An Archaeological Resource Assessment of Medieval Lincolnshire

Paul Everson

[a]   English Heritage, NMRC, GreatWestern Village, Kemble Drive, Swindon, SN2 2GZ   e-mail: paul.everson@english-heritage.org.uk

[b]   6 Monks Lane, Nantwich, Cheshire CW5 5DN   e-mail: everson6@btinternet.com]

Note: For copyright reasons the figures are currently omitted from the web version of this paper. It is hoped to include them in future versions.

1   *Characterisation of the resource*

The resource for the archaeological study of medieval Lincolnshire is a complex and intimate combination of surviving or partially surviving medieval structures; areas of residual landscape, subject to the mediation mentioned below; buried features, landscape and potential; artefacts; records of archaeological activity; and 'text'-documented entities. This is conceptually little different from earlier periods, but practically and because of the thoroughgoing impact of medieval land-use in the county it appears distinctive.

For the medieval period in Lincolnshire, we are dealing (perhaps for the first time quite so clearly) with a completely and purposefully exploited landscape over effectively the whole land surface of the county - 'joined-up landscape'. The period spans half a millenium of continuity and change; 16th-century Lincolnshire was a very different place from 10th- or 11th-century Lincolnshire, but it develops recognisably from it. Yet also there were many social and economic vicissitudes - notably exceptional population growth during the 12th and 13th centuries and population decline in the 14th century and the economic consequences of that; there was no simple or unidirectional 'progress'. There were some major physical changes, particularly in coastal and fenland exploitation. Yet buildings and landscape structures created then remain with us and in use; the period set a physical and cultural framework out of which modern Lincolnshire grew.

Medieval Lincolnshire was itself built on and out of previous, complex periods of landuse and culture, which themselves thoroughly exploited and altered the landscape. These endowed the medieval period with all manner of baggage, both physical - eg obvious residuals like paved Roman roads where they were maintained and major stone buildings in ruins - and less tangible - eg locations and features with

ancient values or on which traditional values could be put (places of meeting, of ritual, of superstition even), from prehistory, from the Roman period, and from the early post-Roman centuries.

At the same time, remains of the medieval period are mediated to us through the overlay of the last 400 years or more, through processes, interesting in their own right, which have adapted, manipulated, levelled, destroyed and sometimes even conserved. Though our access to medieval remains in the landscape may sometimes appear to be particularly direct, the effects of such mediation are almost always significant and need to be identified and understood.

Furthermore (and perhaps most importantly) for the medieval period we know a good deal of its chronological framework, a great deal about the structure of society, much about its economic basis and technical capabilities, and about its belief structure, and so on.

In consequence (and to put it crudely) the expectations of interpretation and understanding to come out of medieval archaeology are likely to be more sophisticated than for preceding periods. The archaeological processes are identical - investigation, recording and interpretation - but they are directed (generally) at what in a different context has been called 'a high resolution interpretation', very much beyond data accumulation (Allen 1996). While it would be wrong to portray this as peculiar to medieval studies, for the medieval period the framework and associated expectation are effectively all-pervading.

Part of the sophistication lies in the potential afforded by its relationship to 'text'- to a documentary background that is both general and specific to a site. Within this are included not only written documentary sources - whose notable richness for Lincolnshire has underpinned the work of a succession of great historical scholars over several generations - but also graphical materials such particularly as topographical drawings (eg Ambrose 1981), maps etc, which provide information with a direct topographical correlation to archaeological sites and field remains.

Medieval archaeology is emphatically not the illustrative handmaid of 'text' in this broad sense (Austin 1990). Examples abound where the recorded archaeology is in conflict with the text. The important excavations at Goltho provide a case in point (Beresford 1975; 1987), where the name of Goltho is not documented until the 13th century and then not as the populous settlement and manorial centre that excavation revealed. Such a conflict or serious anomaly typically leads to a review of the evidence on both parts, and can result in fresh insight - `Goltho' newly understood as Bullington (Everson 1988). In this example and typically, therefore, it is rather the case that archaeology's value and importance is

enhanced in circumstances where relevant documentary resources are also available and capable of correlation. The result can then be the `high resolution interpretation' mentioned above.

2   *The recorded resource and past frameworks*

Documentation of the medieval archaeological resource is diverse. It extends to considerably more than the records of archaeological interventions, principally excavations, that can be put together from the SMR and notices in the county journal, though that in itself constitutes a useful piece of documentation (Woods 1998 = APPENDIX here), capable of correlation with RCHME's – now English Heritage's - national excavations index. In Lincolnshire, as generally elsewhere with rare exceptions, the diversity is not fully assimilated to any single record base. It may never be a reasonable objective to achieve that fully, but core categories of information need to be brought together for the sake of perceiving their interrelationships and dynamic.

The county has little tradition in defining research frameworks for the medieval period, or for any other. A statement of period-based research priorities was produced in the late 1970s by the local archaeological units of the time towards a regional framework of debate, but against a limited and largely personal assessment of the state of knowledge (Mahany 1977). With the exception of *Pre-Viking Lindsey* (Vince 1993), there have been no systematic or repeated reviews of the archaeology of the county by period as seen, most notably in East Anglia and Essex. The relevant History of Lincolnshire volume for the medieval period (Platts 1985) made limited and largely illustrative use of archaeological information, and thereby gave little framework for its research potential.

In contrast, individual large recording projects are capable in themselves of defining framework for further research. For the medieval period this was certainly the effect, exceptionally, of the RCHME's fieldwork project in West Lindsey (Everson, Taylor and Dunn 1991, esp Introduction) and in a more limited way for the Fenland Project (Hall and Coles 1994; Hayes and Lane 1992; Lane 1993), and is the intended case, within a multi-period framework, similarly for the Humber Wetlands Project, for example (Van de Noort and Davies 1993; Van de Noort and Ellis 1997; 1998).

Certainly for the medieval period, Lincolnshire offers good combinations of circumstances for fieldwork projects, especially those able to take an intelligent, multi-disciplinary approach. Because of modern land-use, there are commonly in juxtaposition surviving settlement elements and standing buildings, earthwork remains (though in quantifiably diminishing numbers (Everson et al 1991, 56-7)),

and arable land suitable for fieldwalking; and a ceramic range that is continuous and quite well understood from urban excavations; good AP evidence for large areas from modern and historic flying (Bewley 1999); potential for a variety of environmental sampling, from wetland sites, from locations of land reclamation, from valley colluviation locales. Yet there have been few locally generated, parish-scale or larger, fieldwork projects with a medieval focus. A glaring example of this omission is the lack of wider landscape context even for the excavations at Goltho (qv below). There was, to be fair, in the 1960s and 1970s, an understandable concentration on the prevalent destruction of settlement earthworks, where the fieldwalking and pottery collecting activities of Rex and Froude Russell among others was focused. This in turn fuelled other research initiatives (Hurst 1984; Hayfield 1985).

3   *Investigation and Understanding of the resource*

An overview of the present state of medieval archaeology in Lincolnshire can conveniently be approached through the categories under which recent fieldwork was reported in the pages of the national period journal *Medieval Archaeology* for the first 25 years of its existence. Though mechanistic and limiting in ways that some attempt is made to address in Section 4 below, this has the virtue of covering the main monument categories systematically and allowing a primary level of correlation with the national research priorities formulated by that period interest group and others.

A   MONASTIC SITES

Lincolnshire has a large number of monastic sites, both rural and urban, including examples of all the principal orders (Owen 1971, 146-53 lists over 130, over 80 of them rural houses; Bennett 1993b). They are generally as a class well documented, though as the principal first source the VCH volume (Page 1906) is old, limited and fallible. Where cartularies survive, they are actually or potentially very well documented (Davis 1958). As a group they constitute an excellent sample of a national resource. Of particular individual note are Sempringham, as the mother house of the only English order (the Gilbertines), and the fact that 11 of the 26 foundations of the order, including most of the substantial houses, are located within the county; Newsham, the first English house of the Premonstratensian order; and several with certain or probable earlier pre-Conquest monastic origins, including Bardney, Crowland and South Kyme.

Most post-Conquest monastic sites in the county are securely located; it is a rarity for any to be newly identified or their location revised (but see exceptionally Everson 1989). For many, their precinct boundary is clear or definable. Most are afforded statutory protection and revision of the monument

category through MPP is well advanced and in itself produces a systematic assessment of the documented and archaeological history. Associated standing structures are relatively rare, and where they do exist their potential as sources of archaeological information has not often been exploited (see exceptionally Stocker 1990). By contrast, many are superbly preserved earthwork sites; recent field surveys of several have shown their excellent potential for new information through non-intrusive investigation (eg RCHME surveys of Tupholme, Kirkstead and within Everson et al 1991). Geophysical recording has produced excellent results, complementary to earthwork survey at the Carthusian house of Axholme Priory (RCHME). Excavations have historically targeted the church and main coventual buildings, as at Bardney or Thornton, though the total clearance of the Templars house at South Witham set new expectations (Wilson and Hurst 1967, 274-5). Pioneering work of exceptional importance by Glyn Coppack has investigated the outer court of Thornholme Priory, but remains as yet unpublished (Coppack forthcoming).

Many monastic sites have the remains of ancillary features in their immediate proximity - water supplies and conduits, fishponds, canals, access causeways, fisheries on nearby watercourses; they can have an impact on the local settlement pattern that is archaeologically observable and not infrequently their activities in reclamation and land improvement is extensive. All these things have been noted in field remains (eg Everson 1989a; Everson et al 1991, 46-7) but not worked on in a thoroughgoing way. Networks of granges and tenanted farms, while quite easy to identify in documentary sources, have not formed the basis of study that links them archaeologically to their parent house.

A matter of note when first perceived, but now an established commonplace, was the realisation that post-Dissolution country houses, commonly accompanied by some form of formal garden layout and selectively reusing monastic buildings, occupied most former monastic sites and account for the form and nature of the field remains as now encountered (Everson 1996).

A current study of the abbey of Barlings, its granges and its local landscape may when published serve to illustrate the potential interest of an approach that considers the impact of both the creation and the dissolution of a monastic house on a specific part of the county (Everson, Richmond and Stocker in prep).

B   CATHEDRALS AND ECCLESIASTICAL PALACES

Lincoln Cathedral has a preeminent position in the ecclesiastical archaeology of the county; in architectural and art historical terms it is recurrently the location within Lincolnshire for innovation and for undertakings of high quality and large scale, that act as pattern and inspiration for ecclesiastical

building in its area (eg Stocker and Everson in prep). Its conservation and related recording are regulated by Lincoln Cathedral Fabric Council, which numbers among its members an Archaeological Consultant, currently Lawrence Butler. The CFCE has required that the cathedral authorities articulate a Research Framework of its own for the cathedral and a set of priorities, presumably through the consultant archaeologist.

A mass of scholarship that pertains to the cathedral is summarised in part by Heslop and Sekules (1986) and by Owen (1994), but there is much other and continuing work.

The cathedral as building and site forms a component within Lincoln's Urban Archaeological Database (Vince UAD). The close and holdings of the bishop and dean and chapter are of a parallel importance within the city. They include many standing medieval buildings and are exceptionally well documented, most notably through the *Registrum Antiquissimum* (Major 1953-74). As a core part of the invaluable series on the Ancient Houses of Lincoln (Jones, Major and Varley 1984; 1987; 1990; Jones, Major, Varley and Johnson 1996) historical, structural and topographical information is readily available in print and has also informed and been assimilated into the UAD.

The bishop of Lincoln's palace at Lincoln, prominently sited on the lip of the scarp south of the cathedral, has been the subject of large amounts of investigation in connexion with display and interpretation to visitors, some of it as yet unpublished (Faulkner1974; Chapman et al 1975). His houses outside Lincoln at Stow and Nettleham (neither with surviving standing fabric) have been shown by non-excavational recording to have forms reflecting their different uses - the one with an impressively contrived approach, fronted by sheets of water and giving access to a huge enclosed hunting park, the other a retreat close to Lincoln and occasional lodging for the most important guests with major stone buildings and an integral enclosed garden (Everson et al 1991, 129-31, 184-5). A third residence, at Sleaford Castle, also has no standing fabric but excellent earthwork remains and a riverine location that suggests an interest in a designed setting which has yet to be adequately understood (cf below CASTLES).

The bishop of Durham's residence at Somerton Castle does retain fragmentary medieval standing fabric, which affords the potential for an additional dimension of understanding of the intention and impact of what again appears to be a designed setting for a major residence (eg Buck view reproduced in Ambrose 1981).

C   CHURCHES AND CHAPELS

Lincolnshire had something like 700 medieval parish benefices (Bennett 1993a); but that did not exhaust the number and variety of ecclesiastical provision that might be represented physically by a church or chapel. There were also many parochial and manorial chapels, plus many monastic and quasi-monastic institutions, some of which at the latter end of the spectrum had quite shadowy and ill-documented existencies under the guise of (eg) hospitals, hermitages, bridge and wayside chapels and the like (Owen 1971; 1975). This variety is reflected in a huge range of size and simplicity/complexity of fabric (probably more effectively characterised in the English Heritage's Monument Class Descriptions – MCDs - for 'Parish churches', 'Gate, bridge and causeway chapels' and various monastic categories and through Morris 1989 than in Blair and Pyrah 1996). Individual entities could move from one function to another, sometimes in ways that were not clear-cut, and especially, for example, under the impact of the creation and dissolution of monastic institutions.

This resource is ostensibly quite well documented archaeologically in standard published sources including the Buildings of England volume (Pevsner and Harris 1964; rev Antram 1989), in the VCH and Knowles and Hadcock (1971), and most valuably in Mrs Owen's pioneering listing of chapels (1975). But it is doubtful whether these disparate sources adequately cover the field even at a primary level, and certainly not in a coordinated way. For example a church only described by `Pevsner' in terms of its present 18th- or 19th-century fabric, like Riseholme for example, may or may not be on the site of a medieval predecessor (Everson et al 1991, 155-9). Work on the two major, multi-parish towns of Lincoln and Stamford is much further advanced than that for the bulk of the county, and demonstrates the richness and diversity of the resource (Vince UAD; Rogers 1965; Hartley and Rogers 1974; RCHME 1977, xlv-xlix), even at the level of a secure location and simple characterisation.

Medieval fabric and especially architectural detailing from all sorts of churches is prone to move around and find different forms of reuse or conservation, often interesting in its own right (Stocker with Everson 1990, using only an early medieval dataset to characterise what is a general medieval phenomenon). Systematic documentation of this is in its infancy, except in Lincoln itself (eg Stocker 1990), apart - in my experience - from the pencilled annotations of the Pevsner volumes of certain well-travelled individuals.

With such numbers, it is easy to overlook the importance of the county's standing churches and chapels as a stock of medieval buildings, and their individual value. It is also a relatively little-known stock: in part because the Buildings of England volume and its revision are not the most successful of that remarkable series; in part because they have not, in general, been followed up with more

archaeologically orientated attitudes or studies. New insights and even completely new discoveries, large and small, are not uncommon, and more remain to be made. Only within the programme of work at Barton-on-Humber have substantial stone-by-stone studies been undertaken (Rodwell and Rodwell 1982).

Against such a substantial resource, the number and range of excavations have been limited. Nevertheless several - those particularly at St Peter's, Barton-on-Humber, St Mark in Wigford, Lincoln and St Paul in the Bail, Lincoln - stand out as among the most thoroughgoing and informative in the country (Rodwell and Rodwell 1982; Gilmour and Stocker 1986; Jones 1994). Excavations at Burnham importantly revealed a complete parochial chapel (Coppack 1986). Those at Rand were addressed at preservation by record of a threatened, core element of an otherwise well-preserved settlement complex protected by designation (Field 1983). Other interventions generated by similar or often more limited refurbishment of churches in use have generally resulted in important but commensurately more limited outcomes - eg Holton le Clay (Sills 1982), Healing (Bishop 1978), Keelby (Field 1986), Stow (Field 1984).

The substantial wave of rural redundancies initiated in the 1970s and 1980s had a strong geographical bias to the Wolds and marshland of eastern Lindsey. It gave rise, with the exception of Cumberworth (Green 1993), to only quite limited archaeological recording and that focussed on the standing fabric (eg Miningsby (Everson 1980); Moorby (White); Muckton (White); Authorpe (Field); Little Carlton (Field). While principally the effect of a lack of available financial resourcing, it also reflected the absence of systematic and comparative documentation against which to make an assessment and develop a case for action.

An important concomitant of churches of certain status is a graveyard or burial ground. Substantial skeletal populations were excavated at St Peter, Barton-on-Humber, and St Mark and St Paul in Lincoln: none have yet been the subject of a published report. That from St Peter's is given an additional significance by the complementary early medieval/ 6th- to early 8th-century population now reported on in print from the Castledykes cemtery in Barton (Drinkall and Foreman 1998). There appear to have been no skeletal reports on monastic populations in the county; although the potential is in principle high within Lincolnshire for comparative studies of populations of different dates and backgrounds - it may be that progress in this will rely on regional and national comparisons.

D   CASTLES

Castles in Lincolnshire as a class are well known sites, typically marked by substantial and generally

well-preserved earthworks, which as a group enjoy a high level of protection. Destructive threats nevertheless remain, as illustrated wholesale (at Goltho) and piecemeal (at Welbourn).

With notable exceptions including Lincoln (Lindley forthcoming) and Tattershall (Thompson 1974), standing structures are rare , and certainly have specific logic in respect of continuing use, practical and/or symbolic, to account for their survival. But both the detail visible within earthworks at sites such as Castle Bytham and the experience of excavations at Bolingbroke and Stamford (both still largely unpublished, but see respectively Thompson 1966; 1969 and Mahany 1977; 1978) have shown the potential for survival of major stone buildings in a form suitable for display and, in the latter case at least, for their detailed reconstruction on paper from excavated architectural fragments. The excavations at Goltho, recte Bullington, demonstrated the analogous potential of clayland sites of this class - where earthworks may appear simpler and less promising - both in the recovery of plans of timber halls of equivalent pretension to those in stone elsewhere and in the preservation of waterlogged structural evidence, for example, of bridges and gatehouses (Beresford 1987).

The generally good level of documentation tends greatly to enhance the potential of work on castles.

Artefact collections and environmental samples from these sites of the highest secular status, as much as their buildings, can provide important insights into the conspicuous consumption and resource exploitation at the aristocratic level and its changing expression through time. No Lincolnshire castellar residence has yet delivered this sort of evidence. Its full value would probably lie in contributing to wider comparisons at regional and national level.

The agenda in castle studies has shifted markedly in recent years from one dominated in its conception wholly by military considerations to one where the castle is understood as a residence carrying the image of lordship and set deliberately into a landscape designed to enhance and promote that symbolism (Stocker 1992; Everson 1998). Bodiam in Sussex has been a touchstone in that debate (Everson 1996), but the bishop's palace at Stow Park played a seminal role in the development of such ideas (Everson 1998), and other episcopal residences in castellar guise, including most obviously Sleaford Castle and Somerton Castle appear to be open to similar study (see above). Splendid earthworks at Bolingbroke and Castle Bytham appear to structure the immediate context of those castles in a relevant way, to name just two examples: but what is required more than individual cases is a change in mind-set to allow the actual field remains and other than narrowly military considerations to inform our understanding.

E   TOWNS

Lincoln has in its new Urban Archaeological Database a tool of great efficacy in locating and correlating information within a map-based framework, and thereby promoting perceptions of patterns and relationships in the urban fabric. In this role it informs and underpins the forthcoming publications of syntheses of post-Roman excavations in the city of Lincoln, uphill and down (Jones and Vince forthcoming), which will themselves set new frameworks for future research in the city. An example of its creative power to fuel innovative insights about the early form and development of Lincoln castle, and through that to reset an agenda for debate and investigation at the heart of Lincoln's topography, is already in press (Stocker and Vince 1997).

No other town in Lincolnshire has a similar basis for study. For a number, traditional one-off studies have supplied a useful framework to some effect - Louth (Field 1978), Boston (Harding 1978); for Stamford there is excellent information as befits a town of the first order but it is necessary to draw it together from a series of different sources (RCHME 1977; Rogers 1965; 1972; Mahany and Roffe 1983; Mahany et al 1982); for Barton-upon-Humber the series of studies by Geoff Bryant (1984; 1994) and for Horncastle and Sleaford at least useful springboards (respectively Field and Hurst 1983 and Mahany and Roffe 1979; Elsdon 1997). Elsewhere, drawing together of available information tends either to have a less archaeologically focused aspect - Grimsby (Gillett 1970), Spalding (??), Gainsborough (Ian Beckwith's series of History of Gainsborough pamphlets, 0000-00), Grantham (Manterfield 1981) - or has yet to be undertaken - Kirton-in-Lindsey, Bourne, Brigg, Wainfleet, Alford, Spilsby, Market Rasen, Tattershall, Wragby. For somewhere as evidently important at least at an early date as Caistor, the absence is surprising; but the most important omission, as for the pre-Conquest period (despite Barley 1964; 1981), is Torksey, even if the prime issue as the medieval period unfolds is its urban decline in favour of Gainsborough.

This range of Lincolnshire towns outside the county town is not yet within the schedule of English Heritage's programme of Extensive Urban Evaluations. There will be a considerable benefit in their inclusion in this programme, sooner rather than later, both in identifying particular potential and defining priorities in each case, but in comparisons to the same standard across the range.

There is a legitimate and problematic debate over defining a boundary between towns and other large settlements (Dyer   ), that has a particular relevance in specific parts of Lincolnshire such as the settlements of the Fenland ridge.

Other settlements and locations had or were created with the intention of having functions outside the

agricultural norm. They include apparently deliberately created, 'failed towns' such as Langworth (Everson et al 1991, 26), Castle Carlton (Everson 1986; Owen 1992) , Eagle on the Fosse Way (Beresford 1967). But there were also meeting and trading places such as Spital on the Street (Everson 1993, 00) or Stow Green (Roffe 1986; White 1979), or Barleymouth (Cameron 1984, 196-7) or Dogdyke on the river networks. The latter may have had similar river-based functions as the coastal havens such as Swine, Saltfleet and Wilgrip on the Lindsey coast, Bicker, Fleet and Wrangle on the Wash (Pawley 1993a). What the archaeological form of such places that is capable of investigation is not yet clear, but the quality and diversity of material finds appears a characteristic.

F   ROYAL PALACES

There are no permanent royal palaces in the county (and an apparent intention to build a royal castle at Grimsby seems not to have come off (HKW, 656-7). But a number of buildings which by royal possession for a period, royal use in trnasit, or royal instigation and patronage bear witness to the impact of royal expectations, spending power or the symbolism attached to the Crown and its immediate agents. A striking example is David Stocker's suggestion that what we know as St Mary's Guildhall in High Street, Lincoln owes its elaborate 12th-century form to its use for a limited period at the zenith of Lincoln's standing as an urban and ecclesiastical centre as a royal residence on the occasion of the ritual royal crown-wearing (Stocker 1991).

This phenomenon forms part of the history of a number of Lincolnshire sites, including most obviously the major castles of Bolingbroke, Lincoln and Stamford, but also favoured monastic sites such as Barlings Abbey (Everson, Richmond and Stocker in prep).

G   MOATS AND MANORS

In their most elaborate form, what are categorised formally as moats and manors may differ little in their attributes and functions - and in the considerations which currently inform their study - from castle (qv). The bishop's manor at Nettleham had large ranges of stone buildings and appurtenances such as a formal garden and stabling that contributed to it comfort and elegance: the moated residence at Mablethorpe was the subject of a licence to crenellate in the 15th century, which probably indicates an interest in asserted status conveyed through an elaboration of the site which might not otherwise be anticipated (Everson et al 1991, 129-31; Coulson 1979; 1982).

Field survey of earthworks has proved effective where deployed in some parts of the county, principally West Lindsey (Everson et al 1991, 41-4), in several respects pertaining to moats and manors:

- in identifying and defining manorial complexes in non-clay areas, ie without a moat at their core, for example at West Firsby;

- in identifying the appurtences and wider extent of moated manors beyond the moated platform, for example at Rand and North Ingleby;

- therefore in allowing a better informed discussion of the relationships between manors and (eg) churches or (eg) planned villages;

- in identifying the most substantial of them as residences of local mesne lords, who often took their surnames from the place;

- in differentiating between manorial moats and the many other functions that moats fulfilled, including as monastic granges, park lodges etc.

This level of identification and discrimination is not consistently available throughout the county, and may not be readily achievable.

Standing buildings of manorial status are few compared with most other parts of the country. The 12th-century stone structure at Boothby Pagnell (White 1981; Pevsner) has attracted and continues to attract most active work because of its place in the debate about the existence or otherwise of first-floor halls in England and their alternative interpretation as solar ranges (Blair 1993; Impey and Harris forthcoming). A concerted study of Gainsborough Old Hall bringing together expertise from within and outside the county has set recording and understanding of that late-medieval building on a new footing (Lindley 1991).

Excavations have not yet exploited those frameworks provided by field survey, in part because well-preserved and readily identified manorial sites enjoy a high level of protection by scheduling. The excavations at Goltho illustrated in a manner of national and international importance the physical creation and development of the manor of Bullington, and its transformation in the 12th century into castellar form (Beresford 1982; 1987; Everson 1988). Whitwell's excavation of a much more modest timber hall and solar arrangement within a levelled moat at Saxilby, though interpreted in publication as a secular residence perhaps of an assarting or subordinate manor (Whitwell 1969) was probably rather a monastic holding (Everson et al 1991, 12), though almost undocumented and conceivably sub-let into secular hands. It provides a contrast for which other comparative material is desirable. Published excavations at Epworth revealed a stone manor complex of late medieval date, perhaps more typical of the moats and manors identifiable as earthworks (Hayfield 1984).

This amounts to a surprisingly thin understanding and uneven coverage of a common, largely ubiquitous monument category, that was of great significance in contemporary society at local level.

H   FARMS AND SMALLER DOMESTIC ARCHITECTURE

This characterisation for Lincolnshire is subsumed within the wider brief of `medieval settlement' (qv). Individual buildings of these types and of medieval date apparently do not survive in the county.

I   MEDIEVAL SETTLEMENT

Much of the documentation of medieval settlement in Lincolnshire is cast in traditional inherited terms of `DMV' and `SMV', which [a] presumed an even uniformity of nucleated settlements throughout the county in the period, and [b] concentrated exclusively on abandoned features. This remains the case, despite the clear evidence from historic APs and the existing settlement pattern that some areas were characterised rather by non-nucleated or dispersed settlement (Everson 1983, 00). Except for RCHME fieldwork in West Lindsey (Everson et al 1991) and such specific studies as those of Stallingborough and Aylesby (Everson 1981; Steedman and Foreman 1995, esp 33, 35), existing settlements and their morphology has not been systematically considered part of the resource. Unfortunately that study, too, was confined to an administrative area typified by nucleation, and did not choose in the later 1970s and early 1980s to opt for a sampling strategy that might have included sections of the Lindsey coastal marshlands or the fenland fringes - as it might have done and as was adopted shortly afterwards for a pilot AP project (Jones 1988). Even then, subsequent reflection suggested that the West Lindsey fieldwork as reported in publication accorded too little recognition to the interleaved presence of individual farmsteads and hamlets within the dominant nucleated pattern (Taylor 1995).

Recent frameworking study, in the form of English Heritage's {Medieval} Settlement Project under the auspices of the MPP, has at a national level evolved a more helpful bi-partite distinction in medieval settlement type into *nucleated* and *dispersed*, which reflects a decade or more of scholarly debate (Glasscock 1986; Taylor 1992). It has mapped the overall pattern of their incidence as reflected in 19th-century settlement patterning (Roberts and Wrathmell 1995). This mapping in general terms matches the direct field evidence in Lincolnshire well in identifying the Lindsey marshland and the fenland with its fringes as areas with a predominantly dispersed structure. The origins of the contrasting areas, and the possibilities of fluctuating boundary zones between the two, and any anomalies are immediate issues (Roberts and Wrathmell 1998). In many parts of the country, dispersed settlement correlates with long-established woodland: in Lincolnshire alternative land-use or social factors are surely at play.

The existing documentation of the resource, therefore, matches ill both conceptually and practically with need. Field survey, fieldwalking, aerial photography, documentary work and excavation evidence

13

have all focussed almost exclusively and sometimes misleadingly on abandoned settlements and a paradigm of nucleation. This has produced good evidence for only part of the county - that falling within Roberts and Wrathmell's `Central Province'. Excavations at Goltho, recte Bullington, brilliantly revealed the forms of village properties and peasant buildings on a clayland site, and developed reconstructions as a source for debate (Beresford 1975). More piecemeal investigations on a series of stone sites, including Riseholme (Thompson 1960), have revealed equivalent matters in those contexts rather less satisfactorily. The best comparative evidence in practice lies regionally outside the county in the results from Wharram Percy in the Yorkshire chalk wolds.

Even with the scale of work at Goltho (recte Bullington), we have no clear conception of the pattern of settlement which the nucleated village replaced, evidently in the 11th century (Beresford 1975), still less the physical form or socio-economic basis of that settlement pattern. Nor yet do we have clear detail of the physical process of desertion represented on site or off from the 14th century onwards. Both in a sense are `new' questions beyond the remit of the original excavations; but they might both be addressed by a purposeful study founded principally on fieldwalking. Studies of this sort have been undertaken in the county (eg Lane 1995) but apparently not targeted in this way to provide a context for a major excavation and build on current understanding.

J   INDUSTRIAL SITES

There may be no close correlation between the industries that are distinctive to Lincolnshire when viewed regionally or nationally, those that were most important to it economically, and those that are most accessible for archaeological study or (like pottery) are crucial more generally to the archaeological process. Salt, stone and fishing arguably fit the first category.

Salt

Lincolnshire had a major coastal salt industry from before the late 11th century until into the early post-medieval period (Healey 1993; Sturman 1984; Beresford and St Joseph 1979, 262-5). There is a good basis of understanding of this industry from the early studies of Mrs Rudkin, the Owens, Hallam and others (eg Hallam 1960; Rudkin and Owen 1960; Rudkin 1975; de Brisay and Evans 1975). Important excavations at Bicker (Healey 1975) and Wainfleet St Mary (McAvoy 1994) recording detailed structures and processes have now been published. The locations and extent of the salterns produced by this industry have now been systematically mapped by the National Mapping Programme's project . The very extensive field remains both on the Lindsey and around the Wash have been much affected by

conversion of pasture to arable, and continue to be under pressure, but they remain a remarkable resource of field evidence by national and international standards. In addition to their evidence of structures and processes, the salterns hold good potential for horizontal stratigraphy and landscape relationships with sea banks and settlements, as recently reviewed by Grady (1999).

The industry has a distribution dimension - in coastal trading, in saltways leading inland, and in settlements, like Castle Carlton (Owen 1992), with a place and rights in the distribution network.

Stone

The best quality Jurassic limestones – from Lincoln, Ancaster, and from the Clipsham/Ketton and Barnack areas on the county's borders – were a resource of at least regional importance. The study of their use and distribution for funerary monuments and architectural details in the late pre-Conquest period (Everson and Stocker 1999) may serve as an indication of the mechanics of the industry through the medieval period, with allowance for the great growth of the industry to serve the increasing numbers, scale and sophistication of stone buildings. The building accounts for the steeple of St James at Louth show the organisation of the industry at the end of the period (Dudding 1941). Contrary to the impression given by Alexander (1995) and others, 'quarries' are likely to have been zones of extended linear exploitation of the outcrops rather than limited deep quarrying. Their effect therefore both mirrors and, when returned to cultivation, mimics the natural landform, and has yet to be formally recorded or investigated in any archaeological way.

Exploitation of locally important stone sources for building, including limestone rubble throughout the outcrop, Spilsby sandstone, Tealby and related ironstones, and chalk, also developed in the post-Conquest period and is reflected most clearly and richly in the fabric of local parish churches across the county.

Fishing and fisheries

Lincolnshire's long North Sea coast and estuarine frontages on the Humber and Wash sustained a substantial maritime trade and fishing industry, witnessed by a combination of documentary sources, through many small havens and creeks as well as the major ports of Boston and Grimsby (Pawley 1993a). The local, small-scale and almost ubiquitous basis of sea fishing may be better indicated by the evidence available from the 16th and 17th centuries (Pawley 1993b, map). The related archaeological resource has yet to be defined, still less investigated. But the circumstance that many of the creeks and maritime locations declined and were abandoned through silting up and coastal accretion suggests a high unrealised potential.

Riverine fisheries are numerous and well documented from the 11th century onwards (Barley 1936; White 1984). The good archaeological potential has been demonstrated by work on such features on the Trent in Nottinghamshire, left behind by changes in the river course (Salisbury ??). Opportunities for investigation are difficult to predict specifically rather than generally, however.

With coastal and river traffic so important to communication, the building and maintenance of craft ought to have a significant place in the archaeological record; but evidence for ship- or boat-building and repair – or of craft themselves - is as yet absent. It may have been a riverside activity of towns, large and small, and certainly locations of silting or left behind by major river works like the 18th-century canalisation of the Witham below Lincoln ought to afford good potential.

Pottery

The national pattern of urban production in the earlier period – at Lincoln (Miles, Young and Wacher 1989; Young 1993), Stamford (Kilmurry 1980) and Torksey (Barley 1964; 1981) – and more typically rural manufacturing in the later medieval period – at Potterhanworth, Bourne, Toynton and Bolingbroke – is well evidenced in the county. Characterisation of their products has been developed and refined through both academic studies and the publication of major excavation accounts from Lincoln, Goltho and elsewhere. Reviews of the state of understanding within the county, regionally and nationally are available (Hurst 1984; Mellor 1994; McCarthy and Brooks 1988).

Special opportunities exist at Toynton among the later group of sites and at Torksey among the earlier, where there is a large body of information and a proven quality of the buried resource, to define, protect and investigate a complete settlement or a zone within a major settlement with its economic basis in pottery production.

Sites other than manufactories that produce very good groups of pottery remain important for this topic. An example at Fiskerton Short Ferry suggests that 'trading places' (qv above) may have a special value in this, especially in relation to imports.

Metal-working

Ore-bearing ironstone is available in several parts of the county – in the Scunthorpe area, on the W fringe of the Wolds and in the SW – and was reportedly exploited in the Roman period (Whitwell 1992, 113-5). Evidence is lacking for production in the medieval period, though sites in NE Northants might suggest contemporary exploitation in adjacent parts of Lincolnshire. Otherwise, ironworking or

smithing would solely be an activity of reworking and finishing - as recorded in excavation at Goltho for example (Beresford 1975, 34, 46) and as was necessarily the case with all other metal products whose raw material was not available within the county.

Woodland industries

Coppice and standard woodlands survive as 'ancient woodlands' or a re documented in very restricted areas of Lincolnshire, especially in the S end of the Lindsey clay vale, the southern coastal marshland and in south Kesteven. The archaeology of the woodlands themselves – in the form of woodland banks, subdivisions, ponds, coppice stools and distinctive under-flora – is well preserved in places and well documented by specialist, largely non-archaeological study (Gibbons 1975, 27-35; Peterken 1971; and see Rackham ??; Lane 1995).

Archaeological evidence for the processing of this resource – whether as timber for building or wood for tools and utensils – is absent, and likely to be ephemeral and dispersed in location.

Other industries

Two perhaps stand out, for their significance as markers of later medieval economic change and of a shift in cultural expression. One is processing and finishing of cloth; and the resource lies in the urban fringe, in dedicated districts or streets such as Walkergate in Louth, and (perhaps more obviously) in the batteries of fulling mills that provided the power on an industrial scale. The second is brick manufacture for the county's notable array of surviving early brick buildings (Wight 1972, 208-307).

K   OTHER

Coastal reclamation

Medieval reclamation of marsh and fen is a topic in which, judged simply on the area of land affected, Lincolnshire has a preeminent role in the national agenda (Silvester 1999, fig 9.1). There is a mass of relevant documentation, both of medieval and post-medieval date, that has been mined assiduously by historical scholars to create a framework of understanding of both function and chronology (Hallam 1965; 1988; Owen, AEB incl 1984; 1993; 1996). The major wetland surveys of the past decade have begun to relate that more closely to the landscape and to the complexities and chronologies implied by the physical remains (eg Lane 1993, 86). But Grady's recent paper based on air photographic evidence (1999) has again reasserted the interrelationships between the coastal industries, especially salt,

settlement patterns and the sea banks, highlighting the limitations of current archaeological understanding of these networks.

Communications

Communications patterns perhaps most fully exemplify the nature of the medieval resource as characterised in the opening section of this assessment.

Some elements were retained or recreated from the routes of Roman Roman paved roads – among them Ermine Street for many miles N of Lincoln, the High Dyke through Ancaster, Wragby Road NE of the city, and Tillbridge Lane across the Trent lowlands in western Lindsey. In many cases these were – and still are – substantial earthworks, that served as markers for coherent groups of parish boundaries. Some elements may have been of even greater antiquity, as has been suggested (for example) for the so-called Middle Street along the cliff N of Lincoln or the E-W element of the crossroads at Caenby Corner (Everson 1993). Despite the evidence of early charters, there is some evidence in place- and field-names for a hierarchy and related nomenclature for roads – king's road, *herepath* etc – bequeathed from the early medieval period.

The medieval period itself developed a complex network of communications, principally providing local links between settlements. While much of this network may remain in use, parts were systematically superseded, outside the old enclosures of settlements, by the processes of Parliamentary Enclosure and thereby made archaeological residue. Modern road improvements and realignments continue those processes of transforming fragments of earlier routes into archaeological fossils in the landscape.

Bridges and fords tend to be critical pinch points in relation to routes and communications, and commonly generate a cluster of distinctive associated facilities or archaeological attributes, including chapels (qv above). Brigg (now Humberside/North Lincolnshire) is a prime example, where that specific importance is signalled by the place-name. ON *va*δ, as in Waithe or Langworth etc, as well as OE *ford* provide analogies. Though at a general level fixed points that pin the communications network to the landscape, variations at the local level in the position of a bridge replacing a ford, or a bridge a bridge, can create potentially rich archaeological contexts, especially because of the scope for waterlogged and anaerobic contexts. There appears to be little or no recognition of this in current records.

The MPP Industrial STEP reports on 'Bridges' now provide a good body of information and

assessment about the site type, including medieval examples. Just as importantly, they recognise the impact of the creation or re-siting of a crossing point on a wider canvass of alignments and linkages of communication, in a way that is as relevant to the medieval period as later in making the effects part of the resource.

Individual surviving stone bridges of medieval date, such as the High Bridge at Lincoln, the 14th-century bridge at West Rasen, or the Triangular Bridge at Crowland, represent substantial investments and aspirations to permanence. They may, as the Crowland example most clearly indicates, carry other significance and meaning beyond their structural and functional interest.

Causeways, too, are numerous but under-recognised elements of the communications network in the county's low-lying areas. Of greatly varying scale, from the major constructions represented by the Fen causeway or that linking the island of Stickney/Stickford to the mainland to the wholly local, many (perhaps most) are of medieval or earlier date. They can be approached essentially as industrial archaeology, for their details of date and construction. Rather most interesting, though, are their associations with ritual deposits of all periods and with medieval religious institutions, and therefore their links with deep-rooted traditions, ritual and belief (Stocker and Everson forthcoming).

Further elements in the communications network, especially in the fen and marshland districts, are drove routes and saltways. Where they survive as broad green ways it is commonly as recognised features embedded in the landscape but not as monumentalised, explicitly archaeological entities. This is a characteristic that applies more generally to roads and routes. As linkages in the settlement pattern, their forms and patterns are different in areas of nucleated and dispersed medieval settlement. Along with field patterns and settlement form they ought to constitute one of the most important of the bundle of factors that characterise the historic landscape of the two types of settlement zone. As such, they have a particular value in that arena of landscape character and distinctiveness (Fairclough, Lambrick and McNab 1999).

Field systems
Pace Bassett's study of the Goltho area (Bassett 1985), there is no robust evidence for the survival of pre-medieval field systems providing a fossilised framework for medieval cultivation patterns in the manner proposed by (for example) Williamson's work for parts of East Anglia. Evidence for medieval cultivation in the form of ridge-and-furrow lands bundled together in interlocking furlongs is virtually ubiquitous in the county outside the areas of peat fen and other specialist landuse of more limited

extent, even across the high chalk wolds. In many parishes and townships, such field systems extended at their most developed practically to the township boundary.

With the exception of the sample areas covered by the Fenland Suvey (Hayes and Lane 1992; Lane 1993), there has been no extensive and systematic recording of the archaeological evidence in the manner of Hall's fieldwork in Northants and Bedfordshire (Hall 1972) and no background research to match Hall's in Northants (Hall 1995). Rex Russell's many studies of parliamentary enclosure, including as they often do a reconstruction of the pre-enclosure field layout (eg Russell 1975 etc), nevertheless provide valuable information to set alongside Thirsk's and Hallam's historical work (including Thirsk 1957; Hallam 1965).

The survival of ridge-and-furrow as earthwork field remains has been rapidly and drastically eroded in the latter part of the 20th century, with the subsidised intensification of modern arable farming. In a recent EH-sponsored evaluation of midland field systems, no Lincolnshire parish within the study registered more than xx% survival by area, and none reached the candidate threshold for designation. Rare articulated survivals do nevertheless exist (Everson and Hayes 1984, fig 11). A concentration on monumentalising earthwork survivals of ridge-and-furrow, for example through the national Mapping Programme (Bewley 1999) and the county SMR, while perhaps understandable on a conservation agenda, provides only a partial record of the resource, and does not aid understanding or encourage further research. Among other things, it certainly masks a critical difference in the field systems of the areas of dispersed settlement in the county compared with the areas of nucleation, even though the building block of both is morphologically similar.

In addition to ridge-and-furrow, field systems in the valleys and on the scarp of the Wolds include flights of strip lynchets (eg Everson and Hayes 1984, figs 12 and 14), some of them notable constructions. In the Fens rare examples of flat, ditched lands known as 'dylings' or 'darlands' are local variations of cultivation form (Hall and Coles 1994, 146). Here, too, fields of ridge-and-furrow of great unbroken length mark the conversion of large-scale medieval reclamation to productive arable.

4   *Issues*

4.1   This paper grapples with the 'high' or later medieval period in contrast to a separate presentation of the earlier medieval or Anglo-Saxon period. This chronological break cuts across a string of major research issues – most obviously the origins of settlements, of field systems, of towns (but probably in practice most high-level research issues) – in a way that has no sense. Many comparable research frameworks

run the two together – as indeed the national period society does – perhaps preferring to make a division between urban and rural (eg Glazebrook 1997; Brown and Glazebrook 2000).

4.2   Much of the innovation in medieval studies lies in the capacity that lies in the resource of this period to consider and frame questions in relation to networks – eg of monastic estates -, to interrelationships – eg of manor and church or planned village - , of interdependencies – eg of town and hinterland or settlement and field system -, of interactions – of one town with another or monastery with secular landscape – or otherwise than only by single monument type. The opportunity exists for much of the research frameworks for the county of Lincolnshire or regionally to be framed in those ways and built to those ends. Only by doing so can 'high resolution understanding' be extracted.

4.3   Patterning of evidence becomes an important issue in the medieval period, and more particularly correlations and their absence between different sets of information. This places a premium on a developed SMR or resource base, capable of acting as a research tool, as the UAD for Lincoln has proved capable of. For this, it needs to contain a greater range of spatial information – in contrast to solely archaeological point data – than has been traditional. There is no doubt that this range for the medieval period, which can include matters of detail and refined specialisation, is not easily dealt with in traditional SMR terms; but the capacities of modern GIS facilities need to be exploited as effectively as possible.

4.4   'High resolution understanding' requires full and innovative use to be made of environmental evidence (cf Murphy 1998), about whose importance and potential this paper has said too little.

4.5   In Lincolnshire, there has been such an erosion of above-ground evidence that formerly existed as earthworks, and (quite properly) designation of what remains as earthworks, that there is a case for testing the value of plough-levelled examples of familiar categories like medieval villages, field systems etc. Rather than being viewed as 'destroyed', might they still answer properly framed questions – perhaps extensive questions – about overall form, boundaries, origins and growth – even if not intensive or detailed ones about building types etc? Do we have a grasp on the value of our resource in its varied states, as distinct from valuing it (obviously and predictably) in its optimum state?

4.6   In addition to some glaring deficits in the recorded resource, there may be a related issue of a lack of sure recognition and confidence in that resource. Both are critical to its championing and effective curation on the wider public stage. So, not only where else in England but Lincolnshire would we be recording essentially for the first time in the late 1990s a mid 14th-century monastic grange chapel standing virtually to roof height – as at Grange de Lings (Everson, Richmond and Stocker in prep)? But also where else in northern Europe would we still be pulling down buildings whose fabric was essentially medieval, as has happened with dome church redundancies in Lincolnshire?

4.7   Too much of the medieval resource for Lincolnshire remains locked up in unpublished excavations, several of them substantial and relating to evidence of excellent quality and of far more than local

significance. This is especially unfortunate when the prospective pattern of PPG-led archaeological activity appears likely to make work of this scale a rarity for the future.

5   *Conclusion*

5.1   Lincolnshire is a very large county, which offers exceptional resources for archaeological study of the medieval period and the potential to contribute significantly to the subject and the period (as it has often done before now) at local, regional, and national levels. It has great internal diversity of topography and historic landuse. It has a number of features of intrinsic importance, perhaps most obviously that it centres on a great medieval city and cathedral, the cultural and administrative influence of both of which extended far beyond their own county. Its research frameworks must recognise and exploit these simple fundamental facts.

5.2   Its regional specialisations, if confined to three, are probably:

5.2.1   A very wide range of urban and quasi-urban types, including a great city (Lincoln), a tier of other towns of national and international standing (Boston, Stamford, Torksey, Grimsby), many sub-regional centres (including Grantham, Sleaford, Bourne, Spalding, Louth, Horncastle, Gainsborough), successful and failed new towns, and other 'trading places', notably a series on coastal havens and on inland waterways. Some of these, especially the last group, appear special within the region and need better characterisation. All (Lincoln partially excepted) await study of their internal zoning and organisation, their relationship to their hinterland their interrelationships with each other.

5.2.2   A long coastline and major waterway networks, which are important regionally and nationally. Associated with them are 'trading places', specialised industries, and probably much of the production and distribution of materials and finished goods.

5.2.3   Coastal salt production is distinctive within the region and has among the best preserved field evidence nationally. The Fenland Survey, the Humber Wetlands study and NMP have set a new framework for this topic, especially in its relationship to local settlement patterns, sea defences and the coastal marshland economy.

5.3   Such specialisations apart, Lincolnshire's potential lies more generally in:

●   The variety of approaches and information available and their capacity for intelligent and effective combination;

●   Its size and diversity, offering many bases for sampling and comparison on a scale that might address regional or even national issues;

●   The special opportunities for organic and environmental evidence that lie within its wetland resource.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen 1996   in eds DA Hinton and M Hughes, *Archaeology in Hampshire: a framework for the future*, Hampshire County Council

Alexander, J 1995   'Building stone from the East Midlands quarries: sources, transportation and usage', *Med Archaeol* 39, 107-35

Ambrose, T 1981   *Samuel Buck and eighteenth-century Lincolnshire*, Lincolnshire Museums Information Sheet 24

Austin, D 1990   'The "proper study" of medieval archaeology' in eds D Austin and L Alcock, *From the Baltic to the Black Sea: studies in medieval archaeology*, One World Archaeology (publications resulting from the World Archaeological Congress) 18, London, 9-42

Barley, MW 1936   'Lincolnshire rivers in the middle ages', *LAASRP* 1, 1-21

Barley, MW 1964   'The medieval borough of Torksey, excavations 1960-62', *Antiq J* 44, 164-87

Barley, MW 1981   'The medieval borough of Torksey, excavations 1963-68', *Antiq J* 61, 263-91

Bassett, SR 1985   'Beyond the edge of the excavation: the topographical context of Goltho', in eds H Mayr-Harting and RJ Moore, *Studies in Medieval History presented to RHC Davis*, 21-39

Beckwith, I 0000-00   *History of Gainsborough* series

Bennett, N 1993a   'Parish churches', in Bennett and Bennett 1993, 46-7

Bennett, N 1993b   'Religious houses', in Bennett and Bennett 1993, 48-9

Bennett, S and Bennett, N eds 1993 *An Historical Atlas of Lincolnshire*, University of Hull Press

Beresford, G 1975   *The medieval clayland village: excavations at Goltho and Barton Blount*, Soc Med Archaeol Monograph 6

Beresford, G 1982   'Goltho Manor, Lincolnshire: the buildings and their surrounding defences, c850-1150', *Proceedings of the Battle Abbey Conference in Anglo-Norman Studies 1981* 4, 13-36

Beresford, G 1987   *Goltho, the development of an early medieval manor c 850-1150*, English Heritage Archaeological Report No 4, London

Beresford, MW 1967   *New Towns of the Middle Ages*, London

Beresford, MW and St Joseph, JKS 1979
                            Medieval England: an aerial survey, 2nd edn, Cambridge

Bewley, RH 1999 ed   *Lincolnshire's Archaeology from the Air*, Occasional Papers in Lincolnshire History and Archaeology 11, Lincoln

Bishop, H 1978   `Excavations at the Church of SS Peter and Paul, Healing, South Humberside', *LHA*, 13, 25-34

Blair, J 1993   'Hall and chamber: English domestic planning 1000-1250' in eds G Meirion-Jones and M Jones, *Manorial Domestic Buildings in England and northern France*, Society of Antiquaries Occasional Paper 14, 1-21

Blair, J and Pyrah, C 1996 *Church Archaeology: research directions for the future*, CBA Research Report 104, York

Brown, N and Glazebrook, J ed 2000
      Research and Archaeology: a framework for the eastern Counties 2 research agenda and strategy, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional paper 8

Bryant, GF 1984   *Medieval Churches of Barton-on-Humber*, Barton-upon-Humber

Bryant, GF 1994   *The Early History of Barton-upon-Humber*, 2nd edn Barton WEA

Cameron, K 1984   *The Place-names of Lincolnshire pt 1*, EPNS 58

Coppack, G 1986   `St Lawrence Church, Burnham, South Humberside: the excavation of a parochial chapel', *LHA*, 21, 39-60

Coppack, G forthcoming *Excavations at Thornholme Priory 1974 to 1980 – a monastic outer court*

Coulson, C 1979   'Structural symbolism in medieval castle architecture', *J British Archaeol Assoc* 132, 73-90

Coulson, C 1982   'Hierarchism in conventual crenellation: an essay in the sociology and metaphysics of medieval fortification', *Med Archaeol* 26, 69-100

Chapman, H, Coppack, G and Drewett, P 1975
      Excavations at the Bishop's Palace, Lincoln 1968-72, Occasional Papers in Lincolnshire History and Archaeology 1

Davis, GRC 1958   *Medieval Cartularies of Great Britain*, London

De Brisay, KW and Evans, KA eds 1975
      Salt – the study of an ancient industry, Colchester

Drinkall, G and Foreman, M 1998
      The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Castledyke South, Barton-on-Humber, Sheffield Excavation Reports 6, Sheffield

Dudding, RC 1941   *The First Churchwardens' Book of Louth 1500-1524*, Oxford

Dyer, C   ?in Landscape History

Elsdon, SM 1997   *Old Sleaford revealed. A Lincolnshire settlement in Iron Age, Roman, Saxon and*

Medieval times: excavations 1882-1995, Oxford

Everson, P 1980   `Miningsby, St Andrew's church', *LHA*, 15, 76-7

Everson, P 1981   'Stallingborough - earthwork survey', *LHA* 16, 29-37

Everson, P 1983   'Aerial photography and fieldwork in north Lincolnshire' in ed GS Maxwell, *The Impact of Aerial Reconnaissance on Archaeology*, CBA Research Report 49, 14-26

Everson, P 1986   'Occupation du sol au Moyen Age et a l'epoque moderne dans le nord du Lincolnshire' in eds A Ferdiere and E Zadora-Rio, *La prospection archeologique: paysage et peuplement , Documents d'Archeologie Francaise 3*, 29-37

Everson, P 1988   `What's in a name? `Goltho', Goltho and Bullington', *LHA* 23, 93-9

Everson, P 1989a   `Rural monasteries within the secular landscape', in eds R Gilchrist and H Mytum, *The Archaeology of Rural Monasteries*, British Archaeological Reports British Series 203, Oxford, 141-5

Everson, P 1989   `Lost and found in Lincolnshire: two problems in archaeological inventorizing' in eds MCB Bowden, DA Mackay and P Topping, *From Cornwall to Caithness: some aspects of British Field Archaeology: papers presented to Norman V Quinnell*, British Archaeological Reports British Series 209, Oxford, 55-64

Everson, P 1993   'Pre-Viking settlement in Lindsey' in Vince 1993, 91-100

Everson, P 1996   `The after-life of monastic houses: the earthwork evidence', in ed C Sturman, *Lincolnshire People and Places: essays in memory of Terence R Leach (1937-1994)*, Lincoln, 13-17

Everson, P 1996   `Bodiam Castle, East Sussex: castle and its designed landscape', *Chateau Gaillard. Etudes de castellologie medievale* 17, 79-84

Everson, P 1998   `"Delightfully surrounded with woods and ponds": field evidence for medieval gardens in England', in ed P Pattison, *There by Design. Field Archaeology in Parks and Gardens*, RCHME/Swindon (also published as British Archaeological Reports, British Series, 267), 32-38

Everson, P and Hayes, T 1984
                     'Lincolnshire from the air' in Field and White 1984, 33-41

Everson, P, Richmond, H and Stocker, D in prep
                     `The Premonstratensian Abbey of St Mary at Barlings and its grange at Lings, Lincolnshire'

Everson, P and Stocker, D 1999
                     Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture Volume 5 Lincolnshire, British Academy

Everson, P, Taylor, CC and Dunn, CJ 1991
                     Change and Continuity. Rural settlement in north-west Lincolnshire, HMSO

Fairclough, G, Lambrick, G and McNab, A 1999
                     Yesterday's World, Tomorrow's Landscape, English Heritage

Faulkner, PA 1974   `Lincoln Old Bishop's Palace', *Archaeol J* 131, 340-4

Field, N 1978   *Louth: the hidden town*, Lincoln

Field, N 1983   `Rand church', *LHA*, 18, 101-3

Field, N 1984   `Stow church', *LHA*, 19, 105-6

Field, N 1986   `Lincolnshire churches', *LHA*, 21, 74-5

Field, N and Hurst, H 1983 'Roman Horncastle', *LHA* 18, 47-88

Field, N and White, A eds 1984
          A Prospect of Lincolnshire, Lincoln

Gibbons, EJ 1975   *The Flora of Lincolnshire*

Gillett, E 1970 (reprinted in paperback 1986)
          A History of Grimsby, University of Hull Press

Gilmour, BJJ and Stocker, D 1986
          St Mark's Church and Cemetery, The Archaeology of Lincoln XIII-1, London

Glasscock, RE 1986   'Medieval rural settlement: retrospect and prospect. Conference report', *Medieval Settlement Research Group Annual Report 31, 39-45*

Glazebrook, J ed 1997   *Research and Archaeology: a framework for the eastern Counties 1 resource assessment*, East Anglian Archaeology Occasional paper 3

Grady, DM 1999   'Medieval and post-medieval salt extraction in north-east Lincolnshire' in Bewley 1999, 81-95

Green, FJ 1993   `Conversion of St Helen', *British Archaeological News*, ns 8, 11

Hall, D 1972   'Modern surveys of medieval field systems', *Beds Archaeol J* 7, 53-66

Hall, D 1995   *The Open Fields of Northamptonshire*, Northants Record Society 3

Hall, D and Coles, J 1994 *The Fenland Survey. An Essay in Landscape and Persistence*, English Heritage Archaeological Report, 1, London

Hallam, HE 1960   'Salt-making in the Lincolnshire Fenland during the Middle Ages', LAASRP ns 8, 85-112

Hallam, HE 1965   *Settlement and Society. A study of the early agrarian history in South Lincolnshire*, Cambridge

Hallam, HE 1988   `Drainage techniques', in ed HE Hallam, *The Agrarian History of England and Wales, Volume 2 (1042-1350)*, Cambridge

Harding, G 1978   *Medieval Boston and its Archaeological Implications*, Heckington

Hartley, J and Rogers, A 1974
The Religious Foundations of Medieval Stamford, Stamford Survey Group Report

Hayes, P and Lane, T 1992
The Fenland Project No 5: Lincolnshire Survey, The South-West Fens, East Anglian Archaeology Report No 55

Hayfield, C 1984   'Excavations on the site of the Mowbray manor house at the Vinegarth, Epworth, Lincolnshire, 1975-1976', *LHA* 19, 5-28

Hayfield, C 1985   *Humberside Medieval Pottery*, British Archaeological Reports, British Series, 140, Oxford

Healey, H 1993   'Salt-making II: Saxon and medieval' in Bennett and Bennett 1993, 28-9

Healey, H 1975   'A medieval salt-making site in Bicker Haven, Lincolnshire' in de Brisay and Evans 1975, 36

Hebgin-Barnes, P 1996   *The Medieval Stained Glass of the County of Lincolnshire*, Corpus Vitrearum Medii Aevi, The British Academy/OUP

Heslop, TA and Sekules, VA 1986
Medieval Art and Architecture at Lincoln Cathedral, British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions 8, London

HKW 1963   eds RA Brown, HM Colvin and AJ Taylor, *History of the Kings Works, Volume 1*, HMSO

Hurst, JG 1984   'The development of medieval pottery research in Lincolnshire' in Field and White 1984, 64-8

Impey, E and Harris, R forthcoming
'Boothby Pagnell revisited' in G Meirion-Jones et al eds, *The Seignurial Residence in Europe*

Jones, D 1988   'Aerial reconnaissance and prehistoric and Romano-British archaeology in northern Lincolnshire - a sample survey', *LHA* 23, 000-00

Jones, MJ 1994   'St Paul in the Bail, Lincoln: Britain in Europe?', in ed K Painter, 'Churches Built in Ancient Times'. Recent Studies in Early Christian Archaeology*, Society of Antiquaries of London Occasional Paper, ns 16, London 325-47

Jones, MJ and Vince, A forthcoming
The Story of Lincoln as revealed by Archaeology (synthetic volumes in the *Lincoln Archaeological Studies* series)

Jones, S, Major, K, and Varley, J 1984
The Survey of Ancient Houses in Lincoln. I: Priorygate to Pottergate, Lincoln Civic Trust

Jones, S, Major, K, and Varley, J 1987
The Survey of Ancient Houses in Lincoln. II: Houses to the South and West of the Minster, Lincoln Civic Trust

Jones, S, Major, K, and Varley, J 1990
The Survey of Ancient Houses in Lincoln. III: Houses in Eastgate, Priorygate and James Street, Lincoln Civic Trust

Jones, S, Major, K, Varley, J, and Johnson, C 1996
The Survey of Ancient Houses in Lincoln. III: Houses in the Bail: Steep Hill, Castle Hill, and Bailgate, Lincoln Civic Trust

Kilmurry, K 1980 *The Pottery Industry of Stamford, Lincs, c AD 850-1250*, British Archaeological Reports 84

Knowles, D and Hadcock, RN 1971
Medieval Religious Houses, England and Wales (2nd edition), London

Lane, T 1993 *The Fenland Project No 8: Lincolnshire Survey, The Northern Fen Edge*, East Anglian Archaeology Report No 66

Lane, T 1995 *The archaeology and developing landscape of Ropsley and Humby*, Lincolnshire Archaeology and Heritage Reports Series 2

Lindley, PG (ed) 1991 *Gainsborough Old Hall*, Occasional Papers in Lincolnshire History and Archaeology, 8

Lindley, PG (ed) forthcoming
Lincoln Castle

Mahany, CM (ed) 1977 *East Midlands Committee of Field Archaeologists: Priorities 1977*, Leicester

Mahany, CM 1977 'Stamford Castle', *Chateau Gaillard* 8, 223-45

Mahany, CM 1978 'Stamford: Castle and Town', *South Lincolnshire Archaeology* 2

Mahany, CM, Burchard, A and Simpson, G 1982
Excavations in Stamford, Lincolnshire, 1963-1969, Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph Series 9, London

Mahany, CM and Roffe, DR eds 1979
'Sleaford', *South Lincolnshire Archaeology* 3

Mahany, CM and Roffe, DR 1983
'Stamford: the development of an Anglo-Scandinavian borough', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 5, 198-219

Major, K 1953-74 *The Registrum Antiquissimum of the Cathedral Church of Lincoln, I-X*, LRS 27-9, 32, 34, 41-2, 46, 51, 62, 67-8

Manterfield, JB 1981
'The Topographical Development of the Pre-Industrial Town of Grantham, Lincolnshire, 1535-1835', unpublished PhD thesis, University of Exeter

McAvoy, F 1994 'Marine Salt Extraction: the excavation of salterns at Wainfleet St Mary, Lincolnshire', *Med Archaeol* 38, 134-163

McCarthy, MR and Brooks, CM 1988
                Medieval Pottery in Britain, AD 900-1600, Leicester

Mellor, M 1994   *Medieval Ceramic Studies in England. A review for English Heritage*, London

Miles, P, Young, J and Wacher, J 1989
                A late Saxon kiln-site at Silver Street, Lincoln, Archaeology of Lincoln 17/3

Morris, R 1989   *Churches in the Landscape*, London

Murphy, P 1998   'Lincolnshire: data from plant macrofossils on plant food foraging, arable farming and palaeoenvironments', unpublished typescript contribution to Lincolnshire Research Assessment exercise

Owen, AEB 1984   `Salt, sea banks and medieval settlement on the Lindsey coast', in Field and White 1984, 46-9

Owen, AEB 1992   'Castle Carlton: the origins of a medieval "new town"', *LHA* 27, 17-22

Owen, AEB 1993   `Beyond the sea bank: sheep on the Huttoft outmarsh in the early 13th century', *LHA* 28, 39-41

Owen, AEB 1996   *The Medieval Lindsey Marsh: Select Documents*, LRS 85

Owen, DM 1971   *Church and Society in Medieval Lincolnshire*, History of Lincolnshire 5, Lincoln

Owen, DM 1975   `Medieval chapels in Lincolnshire', *LHA* 10, 15-22

Owen, DM 1994   *The History of Lincoln Minster*, Cambridge

Page, W 1906   *The Victoria County History of the County of Lincoln*, London reprinted ????

Pawley, S 1993a   'Maritime trade and fishing in the Middle Ages' in Bennett and Bennett 1993, 56-7

Pawley, S 1993b   'Maritime trade and fishing, 1500-1700' in Bennett and Bennett 1993, 58-9

Peterken, GF 1971   'Central Lincolnshire woodlands', *Lincolnshire Trust for Nature Conservation Newsletter* September, 12-15

Pevsner, N and Harris, J 1964
                The Buildings of England. Lincolnshire, Harmondsworth

Pevsner, N and Harris, J (rev N Antram) 1989
                The Buildings of England. Lincolnshire (2nd edition), Harmondsworth

Platts, G 1985   *Land and People in Medieval Lincolnshire*, History of Lincolnshire 4

Rackham, O   *Ancient Woodland*

Roberts, BK and Wrathmell, S 1995
                Terrain and Rural Settlement Mapping: the methodology and preliminary results, University of Durham Department of Geography, for English Heritage

Roberts, BK and Wrathmell, S 1998
'Dispersed settlement in England: a national view' in eds P Everson and T Williamson, *The Archaeology of Landscape*, Manchester University Press, 95-116

Rodwell, W and Rodwell, K 1982
`St Peter's church, Barton-on-Humber: excavation and structural study, 1979-81', *Antiq J*, 62, 283-315

Roffe, DR 1986   'The seventh century monastery of Stow Green, Lincolnshire', *LHA* 21, 31-3

Rogers, A 1965   *The Making of Stamford*, Leicester

Rogers, A 1972   'Parish boundaries and urban history', *J Brit Archaeol Assoc* 35, 56-63

RCHME 1977   *The Town of Stamford*, HMSO

Rudkin. EH and Owen, DM 1960
'The medieval salt industry of the Lincolnshire marshland' *LAASRP* ns 8, 76-84

Rudkin, EH 1975   'Medieval salt-making in Lincolnshire' in de Brisay and Evans 1975, 37-8

Russell, RC 1975   *The Logic of Open Field Systems*, Standing Conference for Local History

Salisbury, C   [Fish weirs on the Trent]

Silvester, R 1999   `Medieval reclamation of marsh and fen' in eds H Cook and T Williamson, *Water Management in the English Landscape. Field, Marsh and Meadow*, Edinburgh University Press, 122-140

Steedman, K and Foreman, M 1995
'Excavations at Aylesby, South Humberside, 1994', *LHA* 30, 12-37

Stocker, D 1990   `The Archaeology of the Reformation in Lincoln. A case study in the redistribution of building materials in the mid-sixteenth century', *LHA* 25, 18-32

Stocker, DA 1991   *St Mary's Guildhall, Lincoln. The survey and excavation of a medieval building complex*, The Archaeology of Lincoln, 12-1, London

Stocker, D 1992   `The shadow of the general's armchair', *Archaeol J* 149, 415-20

Stocker, D and Everson, P in prep
The Early Romanesque Tower in Lincolnshire. A Study in Architectural Symbolism

Stocker, D and Everson, P forthcoming
[Untitled paper on causeways] for ed M Carver proceedings of York Christian Millenium congress

Stocker, D with Everson, P 1990
`Rubbish recycled: a study of the reuse of stone in Lincolnshire', in ed D Parsons, *Stone: Quarrying and Building in England AD 43-1525*, Chichester

Stocker, D and Vince, A 1997
`The early norman castle at Lincoln and a re-evaluation of the original west tower of

Lincoln Cathedral', *Med Archaeol* 41, 223-33

Sturman, CJ 1984   'Salt-making in the Lindsey marshland in the 16th and early 17th centuries' in Field and
White 1984, 50-6

Taylor, C 1992   'Medieval rural settlement: changing perceptions', *Landscape History* 14, 5-17

Taylor, C 1995   'Dispersed settlement in nucleated areas', *Landscape History* 17, 27-34

Thompson, FH 1960   'The deserted medieval village of Riseholme, near Lincoln', *Med Archaeol* 4, 95-108

Thompson, MW 1966   'The origins of Bolingbroke Castle, Lincolnshire', *Med Archaeol* 10, 152-8

Thompson, MW 1969   'Further work at Bolingbroke Castle, Lincolnshire', *Med Archaeol* 13, 216-7

Thompson, MW 1974   `Tattershall Castle', *Archaeol J* 131, 317-21

Van de Noort, R and Davies, P 1993
     Wetland Heritage: an archaeological assessment of the Humber Wetlands, Hull

Van de Noort, R and Ellis, S 1997
     Wetland Heritage of the Humberhead Levels, Hull

Van de Noort, R and Ellis, S 1998
     Wetland Heritage of the Ancholme and Lower Trent Valleys, Hull

Vince, A 1993   *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, Lincoln

Vince, A UAD   Lincoln urban archaeological database

White, A 1979   *Stow Green*, Lincolnshire Museums Information Sheet 16

White, A 1981   *The Norman Manor House at Boothby Pagnell*, Lincolnshire Museums Information
     Sheet 23

White, A 1984   'Medieval fisheries in the Witham and its tributaries', *LHA* 19, 29-35

Whitwell, JB 1969   'Excavations of the site of a moated medieval manor house in the parish of Saxilby,
     Lincolnshire', *J Brit Archaeol Assoc* 32, 135-42

Whitwell, JB 1992   *Roman Lincolnshire*, HOL 2 revised edn

Wight, JA 1972   *Brick Building in England from the Middle Ages to 1550*, London

Wilson, DM and Hurst, JG 1967
     'Medieval Britain in 1966', *Med Archaeol* 11, 262-319

Woods, M 1998   [List of sites of medieval date Lincolnshire subject to documented
     excavation/intervention] ... prepared for the first stage of the Research Frameworks
     exercise = APPENDIX]

Young, J 1993   'The distribution of Silver Street kiln-type pottery in Lincolnshire' in Bennett and
Bennett 1993, 30-1

Appendix 1 Resource Assessment Summary and Themes used as basis of seminar presentation

Medieval Lincolnshire

A   **Summary of the resource**

[1]   The resource is a complex and intimate combination of many diverse source materials.

[2]   We are dealing (perhaps for the first time quite so clearly) with 'joined-up landscape' over effectively the whole land surface.

[3]   We are dealing with a period built on and out of previous, complex periods of land-use and culture. This needs understanding if we are to *understand* the medieval remains.

[4]   Nevertheless, the remains are mediated to us through the overlay of the past 400 years or more, which requires understanding if we are to *understand* the medieval remains.

[5]   Because we know much at some levels about the period's chronological framework, social structure, economic basis and even belief structure, and because the resource is so richly textured, a 'high resolution understanding' is expected.

[6]   Viewed site-type by site-type, the medieval resource for Lincolnshire is of outstanding potential. The most notable deficiency compared with some other parts of the country perhaps lies in evidence for later medieval vernacular buildings.

[7]   Development of the resource has generally been patchy and unsystematic. Recent and current area studies – by RCHME in West Lindsey, by the Fenland project and by the Humber Wetlands project – have

implicitly or explicitly set agendas for further work. Major excavations like those at 'Goltho' have demonstrated the potential for excellent results: others of importance remain unpublished. And modern land-use affords excellent scope for studies based on fieldwork, that take a broad, multidisciplinary approach.

B   Synthesis, ideas, issues

[1]   Lincolnshire is a very large county, has great internal diversity of topography and landuse, and centres on a great medieval city and cathedral, the cultural and administrative influence of both of which extended far beyond their own county. Its research frameworks must recognise and exploit these simple fundamentals.

[2]   Lincolnshire affords a very wide range of urban or quasi urban types: a great city (Lincoln), other towns of national/international standing (Boston, Stamford, Torksey, Grimsby), many subregional centres, successful and failed new towns, and other 'trading places', notably a series on coastal havens and on inland waterways. Some of these appear special within the region and need better characterisation, eg especially the last group. All await study of their internal zoning or organisation, their relationship to their hinterland and in their interrelationships with each other.

[3]   Lincolnshire has both a long coastline and major waterway networks which are important regionally and nationally. Associated with them are 'trading places', exploitation and processing of fish stocks, and specialised industries like ship-and boat-building and probably pottery production and distribution

[4]   Coastal salt production in Lincolnshire is distinctive within the region and has among the best preserved field evidence nationally. The Fenland Survey, the Humber Wetlands study and NMP have set a new framework for this topic, especially in its relationship to local settlement patterns, sea defence and the coastal marshland economy.

[5]   A part of the potential for innovation the medieval period ought to lie in its capacity for framing and investigating questions cast in terms of networks, interrelationships, interdependencies and interactions, rather than only in terms of single monument types. Examples.

[6]   Part also ought to lie in its capacity for examining the patterning of evidence, and more particularly in the patterned correlation between different sets of information; for example in settlement studies.

?Issues
[7]   Several of these observations or ideas place a premium on a developed SMR or resource base, capable of acting as a research tool. For this, it needs to contain a greater range of spatial information, in contrast solely to archaeological point data, than has been traditional.

[8]   In Lincolnshire, there has been such erosion of above ground evidence that formerly existed as earthworks and (quite properly) designation of what remains as earthworks, that there is a case for testing the value of plough-levelled examples of familiar categories like medieval villages. Rather than being viewed as 'destroyed', might they (in particular) still answer extensive questions – about overall form, boundaries, origins and growth – even if not intensive or detailed ones about building types etc?

Appendix 2 site interventions compiled by Mark Wood from the county SMR and *LHA* reports of work done supplied as a separate file.