (ed). 2017. *Princes of the Church: Bishops and their Palaces.* London: Routledge.

Kissock, J. and Johnston, R. 2007. Sheephouses and Sheepcotes – A Study of the Post-Medieval Landscape of Cefn Drum, Gower. *Studia Celtica,* **41** (1). 1-23.

King, C. 2003. The Organization of Social Space in Late Medieval Manor Houses: an East Anglian Study. *Archaeological Journal,* **160.** 104-124.

King, P. 1968. The Episcopate During the Civil Wars, 1642-1649. *English Historical Review,* **83** (328). 523-537.

Kingsford, C.L. 1921. On Some London Houses of the Early Tudor Period. *Archaeologia,* **71**. 17-54.

Kjær, L. and Watson, A.J. 2011. Feasts and Gifts: sharing food in the Middle Ages. *Journal of Medieval History,* **37** (1). 1-5.

Lang, A. 1905. The Household of Mary Queen of Scots in 1573. *The Scottish Historical Review,* **2** (8). 345-355.

Langton, J. 2011. Forests and Chases in Wales and the Welsh Marches: and exploration of their origins and characteristics. *Journal of Historical Geography,* **37** (3). 263-272.

Langton, J. 2015. Royal and Non-Royal Forests and Chases in England and Wales. *Historical Research,* **88** (241). 381-401.

Langton, J. 2017. English bishops' hunting rights, hunts, and hunting grounds. 115-126. In: Rollason, D. (ed). 2017. *Princes of the Church and their Palaces.* London: Routledge.

I'Anson, W.M. 1913. The castles of the North Riding. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* **22**. 343.

Larson, P.L. 2010. Village Voice or Village Oligarchy?: The Jurors of the Durham Halmote Court, 1349 to 1424. *Law and History Review,* **28** (3). 675-709.

Lashley, C. 2008. Studying Hospitality: insights from social sciences. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism,* **8**. 69-84.

Laurence, A. 1994. *Women in England 1500 – 1760: a social history.* London: Orion Books.

Leighton, J.M. 1840. *History of the County of Fife: Volume II.* Glasgow: Joseph Swan.

Le Patourel, H.E.J. 1973. *The Moated Sites of Yorkshire.* Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 5. London: Society for Medieval Archaeology.

Lewis, J. and Pringle, D. 2002. *Spynie Palace and the Bishops of Moray: history, architecture and archaeology.* Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland and Monograph Series Number **21**.

Lewis, J.H. 1996. Excavations at St Andrews, Castlecliffe, 1988-90. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland,* **126** (2). 605-588.

Leyser, H. 2011. Walcher, earl of Northumbria (d. 1080), bishop of Durham. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-28428. Accessed: 08/03/2018.

Liddiard, R. 2007. *The Medieval Park: New Perspectives.* Oxford: Windgather Press.

Liddy, C.D. 2008. *The Bishopric of Durham in the late Middle Ages: Lordship, community and the cult of St Cuthbert.* Suffolk: Boydell Press.

Loades, D. 2006. The Marian Episcopate. 35-56. In: Duffy, E. (ed). 2006. *The Church of Mary Tudor.* London: Routledge.

Longstaffe, W.H.D. 1854. *The History and Antiquities of the Parish of Darlington in the Bishoprick of Durham.* Darlington: The Darlington and Stockton Times.

Louisa, A. 2010. Aldrich, Robert (1488/9–1556), bishop of Carlisle. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/ view/10.1093/ ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-315. Accessed: 9/06/2017.

Lowther, C.M. and Bouch, C.M.L. 1948. *Prelates and people of the Lake counties: a history of the diocese of Carlisle, 1133-1933.* Kendal: Titus Wilson and Sons.

Lucas, G. and Regan, R. 2003. The Changing Vernacular: archaeological excavations at Temple End, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire. *Post-Medieval Archaeology,* **37** (2). 165-206.

Lunnon, H. 2017. Inventio Porticus – Imagining Solomon's Porches in Late Medieval England. *British Art Studies,* **6**. https://doi.org/10.17658/issn.2058-5462/issue-06/hlunnon

Lynch, M. 2013. The Reformation in Edinburgh: the growth and growing pains of urban Protestantism. 283-295. In: Obelkevich, J. and Roper, L. (eds). 2013. *Disciplines of Faith: Studies in Religion, Politics and Patriarchy.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Macgeorge, A. 1880. *Old Glasgow: the place and the people from the Roman occupation to the eighteenth century*. Glasgow: Blackie & Son.

Mackenzie, E. and Ross, M. 1834. *An Historical, Topographical, and Descriptive View of the County Palatine of Durham, Volume II.* Newcastle: Mackenzie and Dent.

Madden, F. and Bandinel, B. 1835. *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica, Volume 1*. London: John Bowyer Nichols and Sons.

Maguire, A. and Gomme, A. 1995. Who Needs Two Kitchens? – and Who Parlayed in the Winter Parlour? *Architectural History* **35**. 58-68.

Malloy, K., Hall, D., Oram, R. 2013. Prestigious Landscapes: An Archaeological and Historical Examination of the Role of Deer at Three Medieval Scottish Parks. *Eolas: The Journal of the American Society of Irish Medieval Studies* **6.** 68-87.

Manning, R.B. 1971. The Crisis of Episcopal Authority During the Reign of Elizabeth I. *Journal of British Studies,* **11** (1). 1-25.

Marks, R. and Williamson, P. (eds). 2003. *Gothic: Art for England, 1400-1547: exhibition catalogue.* London: V&A Museum.

Marshall, P. 2009. (Re)Defining the English Reformation. *Journal of British Studies,* **48** (3). 564-586.

Mazzola, E. and Abate, C.S. 2003. Introduction: “indistinguished space”. 1-18. Abate, C.S. (ed). 2003. *Privacy, domesticity, and women in early modern England.* Abingdon: Routledge.

McCallum, J. 2010. *Reforming the Scottish Parish: The Reformation in Fife, 1560-1640.* Abingdon: Routledge.

McCann, J. 2011. Engravings as Evidence of Dovecotes. *Vernacular Architecture,* **42** (1). 36-52.

McIntosh, M.K. 1988. Local Responses to the poor in late medieval and Tudor England. *Continuity and Change,* **3** (2). 209-245.

McIntosh, M.K. 2005. Poverty, Charity, and Coercian in Elizabethan England. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History,* **35** (3). 457-479.

McKean, C. 1996. *Edinburgh: an interactive illustrated architectural guide*. Edinburgh: Rutland Press

McKean, C. 2001. *The Scottish Chateau. The Country House in Renaissance Scotland.* Stroud: Sutton Publishing Limited.

Mileson, S. 2018. Royal and aristocratic landscapes of pleasure. 386-400. In: Gerrard C.M. and Gutiérrez, A. (eds). 2018 *The Oxford Handbook of Later Medieval Archaeology in Britain.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, A.G. 2010. Knights, Bishops and Deer Parks: Episcopal Identity, Emasculation and Clerical Space in Medieval England. 204-237. In: Thibodeaux, J.D. (ed). 2010. *Negotiating Clerical Identities: Priests, Monks and Masculinity in the Middle Ages.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Miller, A.G. 2017. Deer Parks and Masculine Egos: knights, priors and bishops in the medieval north of England. 127-141. In: Rollason, D.W. (ed). 2017. *Princes of the Church: bishops and their palaces.* London: Routledge.

Moffat, A. 2007. *The Reivers: The Story of the Border Reivers.* Edinburgh: Birlinn.

Moffet, L. 1992. Fruits, Vegetables, Herbs and Other Plants from the Latrine at Dudley Castle in Central England, Used by the Royalist Garrison during the Civil War. *Review of Palaeobotany and Palynology,* **73** (1-4). 271-286.

Moore, S.J.E. 1999. *Cutlery for the table: a history of British table and pocket cutlery.* Sheffield: Hallamshire Publications Ltd.

Morrill, J. 1984. The Religious Context of the English Civil War. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* **34**. 155-178.

Morris, R.K. 2003. Monastic Architecture: Destruction and Reconstruction. 235-251. In: Gaimster, D. and Gilchrist, R. (eds). 2003 The Archaeology of the Reformation, 1480-1580. London: Routledge.

Mowl, T. and Earnshaw, B. 1995. *Architecture without kings: the rise of Puritan classicism under Cromwell.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Munck, B.D. 2012. The Agency of Branding and the Location of Value. Hallmarks and monograms in early modern tableware industries. *Business History,* **54 (7).** 1055-1076.

Murray, A.L. 1995. Preserving the Bishop’s Castle, Glasgow, 1688-1741. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland,* **125**. 1143-1161.

Murray, A.L. 2003. The Bishop's Castle, Glasgow, 1598-1744. *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland,* **133.** 343-358.

Neilson, G. 1921. The Cathedral and the Bishopric. *Scottish Geographical Magazine,* **37** (1). 21-25.

Neuschel, K.B. 1988. Noble Households in the Sixteenth Century: Material Settings and Human Communities. *French Historical Studies,* **15** (4). 595-622.

Neville, C.J., 2000. The Courts of the Prior and Bishop of Durham in the Later Middle Ages. *History,* **85** (278), 216-231.

New, E.A. 2002. Christological Personal Seals and Christocentric Devotion in Later Medieval England and Wales. *The Antiquaries Journal,* **82.** 47-68.

Newcombe, D. 2013. Tunstal [Tunstall], Cuthbert (1474–1559), bishop of Durham and diplomat. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-27817. Accessed: 6/06/2018.

Newman, P.R. 2005. *Atlas of the English Civil War.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Nicholas, D. 1988. *The domestic life of a medieval city: women, children, and the family in fourteenth-century Ghent.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Oakey, N. 2003. Fixtures or Fittings? Can Surviving Pre-Reformation Ecclesiastical Material Culture be Used as a Barometer of Contemporary Attitudes to the Reformation in England? 58-72. In: Gaimster, D. and Gilchrist, R. 2003. *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* Leeds: Maney Publishing.

Oram, R. 2004. Dunbar, Gavin (c.1490-1547), administrator and archbishop of Glasgow. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-8203. Accessed 03/06/2018

Page, W. 1923. Parishes: Crayke. *A History of the County of York North Riding: Volume 2.* 119-124. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/yorks/north/vol2. Accessed: 3/12/2019.

Page, W. (ed). 1928. The city of Durham: The castle. In: *A History of the County of Durham: Volume 3.* 64-91. *British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/vch/durham/vol3. Accessed 3/12/2019.

Pantin, W.A. 1962. Medieval English Town-House Plans. *Medieval Archaeology,* **6** (1). 202-239.

Parish, H.L. 2017a. *Monks, Miracles and Magic: Reformation Representations of the Medieval Church.* London: Routledge.

Parish, H.L. 2017b. *Clerical Marriage and the English Reformation. Precedent, Policy and Practice.* London: Routledge.

Parker, F.H.M. 1905. Inglewood Forest. *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmoreland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society* **5.** 43.

Parker, F.H.M. 1907. Inglewood Forest Part III – some stories of deerstealers. *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmoreland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society* **7**. 1-30.

Parker, F.H.M. 1910. Inglewood Forest Part V and VI. *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmoreland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society.* **10**. 1-28.

Parker, R. and Pollock, G. 1992. *Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology*. London: I B Tauris.

Paul, J. 1911. Edinburgh in 1544 and Hertford's Invasion. *Scottish Historical Review* **8** (30), 113-131.

Peacey, J.T. 2008. Blakiston, John. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. https://doiorg.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/10.1093/ref:odnb/2596. Accessed: 24/12/2019.

Pears, R. 2012. Battle of the Styles? Classical and Gothic Architecture in Seventeenth-Century North-East England. *Architectural History,* **55**. 79-110.

Pears, R. 2019. Bishop Tunstall's Alterations to Durham Castle, 1536-48. *Antiquaries Journal* **99**. 161-185.

Peck, L.L. 2005. *Consuming Splendor: Society and Culture in Seventeenth-Century England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pennell, S. 2016. *The Birth of the English Kitchen, 1600-1850.* London: Bloomsbury.

Perriam, D. and Robinson, J. 1998. *The Medieval Fortified Buildings of Cumbria.* Kendal: CWAAS Extra Series **29**. 216-7.

Pevsner, N. 1976. *Dictionary of Architecture*. New York: Viking Press.

Phillpotts, C., Samuel, M. and Seeley, D. 2006. *Winchester Palace: excavations at the Southwark residences of the bishops of Winchester*. London: Museum of London Archaeology Service.

Piper, A.J. 1989. The First Generations of Durham's Monks and the Cult of St Cuthbert. 437-447. In: Bonner, G. Rollason, D.W. and Stancliffe, C. (eds). 1989. *St Cuthbert, His Cult and Community to AD 1200.* Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.

Piper, A. 2004. Kirkham, Walter of (d. 1260), administrator and bishop of Durham. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-15668. Accessed: 16/07/2017.

Pollard, A. 2008. Booth [Bothe], Laurence (c. 1420-1480), bishop of Durham and archbishop of York. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-2888. Accessed: 04/08/2018.

Prentis, M. 2017. Scotland's First Lutheran: The Short Life of Patrick Hamilton. *Church Heritage,* **20** (2). 67-96.

Prior, M. 1985. Reviled and Crucified marriages: the position of Tudor bishops' wives. 118-148. In: Prior, M. (ed). 1985. *Women in English Society, 1500-1800.* London: Routledge.

Rackham, O. 1986. *The History of the Countryside.* London: J.M Dent and Sons.

Raine, J. 1852. *A Brief Historical Account of the Episcopal Castle, or Palace of Auckland.* Durham: George Andrews

Raine, J. 1866. On the Episcopal Palace at Howden. *Yorkshire Architectural Society,* **8**. 295.

Raine, J. 1869. Some Notices of Crayke Castle: a paper by Rev. Canon Raine. *Reports and Papers Read at the Meetings of the Architectural Societies of the Diocese of Lincoln, County of York, Archdeaconry of Northampton, County of Bedford, Diocese of Worcester, County of Leicester and Town of Sheffield.* Lincoln: James Williamson. 66-71.

Raine, J. 1876. Survey of the manor house of Stockton, commonly called Stockton Castle, taken after the death of Bishop Pilkington. *Archaeologia Aeliana*, **2** (7). 120-125.

Rawcliffe, C. 2018. 'Great Stenches, Horrible Sights, and Deadly Abominations': butchery and the battle against plague in late medieval English towns. 18-38. In: Engelmann, L., Henderson, J. and Lynteris, C. (eds). 2018. *Plague and the City.* London: Routledge.

Reid, K.G.C. 2003. Vassals No More: Feudalism and Post-feudalism in Scotland. *European Review of Private Law*, **11** (3). 282-300.

Reid, R.R. 1921. *The King's Council in the North.* London: Longmans Green.

Reid, S. 2012. *Scots Armies of the English Civil Wars.* Oxford: Osprey Publishing.

Remnant, G.L. and Anderson, M.D. 1998. *A Catalogue of Misericords in Great Britain.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Renwick,R. and Lindsay, J. 1921. *History of Glasgow, Volume 3*. Maclehose: Glasgow

Richardson, A. 2003. Gender and Space in English Royal Palaces c. 1160-c.1547: a study in access analysis and imagery. *Medieval Archaeology*, **47** (1). 131-165.

Richardson, A. 2005. *The Forest, Park and Palace of Clarendon, c. 1200-c. 1650: reconstructing an actual, conceptual and documented Wiltshire landscape.* BAR British Series 387.

Rijkelijkhuizen, M. 2017. Knife makers and knife handle production in 17th and 18th century Amsterdam. *Cahiers LandArc 2017, Report* **14.**

Roberts, H. and Godfrey, W.H. 1951. Carlisle House and Carlisle Lane. 75-76. In: Roberts, H. & Godfrey, W. H. (eds). *Survey of London: Volume 23, Lambeth: Southbank and Vauxhall. British History Online* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol23. Accessed: 27 March 2019.

Roberts, M. 2003. *Durham: 1000 years of history.* Stroud: Tempus.

Robinson, J.M. 1989. Rose Castle, Cumberland: the seat of the Bishop of Carlisle. *Country Life* **183**. 70-5.

Robinson, M. and Lynch, P. 2007. The Power of Hospitality: a sociolinguistic analysis. 141-154. In: Lashley, C. Lynch, P. and Morrison, A.J. (eds). 2007. *Hospitality: a social lens.* Oxford: Elsevier.

Rogers, C. 1849. *History of St Andrews.* Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black.

Rogers, C.J. 1998. The Scottish Invasion of 1346. *Northern History*, **34** (1). 51-69.

Rollason, D. 2012. Forests, parks, palaces, and the power of place in early medieval kingship. *Early Medieval Europe*, **20** (4). 428-449.

Rollason, D.W. 2016. *The Power of Place: rulers and their palaces, landscapes, cities and holy places.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rollason, D. 2017. Introduction: researching the palaces of the princes of the Church. 1-13. In: Rollason, D.W. (ed). 2017. *Princes of the Church: Bishops and their Palaces.* London: Routledge.

Rosser, G. 1994. Going to the fraternity feast: commensality and social relations in late medieval England. *Journal of British Studies,* **33** (4).

Ryrie, A. 2004. Reform Without Frontiers in the Last Years of Catholic Scotland. *English Historical Review,* **119** (480). 27-56.

Ryrie, A. 2006. *The Origins of the Scottish Reformation.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Sanderson, M.H.B. 1986. *Cardinal of Scotland: David Beaton, c. 1494-1546.* Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd.

Sanderson, M. 2005a. Beaton [Betoun], David (1494?–1546), cardinal and archbishop of St Andrews. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-1823. Accessed: 18/10/2018.

Sanderson, M. 2005b. Ogilvy, Marion (d. 1575), landowner and mistress of Cardinal David Beaton. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-66295. Accessed: 12/12/2018.

Saunders, A.D. 1997. Norham Castle and Early Artillery Defences. *Fort,* **25**. 37-61.

Scammell, J. 1966. The Origins and Limitations of the Liberty of Durham. *The English Historical Review,* **81** (320). 449-473.

Scanlon, N. 2005. The Development of the Kitchen in the English Country House: 1315-1864. *Journal of Culinary Science and Technology* **4** (2-3). 79-92.

Scham, S.A. 2001. The Archaeology of the Disenfranchised. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory,* **8** (2). 183-213.

Schen, C.S. 2002. *Charity and Lay Piety in Reformation London, 1500-1620.* London: Routledge.

Schofield, J. 1994. *Medieval London Houses.* London: Published for the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art by Yale University.

Schofield, J. 2017. Bishop's houses in medieval London. 179-194. In: Rollason, D.W. (ed). 2017. *Princes of the Church: Bishops and their Palaces.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Shammas, C. 1980. The Domestic Environment in Early Modern England and America. *Journal of Social History,* **14** (1). 3-24.

Shead, N. 1969. The Origins of the Medieval Diocese of Glasgow. *Scottish Historical Review,* **48** (146). 220-225.

Sheppard, F.H.W. (ed). 1970. Survey of London: Volume 36, Covent Garden. London: London County Council. *British History Online. 16 March 2020.* http://www.british-history.ac.uk/survey-london/vol36.

Sherlock, P. 2004. Episcopal Tombs in Early Modern England. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* **55** (4). 654-680.

Simpson, G. and Hatley, V. 1953. An excavation below Bishop Tunstal's Chapel, Durham Castle. *Antiquaries Journal,* **33** (1-2). 56-64.

Simpson, G. and Webster, B. 1962. The Archives of the Medieval Church of Glasgow: an Introductory Survey. *The Bibliotheck: a Scottish Journal of Bibliography and Allied Topics,* **3**. 195-201.

Skelton, K. 2009. Redefining Hospitality: The Leisured World of the 1650s English Country House. *Journal of Architectural Historians,* **68** (4). 496-513.

Skelton, L. 2014. Beadles, Dunghills and Noisome Excrements: Regulating the Environment in Seventeeth-Century Carlisle. *International Journal of Regional and Local History,* **9** (1). 44-62.

Slavin, P. 2014. Warfare and Ecological Destruction in Early Fourteenth-Century British Isles. *Environmental History,* **19** (3). 528-550.

Smith, A. and Riall, N. 2002. Early Tudor Canopywork at the Hospital of St Cross, Winchester. *Antiquaries Journal,* **82.** 125-156.

Smith, B.R. 1999. *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Smith, C. and Graves, C.P. 2017. En Route and in Residence: integrating documentary and archaeological evidence for the itineraries and residences of the medieval Bishops of Durham. 285-303. In: Rollason, D.W. (ed). 2017. *Princes of the Church: Bishops and the Palaces.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Sökefield, M. 1999. Debating Self, Identity and Culture in Anthropology. *Current Anthropology,* **40** (4). 417-448.

Somerville, J.P. 1999. *Royalists and Patriots: Politics and Ideology in England 1603-1640.* Boston: Addison-Wesley.

Sowler, T. 1972. *A history of the town and borough of Stockton-on-Tees.* Middlesbrough: Teesside Museums & Art Galleries Department.

Spicer, A. 2003. Iconoclasm and Adaptation: The Reformation of the Churches in Scotland and the Netherlands. 29-43. In: Gaimster, D. and Gilchrist, R. 2003. *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* Leeds: Maney Publishing.

Stacy, W.R. 1986. Richard Roose and the use of Parliamentary Attainder in the Reign of Henry VIII. *The Historical Journal,* **29** (1). 1-15.

Stamper, P. 1988. Woods and Parks. 129-185. In: Astill, G. and Grant, A. 1988. (eds). *The Countryside of Medieval England.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Starkey, D. 2007. *Elizabeth: The Struggle for the Throne.* New York: Harper Perennial.

Summerson, H. 2018. May, John (d. 1598), bishop of Carlisle. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-18421. Accessed: 13/11/2018.

Surtees R. 1823a. Parish of Darlington. 350-377. In: *The History and Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham: Volume 3, Stockton and Darlington Wards.* London: Nichols and Son.

Surtees, R. 1823b. Parish of Stockton. 168-196. In: *The History of Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham: Volume 3, Stockton and Darlington Wards*. London: Nichols and Sons.

Sykes, N. 2004. The Dynamics of Status Symbols: Wildfowl Exploitation in England AD 410-1550. *Archaeological Journal,* **161** (1). 82-105.

Tabraham, C. and Owen, K. 2010. *St Andrews castle, cathedral and historic burgh.* Edinburgh: Historic Scotland.

Tarlow, S. 2003. Reformation and Transformation: What Happened to Catholic Things in a Protestant World? 108-121. In: Gaimster, D. and Gilchrist, R. 2003. *The Archaeology of Reformation, 1480-1580.* Leeds: Maney Publishing.

Tatton-Brown, T.W.T. 2004. Rose Castle: Palace of the Bishops of Carlisle. 257-268. In: McCarthy, M.R. and Weston, D. (eds). 2004. *Carlisle and Cumbria: Roman and medieval architecture, art and archaeology.* Leeds: Maney Publishing.

Tatton-Brown, T.W.T. and Crook, J. 2002. *The English Cathedral.* London: New Holland.

Taylor, A.L. 2018. Where are the wild things? Animals in western medieval European history. *History Compass,* **16** (3). https://doi.org/10.1111/hic3.12443

Taylor, J.D. 2004. *Documents of Lady Jane Grey: Nine Days a Queen of England, 1553.* New York: Algora Publishing.

Taylor, P. 2006. (ed). *The Oxford Companion Guide to the Garden.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, A. 2000. *Princelie Majestie: the court of James V of Scotland, 1528-1542.* East Linton: Tuckwell.

Thompson, M.W. 1998. *Medieval Bishops' Houses in England and Wales.* Kent: Ashgate Ltd.

Thompson, M.W. 2008. *The Decline of the Castle.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thorp, J.R.L. and Alcock, N. 2019. Great Moor Farm, Sowton, Devon: the recording and excavation of a 16th- and 17th century farmhouse. *Post-Medieval Archaeology.* 1-39. https://doi.org/10.1080/00794236.2019.1654738

Thurlby, M. 2017. Bishop Hugh of le Puiset's great hall at Auckland Castle: its place in English twelfth-century architecture. 348-374. In: Rollason, D.W. (ed). 2017. *Princes of the Church: Bishops and their Palaces.* Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 39. Abingdon: Routledge.

Thurley, S. 2009. The Cloister and the Hearth: Wolsey, Henry VIII and the Early Tudor Palace Plan. *Journal of the British Archaeological Association,* **162** (1). 179-195.

Thurley, S. 2017. *Houses of Power: The Places that Shaped the Tudor World.* London: Bantam Press.

Tuck, J.A. 1985. War and Society in the Medieval North. *Northern History,* **21** (1). 33-52.

Turner, A., Gerrard, C. and Wilkinson, K. 2010. Geophysical and geoarchaeological survey at the Bishop's Palace, Wells. 125-136. In: Dunning, R. 2010. *Jocelin of Wells: Bishop, Builder, Courtier.* Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.

Turner, R. 2017. St David's Palace and its Remarkable Roofscape. 375-386. In: Rollason, D.W. (ed). 2017. *Princes of the Church: Bishops and their Palaces.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Turner, R.C. 1997. The medieval palaces of the bishops of St Davids, Wales. 217-225. In de Boe, G. and Verhaege, F. (eds). *Military Studies in Medieval Europe.* Zellik: Medieval Europe Brugge.

Tyson, B. 1983. William Thackeray's Rebuilding of Rose Castle Chapel, Cumbria, 1673-75. *Transactions of the Ancient Monuments Society,* **27**. 61-74.

Usher, B. 1998. Durham and Winchester Episcopal Estates and the Elizabethan Settlement: A Reappraisal. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History,* **49** (3). 393-406.

Usher, B. 2003. *William Cecil and Episcopacy, 1559-1577.* London: Routledge.

Walford, E. 1878. Lambeth: Waterloo Road. 407-425. In: Walford, E. 1878. Old and New London: Volume 6. London: Cassell, Petter & Galpin, 1878. *British History Online.* Web. 17 March 2020. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/old-new-london/vol6/pp407-425.

Walker, R.B. 1960. Lincoln Cathedral in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth I. *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, **11** (2). 186-201.

Walsham, A. 2017. Recycling the Sacred: Material Culture and Cultural Memory after the English Reformation. *Church History*, **86** (4). 1121-1154.

Walter, J.C. 1908. *A History of Horncastle from the earliest period until the present time.* Horncastle: W.K. Morton and Sons.

Weston, D. W.V. 2013. *Rose Castle and the Bishops of Carlisle 1133-2012.* Kendal: Titus Wilson and Sons.

White, P. and Cook, A. 2015. *Sherborne Old Castle, Dorset: archaeological investigations 1930-90.* London: Society of Antiquaries of London.

Whittle, E. 1999. The Tudor Gardens at St Donat's Castle, Glamorgan, South Wales. *Garden History*, **27** (1). 109-126.

Whitwell, J.B. 1984. The Bishop of Durham's Manor at Howden. *The Archaeological Journal*, **141,** 56-57.

Willen, D. 2008. Russell, John, first earl of Bedford (c. 1485-1555), courtier and magnate. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-24319. Accessed: 03/09/2018.

Williamson, T. 1995. *Polite Landscapes: Gardens and Society in Eighteenth Century England.* Baltimore: John Hopkins Publishing.

Willmott, H. 2002. *Early post-medieval vessel glass in England, c. 1500-1670.* York: Council of British Archaeology.

Wilson, B and Edwards, P. 1993. Butchery of horse and dog bones at Witney Palace, Oxfordshire, and the knackering and feeding of meat to hounds during the post-medieval period. *Post-Medieval Archaeology*, **27** (1). 43-56.

Wilson, J. 1912. *Rose Castle: The Residential Seat of the Bishops of Carlisle.* Carlisle: Charles Thurnam.

Wilson, J. and Bewley, E.T. 1902. Bewley Castle. *Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society*, **3**. 240-262.

Winning, T. 1959. Church Councils in the Sixteenth-Century Scotland. *The Innes Review*, **10** (2). 311-337.

Wood, I. 2008. Monasteries and the Geography of Power in the Age of Bede. *Northern History*, **45** (1). 11-25.

Wood, R. 2010. The Norman Chapel in Durham Castle. *Northern History*, **47** (1). 9-48.

Woolgar, C.M. 1999. *The Great Household in Late Medieval England*. London: Yale University Press.

Woolgar, C.M. 2011. Gifts of food in late medieval England. *Journal of Medieval History*, **37** (1). 6-18.

Young, C.R. 1979. *The Royal Forests of Medieval England.* Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Young, M.B. 2016. Coke, Sir John (1563-1644), politician. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. From https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-5828. Accessed: 08/08/2018.

Yule, G. 1969. Continental Patterns and the Reformation in England and Scotland. *Scottish Journal of Theology*, **22** (3). 305-323.