THE DEFENCES OF YORK

(Being an Address delivered at York, 29th July, 1874),

By G. T. CLARK, ESQ.

"Diruta prospexit mœnia sæpe sua."

How oft its walls have fall'n.
A. NECKHAM, EBORAC.

I SUPPOSE that no man of English race, at all acquainted with the history of his country, can enter this city of York without feeling something of that respect for a glorious past of which all men are more or less conscious, and which in the higher and nobler sort acts as an incentive to greatness both in thought and deed. It may, indeed, be, that those who dwell within the city, and have been familiar with it from childhood, are less conscious of this feeling than we who are here as strangers, to whom your noble river, ancient walls, and venerable Minster, stand out unassociated with the concerns of every-day life; but, on the other hand, you men of York cannot but feel for the place something of the love of children for a parent; something of the pride of citizens of no mean city; something of the secret charm by which every man, worthy of the name, is attracted to his native land. Not London itself, the capital of the empire, not Canterbury, the seat of that other Metropolitan of our National Church, calls up more varied or more brilliant recollections than are inseparably associated with the name and title of York: associated with the fortunes of that great branch of the House of Plantagenet, which, with so steady a persistence, contested the crown of England: associated with a long list of the best and noblest of the land, who, during the wars of the Roses, staked life and fortune upon the House of York.

It was said by one who was born on the Trent, if not on the Ouse, "whatever makes the past, the distant, or the future, predominate over the present, advances us in the dignity of thinking beings." With the future, indeed, we,

your antiquarian visitors, have not specially to do; our province is with the past: but never, within the four seas of Britain, have we visited a city which combines with so flourishing a present so many memorials of the past, so much still visible to the eye, so much still suggestive to the memory, so much that is intimately connected with those centuries during which the English name and nation were being built up. No man can unfold a map of the territory beyond the Humber, nor penetrate into its recesses, without observing how copious are the traces of our Scandinavian ancestors. Those names

> "That have their haunts in dale, or piny mountain,
> Or forest by slow stream, or pebbly spring,"

are still vocal in our ears, and intelligible to our understandings. They speak to us, with no uncertain sound, of those hardy mariners who crossed the German Ocean in search of prey, and whose long ships were known and dreaded in every creek and upon every river along the seaboard of Britain. Saxons and Danes, Jutes and Angles, each and all have left their traces over the broad plain of York; traces of long and bloody struggles during which those not remote kinsmen were becoming fused and welded into the Englishman. No Englishman, and most of all no Yorkshireman, can forget that it is neither from the native Briton, nor from the Roman colonist, but from these Teuton and Scandinavian sea-kings, fierce and lawless as they were, that we derive all those qualities that have made England a great country.

The history of York, indeed, and of the material defences by which it is still surrounded, is older by some centuries than the history of England and the English people, and long before we arrive at the times of the Scandinavian invaders, we have to deal with the remains of those masters of the world, under whom this city rose to be, as its great historian has pronounced it, "a second Rome," the "mart and emporium of the common produce both of sea and land." The real history of the metropolis of northern England begins with the Roman occupation. When, however, the Romans called their station Eboracum, they evidently did not, as in "Colonia" or "Confluentes," employ a new and altogether Latin name, but, as in "Medio-

lanum," "Isca," or "Durolipons," they Latinized one of native origin, already in use. Until recently, strange as it may appear, this was the only positive argument, and it was a strong one, in favour of the præ-Roman existence of the place. Recently, however, researches into the sepulchres around the city have discovered undoubted British burials below those of the Roman and English periods, and these, I believe I may say, in the opinion of Mr. Raine, have established the existence of an early British settlement, probably the same as the later "civitas Brigantum" of Tacitus. I believe this discovery to stand alone in affording material evidence of the British city. No earthwork of distinctly British origin is found within or near York, nor indeed, save the ancient river, is there at hand any physical feature of the country bearing a decidedly British name. No part of the great earthworks by which the city is girt can be attributed to the Brigantes. Though not all of one date, they all evidently belong to ages more advanced, and to a class of works very different from those found scattered along the crests of the hills, and sometimes retaining, even now, their Celtic appellations. We know, from Cæsar's description of Verulam, that the British towns were strong earthworks in a wood, and from Strabo that these works were fenced in with hewn-down trees, and such we may suppose to have been the Caer Evrawc found and taken possession of by the Romans, out of the name of which they fabricated Eboracum.

Much, and mainly of an unsatisfactory character, has been written upon the etymology of this, the earliest name of the city. It seems generally to be thought to be connected with the name Eure, now confined to the great river of Yorkshire above Boroughbridge, but which formerly, it is suggested, may have been extended to the lower stream, upon which Caer Evrawc was situated. But, however this may be, and whether the Roman settlement was by foundation or by adoption, the actual site of York is worthy of a people who proposed to take and hold the country, and to maintain it under law and order. Central in position, it stands upon a river navigable to the sea, and while the country round was open and admitted of being intersected by roads in every direction, the city itself was protected on one part by a broad and deep river, and on another by a stream which, though of less volume, traversed and satu-

rated a tract of marshy and impracticable country. It is evidently to the confluence of these two streams, now known as the Ouse and the Foss, that York owes its origin.

The Roman station covered a tolerably level platform, from 25 to 30 ft. above the water of the river, and about 100 yards from its left or eastern bank. Sometimes, as at Leicester, these stations, when near a river, were extended to its actual edge, and the water became the defence on that side, but here, the river being navigable, that plan would have been unsafe, and a space was left between the fortified area and the stream.

The precise date of the Roman settlement on the Ouse is unknown. Of the early generals, Cæsar probably penetrated but little beyond the Thames, or at most to the crest of the Chilterns. Aulus Plautius, Claudian, Vespasian, and Ostorius Scapula, were engaged chiefly in subduing the south and west, the last extending his conquests into the Midland territory, and perhaps reaching the Humber, where, and in the country of the Brigantes, Suetonius Paulinus seems to have made a settlement. Agricola, who landed as a commander in A.D. 78, and retired finally A.D. 85, completed the conquest of North Britain, and probably established a permanent camp at York. Of course such a post would be, at first, a mere light earthwork, a bank and ditch, set out in the Roman fashion, and protected with palisades and by the discipline of the garrison. Of this first camp nothing is positively to be distinguished, but no doubt when it was superseded by a walled station, the new defences were built upon the old lines, where they are still to be seen or traced. By whom the Roman walls were originally built is unknown, probably during the second campaign of Agricola, A.D. 79, after the complete subjugation of the Brigantes, and in connection with the great military roads, of which four radiated from the city, and communicated afterwards with a whole network of subordinate or cross-ways, many of which are still in use. During the times of Hadrian, who landed A.D. 120, and built the Northumbrian wall from sea to sea; of Lollius Urbicus, who twenty years later connected in a similar manner the Forth and the Clyde, and of Severus, who, A.D. 207, reasserted the Roman power and reinforced the wall of Hadrian; the country became populous and rich, many walled stations and towns connected with them were

founded, and the remains of Roman residences scattered far and wide over the land attest its prosperity and internal peace. Ptolemy, writing in the second century, mentions Eboracum as the head-quarters of the sixth legion, a fact corroborated by many local inscriptions, and I am informed by Mr. Barber that a stone was dug up in Walmgate which recorded some work executed there by the 9th Legion by order of Trajan, and which was considered by Mr. Wellbeloved to be, with but one exception, the earliest Roman inscription in Britain. Eboracum became rapidly a large city, a place of great military and commercial importance, the capital of the north, and from the time of Severus to that of Constantius Chlorus, both of whom died at York, it was the seat of the government of Britain, and the centre of the great military force maintained there. It was the chief of the twenty-eight Romano-British cities, and of the two which alone bore the title of "Municipium." Above the city the river was guarded by the stations or "castella" represented by Beningburgh, Aldwark Ferry, and Aldburgh, placed about five miles apart. The fortress, or military part of the Roman city, was confined to the left bank of the river, but the suburbs crossed the Ouse and extended widely to the south-west as well as to the north. The walled enclosure measured about 452 yards north-west and south-east or up and down the stream, and 530 yards in the direction at right angles. There were four principal gates, those to the north-east and south-west nearly in the centre of their respective sides, those to the north-west and south-east considerably to the south of, or nearer to the river than the centre. But it is to be remarked that as the former gates being in the centre were 226 yards from each angle, so the latter were also about that distance from the angles to the south. This looks as though the original walled area had been a square of 452 yards on each side, and that afterwards, when the buildings were of a permanent character, and the lines of the great roads leading up to the gates were fixed by houses along them, it was found necessary to enlarge the fortified area, and that this was done by adding a breadth of about 106 yards on the north-eastern side, which would of course throw the north-west and south-west entrances by that much out of centre. If moreover we suppose the whole area wall to have been

rebuilt when this supposed alteration was made, we should have an explanation of the modern character of the extant masonry, which is held by those conversant with Roman work in Britain, to be of a late period. On the other hand, it would seem that one variety of the regular Roman camp, as described by Polybius and verified by General Roy, while it had the north and south, or Prætorian and Decuman gates central, had often the lateral gates, though opposite to each other, somewhat out of centre, so that the arrangement of the lateral gates at York, though to the south instead of, as usual, to the north of the centre, may, after all, be the original one.

Considering the magnitude, population, and wealth of Roman York, and the number of public buildings which must necessarily have accumulated there during the 400 years which elapsed from the conquest by Claudian to the end of the Roman rule, the presence of some of which is attested by inscriptions and foundations, it is remarkable how few monuments of the period remain above ground, or rather how completely the whole, with one or two exceptions, have disappeared. No doubt, under the 15 or 20 ft. of débris which are supposed to cover up the site of the Roman city, and the equal depth of later soil which, in certain points, seems to have accumulated since the commencement of the English period, there may be concealed many curious remains as well of the Romans as of their successors. Some of the Roman foundations are from time to time laid bare in the excavations for sewers, but the unburied remains of Roman work are confined to a tower and parts of the adjacent wall, and to fragments of the same wall in another part of its course.

The "multangular tower," which by some happy accident has been preserved to represent Roman York, formed one corner of the Roman area. It is a shell of masonry, presenting nine faces, 45 ft. in exterior diameter, and 24 ft. wide at the gorge, which is open. It is not placed, as in mediæval works, so as merely to cap the junction of two walls, which would have met at a right angle, but the whole angle is superseded, as in Roman camps, by a curve of about 50 ft. radius, and the tower stands in the centre of this round ring, three quarters of it, presenting its nine faces, being disengaged. The tower and its contiguous wall are

5 ft. thick. The Roman part of the work is about 15 ft. high. It is of rubble, faced on either front with ashlar, the blocks being from 4 to 5 inches square. There is one bond of five courses of bricks, each brick 17 in. by 11 by 2½ in. that may be traced along both tower and wall, although the surface of both has been much patched and injured. Upon the Roman work has been placed an ashlar upper story, composed of larger stones, and about 3 ft. thick and 12 ft. high, pierced by nine cruciform loops, one in each face, and each set in a pointed recess. This addition is of Early English or early Decorated date. The wall extending south-east from the tower for 53 yards, is of the same date, material, and workmanship. Both, having escaped destruction in the post-Roman period, were incorporated into the defences of the later city. The wall on the other side of the tower, running eastwards, has been partially destroyed, and is now only 4 ft. high, and at a short distance becomes buried in the later bank. This part of the wall was evidently destroyed before the earthwork was thrown up, for not only is it buried within the bank, but the wall of the mediæval city is here founded 4 ft. in front of it, and in other places many feet above it. It is to be observed that the Roman tower and wall, where perfect, are entirely unconnected with any bank of earth, and the ashlar facing, both inside and outside, shows this to have been originally intended. The wall stands on the natural surface of the ground, and is seen of equal height on either face. There may have been, and probably was, an exterior ditch, even in Roman times, but a bank of earth sustaining the wall it is pretty clear there was not. This feature in the Roman defences, so different from the practice in later times, is not peculiar to York. It is seen at Porchester, Silchester, and in other Roman fortresses, where each face of the wall was intended to be seen. It is thus evident that the earthworks which form so important a feature in the defences of York are all of post-Roman date. Another fragment of the Roman wall is now seen in Mr. Gray's garden, about 100 yards west of Monk Bar, where it was covered up by about 12 ft. of débris, and has recently been laid open at a point very close to, if not actually upon, the old Roman north gate, of which some of the exposed foundations may very well have been a part. Here also the Roman wall underlies the bank upon which the

mediæval wall is built. A third fragment of this Roman wall, about 40 yards in length, is exposed in a court close east of Monk Bar. It is about 6 ft. high, and faced with the original ashlar blocks, and until lately was covered up in the earth-bank. This fragment is about 6 ft. high above the present surface, and it is thought that the level of the Roman street is about 20 ft. lower down. Although so little of the Roman wall is seen above ground, it has been traced at various points, so that it may be considered as established that it included the whole area, and that there were upon it four angle towers and four main gates, of which Bootham Bar represents one, though the present mediæval structure contains no trace of Roman work, and indeed probably stands at a much higher level than its Roman predecessor. The line of road from this bar is Roman, and led to Isurium or Aldborough. Of the other three gates, the position has been ascertained by excavation, or by following up the Roman road leading to each. The gate near Monk Bar, traced in Mr. Gray's garden, was upon the road leading to Derventio or Stamford Bridge. Another was in Low Petergate, close to Christ's church, on the road leading to Prætorium or Brough-on-the-Humber. This road crosses the later way at Walmgate Bar. A fourth gate was at the bottom of Stonegate, in front of the Mansion House, upon a way which traversed the site of the present Guildhall, crossed the Ouse at that point by a bridge, and, passing through the site of the present Micklegate Bar, proceeded in a direct line towards Calcaria or Tadcaster. Most, if not all, of the masonry which has been laid open seems to be of the same general date with the multangular tower. It is remarkable that the remains of only one mural tower, of Roman date, have been discovered. It was 22 ft. square, and projected wholly inwards. It stood a few yards south of Bootham Bar.

Besides these fragments of the wall various other Roman remains have been laid open below the present surface, all of which are shown in the admirable antiquarian map of the city by Mr. Skaif. They are chiefly, a chamber inside the wall 60 yards north of the multangular tower; a building in Museum Street, on the site of St. Leonard's Hospital; and some walling behind St. Cuthbert's church, by Peaseholme Green. Beyond the river and outside the military

post, other remains of Roman buildings have also been found. The present railway station covers the site of three baths and a drain leading towards the Ouse. In Tanner Row, close east of these, are traces of a temple of Serapis, and the pavement of a house; and especially should be mentioned a pavement laid open just within Micklegate Bar, in the lane leading towards the station. This is particularly important, because it lay under the earth-bank of the city wall, and proves that here also that bank is post-Roman. On the other side of the same Roman way, where St. Martin's Lane falls into Micklegate, are other remains, and besides these, situate either within the fortified space, or within the limits of the expanded Roman city, have been found similar traces of occupation over a still wider area. Of these the most important are a pavement, a sepulchral vault, several stone coffins, and other indications of extensive cemeteries at Clementhorpe, along the Tadcaster road, and between that road and the Ouse, upon the ground now being excavated for the proposed railway station. Also, on the north side of the Ouse, beyond St. Mary's and the Almery Garth, are traces of burials extending up to the Aldborough road. Happily for the interests of archæology, all excavations over these areas have been carefully watched by Mr. Raine and others, whose discoveries have created and enriched the valuable museum of the Yorkshire Society. What is incontestably proved by all these discoveries is, that the Roman Eboracum far exceeded the bounds of the military post, and included suburbs thrown out in every available direction far beyond the defences, showing that the inhabitants were very numerous and rich, and lived entirely free from any apprehensions of danger.

Although the Foss is most certainly a natural stream, and not, as has been asserted, a Roman cut, it seems probable from its name that the Romans either altered its lower course or converted it into a larger basin below the city, just above its junction with the Ouse. It is more than probable that they here received and stored their supplies of corn, and that much of the commerce of the city in its palmy period was here carried on. It seems not improbable that a large strip of the low land on the left bank of the river was then a part of the basin, though now, since the construction of the Castle weir, silted up and reclaimed.

The Roman armies were officially withdrawn from Britain A.D. 426—430, and Eboracum, falling into the hands of its but very imperfectly Romanised British inhabitants, became once more Caer Evrawc. Doubtless, up to that period, the Roman buildings, public and private, churches, basilicas, and domestic dwellings, were perfect, nor is it probable that the Britons, tinctured with Roman blood and used to Roman customs, would have injured them ; but that they were destroyed, and buried deep in their own ruins before the existing earthworks were thrown up, is certain. By whom then, and at what period, and as a defence against whom, were these earthworks formed? To answer this question it will be convenient, in the first place, to describe them. These earthworks appear to be of, at least, two periods : those upon the right and left bank of the Ouse seem of one date ; and those beyond, or upon, the Foss, of another. The former, as the older, may be taken first. A broad and deep ditch was dug around the area to be fortified, and its contents were thrown inwards so as to form a ridge or bank of earth from 15 to 50, or even 30 ft. high, and of breadth in proportion. The ditch, when not at too high a level, was supplied with water from the Ouse. This new work included a space about three times the area of the Roman station, and probably corresponded with the latest extension of the Roman city. The new area, though not, like the Roman post, rigidly rectangular, was more or less so, and for the most part contained within straight lines, meeting at right angles, or nearly so. As the Roman wall and tower at the south-west angle were standing and tolerably perfect, they were accepted as part of the new defence, but from that wall to the Ouse a bank and ditch were carried straight, 114 yards, to what is now known as Lendal tower. In the opposite direction, as the Roman wall was already broken down, the bank was heaped up over it, and so contained, and probably still contains it, along the edge of the Dean's garden as far as the north-west angle. The two lines, however, of the bank and the wall, do not precisely coincide, and the wall is the more direct and even of the two. From the multangular tower, nearly to the north-east angle, 860 yards, the wall is slightly in the rear of the bank, though more or less covered up by its slope ; but at about 40 yards from the angle, the wall, which had very gradually approached, crosses the

line obliquely, so that at the angle it is in front of the wall, the ditch of which must have much encroached upon the site of the tower, no doubt then a mere ruin. From the angle the bank, still covering up the remains of the wall, is continued about 452 yards in the direction of and beyond Monk Bar. At two points, namely, in Mr. Gray's garden and in a court opening from the Bar, the inner skirt of the bank has been cut away and the wall below it brought to light. Further on, near the site of St. Helen's church, the wall turned at a right angle, and no doubt had a multangular tower. This, however, is gone. Along this front the wall is mostly a little in the rear of the bank. At the north angle it nearly coincides with, or may be a trifle outside it, but, after the crossing, the lines slightly diverge, and at the east angle are about 4 ft. apart. This want of coincidence is caused by the irregularity of the bank. This discrepancy tends still further to show that the wall was practically destroyed, and of no use as a defence, when the bank was cast up. At the point marked as the site of St. Helen's church, the earthwork leaves the line of the wall, and is continued alone, in the same general line, for 150 yards, when it forms a re-entering angle, nearly a right one, and turns outwards, descending the gentle slope of the ground, until at 104 yards it ceases at Layerthorpe on the bank of the Foss. The earthwork was there stopped because it was no longer needed. The Foss, then, and long afterwards, was not only a broad and deep, though sluggish stream, but was connected with a broad tract of marsh, neither land nor water, and in itself an excellent defence. From hence the Foss seems to have been the boundary of the new area for about 900 yards, when it passes off towards the Ouse, including within its waters a long tongue of land, now St. George's Field, then a marsh, which, though on the right bank of the Foss, was of course left outside the line of defence. Probably the bank recommenced at the re-entering bend of the Foss, and was carried across the site of the later castle direct to the Ouse, where about 70 yards of it are still seen. Thus it was that, partly by the Roman wall and tower, partly by the Foss river, and mainly by a great earthwork, were completed the defences of the city north of the Ouse.

South of that river there was no older wall to fetter or

affect the course of the bank. It commenced at Skeldergate, on the Ouse, and reached to the Bishop-Hill angle, about 243 yards, much of which part of it has since been modified by the earthwork of the Bayle Hill. From the angle, which is almost a right one, the bank is continued about 720 yards in a nearly straight line, where, turning at rather above a right angle, it is continued in two straight lengths of 220 and 307 yards, connected by a very large angle, until it abuts upon the river at Northgate Postern, opposite to Lendal tower, and thus includes the suburb now known as Micklegate.

Such are the earthworks, north and south of the Ouse, of which there remain nearly 3000 yards in length. What is their age? and by whom were they constructed? Not by the Romans, for they rest upon Roman buildings which had been destroyed and more or less buried before the earthworks were commenced. Scarcely by the Picts and Scots, invaders from the north, who came down from time to time in force to burn and destroy, but never to settle or construct. Scarcely by the Saxons or early English, for these seldom, if ever, employed straight lines in their works of defence, and certainly never on so extended a scale. On the whole, it seems most probable that after the withdrawal of the Roman Legions, and the occurrence of a few very destructive invasions from beyond the northern border, the Romanized Britons, having still much to defend, made a great effort to enclose their overgrown city, and though not equal to so great a work in masonry, constructed a work in earth which presents, as was to be expected, many indications of Roman castrametation. Should this supposition be sound, it will account, not only for these works, but for such banks of this class as Wallingford, Wareham, and Tamworth, which, though laid out in rectangular areas, do not stand upon any great Roman roads, present no traces of Roman occupation, and the banks and ditches of which are on a larger scale than was usual with the Romans, whose temporary works were but slight, and who usually employed masonry for those of a more permanent character. The same admixture of British with Roman blood and customs which produced in Ambrosius Aurelianus a chieftain of mixed descent, might well have manifested itself in such works as those of York.

Of the interval between the departure of the Legions and the first establishment of Deira as a Saxon kingdom, a period of about sixty years, but little has been recorded. It was the period during which the failing energy of the Britons once, and once only, blazed up, and under the leadership of the Gaulish St. Germain, gained, over the Picts and Saxons, the celebrated Hallelujah victory. Probably it was about this time, during the first quarter of the fifth century, that these earthworks were executed. How the British rule was carried on, and what degree of civilization was retained by the Romanized natives, is a matter rather of conjecture than of proof. The Metropolitan supremacy of the city was, however, maintained, for it comes to light about the middle of the sixth century; no longer, indeed, as a Christian centre, the British Sampson, who presided over the Church, having been driven into Brittany, but as the Pagan capital of Deira, under the sway of the Saxon Ælle. In the seventh century, York was again a flourishing city, and once more was penetrated by the leaven of Christianity. Here Paulinus, in A.D. 626, baptised the founder of Edinburgh, who testified his faith by the construction of a chapel of timber, the humble precursor of that "ampla ecclesia," the great Minster of the North. The earlier churches, with the Roman temples and Basilicæ, had, no doubt, long been destroyed. York had its full share of the calamities which drenched the land with gore during the slow foundation of the English Commonwealth. It was burned in 758, during the Archbishoprick of Egbert, brother to Eadbert, King of Northumbria. In 867 it was taken by Inguar and Ubba, the sons of the Danish Lodbrog, who severely avenged their father's death upon the lands watered by the Ouse, massacred the inhabitants, and destroyed the city which, though fortified, does not seem to have been vigorously defended, nor is mention made of the Castle. Gudrun, a Danish chief who held the city during the absence of Inguar and Ubba, is thought still to be remembered by the association of his name with one of its principal streets. It is to this period that, judging from material evidence, the only evidence afforded, may most probably be attributed the completion of the earthworks as we now see them, upon the south-eastern part of the city, upon and beyond the Foss. The dangers which York had most to apprehend during the 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th cen-

turies, that is from the first appearance of the Vikings upon the shores of Britain, came chiefly from the east, and by the way of the Humber and the Ouse. Hence the defence of the city on that side, and against a maritime foe, became a matter of vital importance to the Saxon settlers, who had to defend themselves against a brood later from the bowels of the north, and possessing all that fierceness of which civilization had to some extent deprived their predecessors. The first object was to defend the river. We learn from the Saxon Chronicle that the English way of effecting this was to cast up two large mounds, one upon each bank. Thus in the 8th and 9th centuries were defended Nottingham and Hertford, Stamford and Buckingham, and thus would naturally be defended York. Such is doubtless the origin of the Castle mound on the left bank of the Ouse, and the Bayle Hill on the right bank, which may therefore reasonably be attributed to the ninth century. A mound was the usual accompaniment of the "aula" or chief residence of a great English landowner, and in no part of England are these moated eminences more abundant than in Yorkshire. The date of many is recorded in the Saxon Chronicle, and close analogy affords a clue to that of most of the others. Usually they are accompanied by a circular ditch surrounding the mound, while on one side, also included within its proper ditch, is a base court of more or less of a half round or of a horse-shoe figure. Wigmore, of which the date is recorded, is an excellent example of such a work, as is Tickhill, and on a smaller scale, Barwick-in-Elmete and Laughton-en-le-Morthen. The York mounds are of the same character. The Castle Hill had, until recently, its proper ditch, fed from the Foss, and isolating it from the lower ward, now disfigured by the Assize Courts and prisons, but which also had its ditches of which the Foss formed, and does still form, a part. The mound is placed 120 yards from the Ouse, is at least 50 ft. high, above 100 ft. diameter at the top, and had a very steep slope. The ditch around it was 50 ft. broad, and of the depth of the communicating river. The annexed lower and larger area, of horse-shoe form, was about 170 yards in breadth, where it rested upon the ditch of the mound, and projected about 125 yards from thence to the Foss, its defence upon the north, east, and south sides, while to the west was its own ditch and that of the mound. Thus, the

whole work was an oval of above 250 yards by 125 yards within its ditches, having the mound at one end, and the lower court at the other, each with its proper ditch, and a cross ditch common to the two; a very common arrangement in the military earthworks of England and Normandy, though not often upon so large a scale.

So also the Bayle Hill, a rather smaller mound of the same pattern, about 70 ft. diameter at the top, placed 100 yards from the Ouse, had its ditch, now filled up and traversed by the later defences, and that this surrounded the hill and was fed from the Ouse, is clear from the evidence of Leland, and from the depression in the later wall where it crosses the line of the ditch in order to rest upon the slope of the mound. The Bayle had also its lower appendages at the western side, traces of the ditch of which are even now visible. Like the Castle Hill, its base is about 40 ft. above the river, and it is placed upon a sort of natural ridge, known as Bishop-Hill, which is continued outside the walls, and which was commanded by the mound. Although the area of the lower ward of this work cannot be precisely traced, it must have been spacious, for it included the present prison, and the remains of the ditch are 150 yards from the centre of the mound.

The Castle mound of York seems to have existed before the reign of Athelstan (922), who demolished a fortress thrown up by the Danes, and divided the spoil found within it. Demolition is to be understood as confined to the superstructure, not to extend to the earthworks of these early fortresses.

Thus, by the construction of these two mounds and their appendant works, the city, upon its eastern side, was defended from such as attacked it by the river, but to complete the defence on this side something further was thought necessary. The Danes came in their own ships, and would have ascended the river to the outskirts of the city, and, the Ouse being closed, might thence have ascended the Foss, and attacked above the castle, encamping on the ground east of it, which was about 45 ft. in level above the Foss Island marsh. An area was therefore traced out, beyond the Foss, which included the high ground, and thus, covering the one river and flanking the other, made an attack on that side a service of danger. The Walmgate, as the new outwork is called, is fortified by a curved bank, in the English manner,

which, with its exterior ditch, extends about 880 yards, resting on the Foss Island marsh at one end, and on the Foss itself at Fishergate on the other. A glance at the map will show how completely this part of the city was protected by the Walmgate work beyond the Foss, by the Foss itself, by the castle in its rear, and by the Bayle Hill and its connected works beyond the Ouse. It is remarkable that such Saxon remains of buildings as are found in York are contained within the two suburbs of Walmgate and Micklegate. Saxon interments in great number are found about the city, many laid above those of the Romans, as the British remains are laid below them. The site of Walmgate was traversed by a Roman road, but no Roman remains have been found within it, nor is there any reason to regard it as representing a Roman settlement. To the centuries preceding the Norman Conquest may also be attributed several conical mounds at various points outside the city, such as Heyworth Mount, the poor remains of which are seen 680 yards from Layerthorpe Bridge; Lamel (la-muele) Hill, about 400 yards outside Walmgate Bar; Siward's Mount, near the Heslington road, 1½ miles from Walmgate Bar, about 126 ft. diameter at its base and 54 ft. at its summit, and 17 ft. high; probably its flat top is due to its having been used as a battery; the Nun Hill on the Bishopthorpe road, 600 yards from Skeldergate; the Mount, 600 yards south-west of Micklegate Bar; and a Mount near it, now removed. Of these, Lamel Hill was found to contain a Saxon interment, and all are evidently sepulchral tumuli. They are, or have been, crowned with windmills, and served as batteries during the Parliamentary siege of York. The Hills bearing the name of Severus are evidently natural.

Such appears to have been the condition of the city, as regarded its defences, during the centuries preceding the Conquest; but if, on the one hand, these formidable fortifications tended to repel enemies, on the other hand, the great wealth of the inhabitants operated as a still stronger attraction to invite them. Still, notwithstanding the Danish invasions and spoilings, the vitality of the city continued strong. Alcuin, who wrote in the same century in which lived Inguar and Ubba, commemorates its wealth and splendour, its love of literature, indicated by the volumes in the Cathedral library, and its great commercial prosperity.

Asser, the biographer of Alfred, who wrote at the close of the ninth century, was educated in the foundation preceding St. Mary's, under Bishop Albert, whose predecessor, Egbert, had there been visited by Bede. He refers to the defences of the city both as "mænia" and "muros," and says the walls which were broken down in the Danish war, A.D. 867, were not at that time firm and strong, which implies that they were so when he wrote. In 923, the city fell before Ragnald, a Northman; and after the middle of the eleventh century, when Deira was passing into Yorkshire, occurred here the death of Siward, the celebrated Earl of Northumberland, a grand old warrior, who was also a liberal contributor to the church of York, and gave so largely to St. Olaf's, where he was buried, as to be among the reputed founders of that very celebrated monastery. Rather later in the century, York was disturbed by the oppression exercised by Tostig, against whom the whole province rose, and a gemote was held here in 1065, at which, says Freeman, both English and Danish blood were represented. The object of the assembly was, in truth, the breaking up of the kingdom, and the provincial movement was aided by the Mercians and the Welsh. Happily, however, wiser councils prevailed, peace was purchased by a limited concession, and Tostig, against whom the revolt was directed, was banished. The defences of York were, however, once more to be tried before the coming of the Normans. In the fated year 1066, Tostig, encouraged by his northern allies, hovered over the English shore, and uniting with Hardrada, entered the Humber, and they laid up their ships at Riccal, nine miles below the city. Edwin and Morker at last left their seats at Laughton and Barwick, and mustered their forces at York, and the armies met at Gate-Fulford, two miles down the river. The two English earls were beaten, and York surrendered, and agreed to give hostages at Stamford Bridge, though the actual handing over is thought to have taken place at Aldby, where a mound and foss still indicate the residence of the Northumbrian kings. But though the earls had failed, Harold—

> "—— the Champion risen in arms to try
> His country's virtue."

was not wanting to his duty. Notwithstanding the im-

pending invasion from the South, he marched at once to York, resting neither day nor night. He reached Tadcaster while the Metropolitan city was actually capitulating, entered it without resistance, left it without delay, and fought and won the great battle of Stamford Bridge. Again he marched through York, and upon the Derwent came up with the Norwegian reserves. These he put to flight, and slew their redoubtable chief; and finally, after spending two days in York, he marched southward to lay down his life for England at Hastings. York was thus a witness to the last and noblest effort of the great English leader to free his northern capital from the invader; and so, with her defences sorely broken down, and with but little military credit of her own, she awaited the approach of the Normans.

The Norman Conquest found York a very considerable city, and if her military reputation at that period stood low, events showed this to be due rather to the want of a leader than to any deficiency of courage in the citizens. The city was at this time composed of seven divisions called "shires," of which one, containing the mound known as the "old Bayle," then and long afterwards belonged to the Archbishop. There were 1800 "mansiones hospitatæ," that is, houses paying customary rents—and two castles. The city ditch is also mentioned, in which, "in fossato urbis," were situated certain "mansiones." Bank and ditch there certainly then were, and as Asser mentions walls in the tenth century, it is not improbable that such then existed, as they certainly did at Exeter and Hereford. Had, however, the masonry been of a very substantial character, some trace of it would probably still remain, which does not appear to be the case. William visited York for the first time in the summer of 1068. The citizens received him with submission, and as usual he ordered a castle to be built, and, equally as usual, as at Cambridge, Oxford, Warwick, Lincoln, the place selected was the mound of the existing stronghold. Its construction and defence were entrusted to William Malet, Robert Fitz-Richard, Gilbert of Ghent, and 500 selected knights. Malet, who had distinguished himself at Hastings, was Sheriff of Yorkshire and a large landholder in the shire. At York, William received the acknowledgment of his supremacy from Malcolm of Scotland, and in person from Æthelwine, Bishop of Durham, and Archill, a great North-

umbrian Thane. It appears from Domesday that of the seven shires of the city, one was laid waste in the construction of the castle; and the houses were reduced from 1800 to about 1036. Probably the people had been allowed to encroach up to the castle ditch, and it was thought necessary to clear an esplanade beyond it. The submission of York was due to temporary circumstances, and was apparent only. In the following year, 1069, the citizens rose against the Norman garrison, and killed Robert Fitz-Richard. They were joined by Eadgar the Ætheling from Scotland, and by the men of Northumbria; and the castle was beleaguered. It was more than a rebellion; it was a revolt. Of course but little could have been done in so short a time towards the substitution of masonry for the lighter English works, which were probably of timber, or at least of walling without mortar, and Malet must have confined his exertions to strengthening what was already in existence. The position, indeed, even if only stockaded, was a very strong one, and Malet though much alarmed, and well aware of the danger, held out until the king came to his assistance, burned the city, defiled the Minster, and punished the citizens. William now ordered a second castle to be constructed upon the Bayle Hill. That this was a mere stockade is clear from the fact that it was completed in eight days, before he left the city. Rapidly as the works were executed, still the post must have been strong, for the mound was high and steep, its ditches broad and deep, and filled with water from the river. But, though such works were capable of being held safely by a few resolute men, as at Wigmore against an army, for a limited time, the defences were of a character familiar to the English, and would not strike them with the same terror as the lofty keeps of stone which the Normans had lately begun to build in Normandy, and which William himself was commencing in London. William Fitz-Osborne was placed in charge of this second castle, which must have much resembled that of the chief seat of his own earldom at Hereford. But even this double bridle failed to restrain the fierce spirit of the English. After a brief rising, which was put down by William's lieutenants, the people organized a fresh and more serious attack, and called to their aid their kinsmen from beyond the sea. The Danes, however, wasted their strength in a series of attacks upon the east coast

from Dover to Ipswich and Norwich, and it was not till September, 1069, that the raven standard again floated over the waters of the Humber. On this occasion the Danes came as allies of their kinsfolk of York, and were so received. While yet upon the river they were joined by the Ætheling and the great English earls who had taken refuge with him in Scotland. The rising threatened William's throne. He charged Malet and Gilbert of Ghent to hold firm, and received from them the assurance that they were safe for a year. They must have repented sorely of their pledge when they beheld the whole population of the city with their Danish allies swarming thick as wasps around the castle. Probably the garrison which would be sufficient to curb a moderate insurrection would be powerless against a force numerous enough to take and hold the works of Walmgate, and thus render unavailing the outworks of the castle on its eastern point. The garrison had to confine itself to the actual defences of the fortress itself. They at once fired the adjacent houses to clear the way for their operations, and, the fire extending, burned a great part of the city, during which they sallied out in force. They were intercepted. Waltheof, well surnamed "the strong," in personal vigour and headlong courage the worthy son of Earl Siward, stood by the narrow postern, and as the files of Normans rushed out from the castle, slew all who came within the sweep of his weapon. He was well supported by his Danish friends. Three thousand Normans were said to have been slain. The castle fell, and the two commanders were taken prisoners. The new defences were destroyed, probably by fire, and the North once again was free. The numbers engaged, with every allowance for exaggeration, show that the garrison occupied not merely the mound or citadel, but also the lower ward.

Unfortunately for the English, they had now no leader capable of meeting William in the field, nor even of retaining under arms the men who had won so bloody a victory. The Danes retired to their ships, and the countrymen to their lands and fastnesses. Victory and defeat were alike fatal to an army so composed. The news, indeed, found William heavily engaged in the west with armed disaffection and rebellion on every side. Scarcely less wroth with those whose ill-grounded confidence had misled him than

with the English who had shaken his throne, he put himself at the head of a force of cavalry, fell in with the retreating Danes in the parts of Lindesey, himself quelled a rising at Stafford, and as winter advanced, had reached the banks of the Aire, taken possession of the moated mound of Castleford, and directed the foundation of the strong castle of Pontefract. From thence, he marched to York, and, such the terror of his name, entered the city unopposed. He directed the castles to be again renewed, and then was carried out that wide and terrible devastation of the northern counties, necessary perhaps to enable him to hold England, but which has loaded his name with infamy. Upon the completion of his cruel task he kept the Christmas of 1069-70 amidst the blackened ruins of York. Christmas past, William visited Durham; put down a considerable rising in the country about the Tees, and, after an absence of a few weeks, returned, for the last time, to York. The conquest was effected.

With the Norman Conquest began a new period with the defences of York. When these were executed, whether they were commenced by the Conqueror or by his immediate successors, is uncertain, and a problem only to be solved, if at all, by a careful study of what remains of the mediæval masonry. These works, which display fragments of almost every age from the end of the eleventh or the commencement of the twelfth century down to the present day, have as yet been found to exhibit no masonry which can be attributed to an earlier date than the reign of William, if indeed there be anything as early. No doubt the walls and gates now existing, stand on the line of and replace or represent the works which, whether of timber or stone, preceded or immediately followed upon the Norman Conquest. These works, in their earliest form, crowned the mounds and banks of the more remote period as their successors are still seen to do, and the earthworks, even then consolidated by time, were in a condition to bear without danger of settlement any load of masonry that might be laid upon them. Their great height and breadth, and their exterior ditches, rendered it unnecessary to raise the curtains and mural towers to any considerable elevation, and gave to their defenders an immense advantage.

Before, or while speculating upon the date or uses of the

various parts of the existing defences, it will be convenient to pass them in general review.

At the point at which the Ouse entered the city two towers were built upon the bank, and partly in the water, from the basements of which a stout chain guarded the passage. Leland describes it as "a chain of Yren to caste over the Owse." The winch for raising and depressing it was probably in the basement of the Lendal tower, and each end of the chain passed through a loop or hawsehole, traces of which are still visible, though the machinery for working the chain, which was probably a heavy one, is gone. The tower on the left bank, known as Lendal, is rectangular in plan, 42 ft. on the river face, and 18 ft. deep. Its upstream angle is boldly rounded off, and that in its rear capped by a round turret of three-quarter projection, which stood in the tower ditch, and contained a stair. Near it a postern led into St. Mary's Abbey precinct. From Lendal tower, the city wall, built on the ridge of the high bank, with a very shallow foundation, passed 114 yards until it struck the Roman wall, which superseded it, turning at a right angle, without earthbank, for 63 yards, until it ended in the multangular tower, raised and looped as already described, and the base of which is about 30 ft. above the river. All this part of the mediæval defence is seen from the museum garden, where the earthbank and wall have been recently cut through, and a new lodge built at the garden entrance. The battlements of the wall were reached here by interior stone steps, the bases of which seem to have rested on earthen ramps now removed.

Beyond the Roman tower the city wall begins again, and passed off 217 yards upon the bank to Bootham Bar. The latter two-thirds of this distance has been removed with the earthwork, and the ditch filled up, to make way for a modern crescent, but Halfpenny's view, published in 1807, shows the whole wall from the tower to the Bar with its earthen base and buttresses of two setts-off, of which many still remain and seem to be of Decorated date. So far the wall is covered by the fortified area of St. Mary's Abbey, which formed a sort of outwork on this side. It will be convenient to describe the Bars afterwards.

Beyond Bootham Bar the wall is produced in a tolerably straight line, along the ridge of the bank, for 316 yards to

the north-east angle of the city. Upon it are about twenty-nine buttresses, at unequal distances, some original, others added at various times to support the wall from the outside. Besides these are five bastions, that is to say, mural towers of the height of the wall. The two next the Bar are mere half-hexagonal bays. The other three are about a quarter round. None appear ever to have been higher than the wall, which also here is far too thin to allow of a rampart walk. It has no doubt been often repaired, but its base looks old, and probably the walk was a timber gallery upon struts. There is no tower at the north-east angle, which is rounded, as though built upon the Roman lines, and capped by a small buttress.

From hence the wall, still built upon the bank, passed at right angles in a nearly straight but somewhat irregular line, 340 yards, to Monk Bar, called also Goodrun-Bar. Leland writes of ten towers on the wall between Bootham and Monk Bar, but at present there are thirty-three buttresses and but one half-round bay or bastion. The ditch which, upon the north-east front, has been filled up and built upon, is here left uncovered, though nearly filled up. Along its counterscarp is a broad way known as "the Lord Mayor's Walk." The ground from the Roman tower to Monk Bar is level or nearly so, and a part of the platform is covered by the Minster and its appendant buildings. From the Bar the descent begins towards the Foss.

From Monk Bar the wall continues 112 yards to the point at which the foundations of the Roman wall turn westward, and where was, no doubt, a multangular tower. Beyond this point, for 56 yards, the wall deviates slightly outwards from the straight line, and thus reaches a half-round bastion opposite the Merchant Tailors' Hall. From thence it curves very slightly inwards for 94 yards, and there forms a re-entering angle occupied by a low drum tower, or rather bastion, of half projection and 18 ft. diameter. From thence the wall passes off at a right angle for 105 yards, and still on the bank, descends until it terminates near the Foss in a small, nearly circular turret, but of rather irregular figure, corbelled out upon the end of the wall. Here the wall now stops, but it was continued along the margin of the water as far as the then adjacent bridge, upon which was built the Layerthorpe Postern. This was a rectangular tower, pierced

by a low pointed passage above which was a first floor, with a long loop towards the bridge; and above it, in the second floor, a square opening.

The Postern tower was in fact a regular gatehouse, placed on the city end of the bridge, provided with a portcullis and gates. It was removed, with the bridge, in the present century. At this postern the wall ended. From Monk Bar to Layerthorpe the wall was thus divided into three unequal sections. Upon the first part are eighteen buttresses, upon the second five, and upon the third part eleven. In front of all this part of the wall the ditch remains visible and open, though scarcely to its full depth. The wall on either side of the re-entering angle looks old, and both it and some of its flat buttresses have a late Norman aspect. The wall itself is not above 2 ft. 6 in. thick, but an arcade of round-headed arches of Decorated date has been built against it, on the inside on the bank, and carries the rampart wall. That this arcade is an addition, and of far later date than the wall, is evident from the absence of bond, and from the character of the masonry, which is Decorated.

The Foss at Layerthorpe was an excellent defence for some centuries after the Conquest. In the reign of Edward I. it was a part of the mill-pool, and a valuable fishery, and in that of Edward III. it appears as the "Stagnum Regis," no doubt being held by the crown as an appendage to the castle mill. Leland says, "for two flite shottes the broad and depe water of Foss comming out of the forest of Galtres, defendeth this part of the Cyte without waulle." Leland's two arrow flights are about 432 yards, at which distance the ground rises, and the wall recommences beyond the Foss at the Red or Brimstone tower, a small rectangular blockhouse of red brick, once used as a brimstone manufactory, and which is mentioned in the 5th of Elizabeth, when it could not have been very old. Both wall and bank recommence at this tower, fencing in the suburb of Walmgate. The wall, here not above 10 to 12 ft. high above the bank, takes a slightly convex course for 332 yards, when it reaches Walmgate Bar. Upon it were three towers, and are now six buttresses. The ditch, which was broad and deep, and full of water, is now quite filled up.

From Walmgate Bar to Fishergate Bar the wall mea-

sures 370 yards, and is laid out in an irregular curve. It is strengthened by seven buttresses, besides one which is broad and flat, and caps a low salient. Here also the ditch is filled up, and the earthwork covers the foundations of the wall. Fishergate Bar is not usually counted among the regular Bars of York. It is a large round-headed archway in the curtain, with two lateral shoulder-headed passages for foot traffic. It is 29 ft. high, and of the same breadth, and with a projection forwards upon the curtain of 15 ft. It has no superstructure, and is part of no regular gatehouse, but as it still shows a half-round groove it certainly had a portcullis, and probably there was some kind of wall above to screen the grate when lifted. If the side doors be original they may have opened into mural galleries in the base of a barbican, as in the spur outwork covering the water gate at Beaumaris. This bar is said to have been constructed in the fourteenth century. It was ruined by the rebels in the reign of Henry VII., and was blocked up in Leland's time and until recently, when it was opened and repaired. An inscription upon it states that 60 yards of the adjacent wall were rebuilt in 1445.

From Fishergate Bar the wall passes straight for 70 yards, having upon it but one buttress. It then makes a re-entering angle, and turns obliquely off for 32 yards when it reaches a large irregularly rectangular bastion, 21 ft. by 18 ft., which caps an acute salient, and contains, below the rampart level, a chamber with a fireplace. From this point the wall is continued north-west for 38 yards, when it makes another angle, a low salient, and at 35 yards further the bank and wall end in Fishergate Postern and tower, which formerly rested upon the Foss just opposite to the castle, but are now separated from the river by a street and several houses. Between Walmgate Bar and Fishergate Postern were formerly three towers, one being attached to the Postern. Fishergate, except the gate-houses, is the largest mediæval tower remaining connected with the city walls. It is rectangular, 27 ft. broad by 21 ft. deep, and its two outer angles are capped by flat pilasters, which meet and form a solid angle. It has a basement on the ground level, and two upper floors. The entrance is in the former, in the rear, by a doorway with a four-centred head. On one face is a garde-robe on corbels, on the first floor. This tower seems

to have been originally Early English in its style, but to have been rebuilt and otherwise altered in the Perpendicular period. In the curtain, close to the tower, between it and the end of the bank, is a postern for foot-passengers, evidently original, and probably of the Early Decorated period. It has a high pointed arch, and had a portcullis, one groove of which is cut in the wall of the tower, and being stopped a little above the crest of the present parapet, shows the height to which the grate could be raised. Probably the original parapet was somewhat higher, so as to screen the grate when up.

The wall of Walmgate, from the Red Tower to the Fishergate Postern, deserves close attention. It crests the earth-bank all along, but where the bank has slipped away, or in part been removed, it is seen that the wall stands upon arches, some round, some slightly pointed, some flattish or segmental, probably having been patched, and all of rude masonry, mere foundation work, and evidently intended to be concealed. Outside, above this, at the top level of the bank, the wall rises from a plain ashlar base with a chamfered offset. The base or plinth, and the arches below, are no doubt Norman, but most of the buttresses and the greater part of the wall seem Decorated, as certainly is more or less of the parapet. In some of the merlons are cruciform loops with round ends, and the top of each loop rises under a little gable into the slope of the coping, with a trefoiled head of simple and elegant design. The wall, whatever may be the age of its base and of much of its superstructure, has evidently been roughly used, and much altered by restoration. It has a broad rampart walk, which rests in many places upon an arcade, nearly buried, and elsewhere seems solid. This appears to be of the date of the wall, but repeated repairs have concealed the lines of junction so that the point is uncertain. Why this part of the wall was placed upon arches it is not easy to say, for the foundation seems sound and good. Moreover, a wall so built was very liable to be mined. Precisely the same thing is seen at the old castle wall at Southampton, where the piers have recently been uncovered and the bank removed, so that the wall looks like a Roman aqueduct. There also the ground is sound and firm. Fishergate Tower stands on ground very little above the level of the Foss, and when built probably stood

upon its very bank, though now about 64 yards of made ground intervene. Here the Foss was crossed by the dam or weir of the Castle Mills, a formidable work, the date of which is unknown, though probably executed in connection with the Castle mound, and to the obstruction created by which the silting up of the Foss Island must be attributed, and which, when first made, served the double purpose of keeping full the castle ditches and the Foss at Layerthorpe, and of providing water-power for the Castle Mills. A bridge now crosses the river at this point close under what remains of the castle wall. Below the bridge the river forms a deep pool, about 80 yards broad. This bridge was built or rebuilt 4 Henry IV., and is described by Leland. Upon one of its up-stream piers stood a chapel dedicated to St. Ann or Agnes, and like London Bridge it was crowded with houses. At the bridge foot, but lower down, on the right bank, was placed St. George's Chapel.

The Castle Mills stood, where their modern representatives stand, just outside the castle ditch, and below a round tower on its wall.

The mural defences of the city were thus interrupted between Fishergate Tower and the castle by about 306 yards of water, a space now occupied partly by the Foss and partly by encroachments upon its banks. From this point for about 157 yards, the outer wall and ditch of the castle formed the defence common to the castle and city, and here was the Castle Postern, which communicated with the mills.

The city wall recommenced on the counterscarp of the castle ditch, on what is now called Castlegate Street, and in the wall was a footgate from the city called Castlegate Postern, removed in 1826. There the bank began again, and the wall was continued along it 70 yards to the Ouse, and ended at New Walk Postern and Water-tower, now removed, but the name of which is preserved in Tower Place. This part of the wall is very low, and had a ditch, which may have connected the castle ditch with the Ouse. No great strength of wall was here required, the ground in front being occupied by the mill-pool and the marsh of St. George's Field, now converted into a pleasant promenade.

Skeldergate Ferry, by which the Ouse is here traversed, seems to have led to another water-tower, with which the

wall recommenced, and in it was Skeldergate Postern, represented by a modern arch. This name is said to come from the kelders or cellars in which the merchants in this quarter of the city stored their goods, as in the old town at Edinburgh; though it is certainly curious that they should have selected the lowest part of the city for such receptacles. From the archway the ground rises rapidly up the Bayle Hill, upon the side of which the wall is built, being slightly bowed outwards in plan to leave the top of the hill free, and a little in the rear of the wall. It is evident that there was a ditch all round the hill, most of which has been filled up, and the wall carried across it. Outside the wall the Bayle ditch and that of the city coincided, and the excavation was broad and deep. It is now mostly filled up by Bishop-Hill Street, so called from the archbishop's shire, of which all this formed a part. The suburb here is Clementsthorpe, named from the Benedictine nunnery of St. Clement, founded in 1130, and of which exist a few traces of the church and enceinte wall, within the area of which a tesselated pavement was discovered.

Two hundred and forty-three yards from the Ouse, the wall makes a sharp turn westwards, and is capped by a round bastion 21 ft. diameter, vaulted below the rampart level, and entered by a low door in the gorge. This part of the wall has three buttresses, and a half-round bastion. It seems original, and may be built on arches, which however are not seen. From the angle the wall runs nearly direct to Micklegate Bar, 568 yards. There the rampart is reached by thirty-three steps. Upon the wall are four half-round bastions, and a half hexagon, and about twenty-four buttresses. Leland mentions nine towers. The bank is high, and the wall is built against it so as to show more in the front than in the rear, where the earth forms a ramp. The ditch was very formidable, and at least 50 yards broad. Probably it was dry, or nearly so, for the natural surface here is about 22 ft. above the top water of the river.

From the Bar the wall runs straight 152 yards to a salient overlooking the old Friars' Garden, now the railway station, the railway passing through the bend and beneath the wall under a modern four-centred arch of broad span. This part of the wall is very lofty, and is besides upon a

ANCIENT YORK.

Scale:—$\frac{1}{6800}$.

St Mary's Tower
St Mary's Guard
Manor House
ABBEY
BOOTHAM BAR
MOAT
Supposed Roman Road
Cathedral
Multangular Tower
Lendal Tower
ROMAN CEMETERY.
MONK BAR
Roman Tomb found here
RAILWAY TERMINUS
NORTH ST POSTERN
OUSE
Supposed Roman Road
LAYERTHORPE POSTERN
MICKLEGATE
BAR
Ouse Bridge
Supposed line of Roman Road
Foss Bridge
RIVER FOSS ISLAND
CLIFFORD'S TOWER
FOSS
RIVER
CASTLEGATE POSTERN
VICTORIA BAR
SKELDERGATE POSTERN
Red Tower
OLD BAILE
MOAT
LOWER WARD
WALMGATE
Castle Mills
F.GATE POSTERN
FISHER GATE
MOAT
BAR
MOAT

CLIFFORD'S TOWER

Standidge & Co. Lith. London. (3403)

very high bank. It has probably settled a good deal, for it is propped by twenty-four buttresses, and a small square bastion. The capping bastion of the angle is irregular in shape. Here the wall makes nearly a right angle, and passes north-east 527 yards to the Ouse, having on its course a salient at a very large angle. The bank is irregular, sinking towards the river, and the wall varies in height. Here are four small bastions, and about a dozen buttresses. In Leland's time were eleven towers between Micklegate Bar and the Ouse. The wall ends in a round water tower, which received one end of the Lendal chain. Just within the tower is the North Street Postern, now a modern archway. This part of the defence was very strong, the bank and wall being mostly high, and the ditch, which is only now being filled up, being broad and deep, and fed from the river.

This part of the wall has been cut through to form a road to the new railway station. The opening showed scarcely any foundation, but the colour of the soil made it evident that the bank had been much cut into and patched.

Leland says the circuit of the walls is $2\frac{3}{4}$ miles nearly, and Lockwood makes them 4707 yards, or 2 miles, 5 furlongs, 87 yards. The ordnance survey of the city, an admirable work, executed with extreme accuracy and minuteness to a scale of $\frac{1}{1056}$ or 5 ft. to the mile, and showing all the antiquities, tallies very closely with this, but this includes the open spaces at Layerthorpe and Fishergate. Omitting these, and the breadths of the Ouse, the length of the actual wall is 3671 yards, or 2 miles, 15 yards. There are six bridges, Ouse and Layerthorpe of five arches each; Monk Bridge, of three arches; Foss Bridge, of two; Castle Gate of one; and St. Mary's, a new iron bridge, replacing Lendal Ferry. None of these are old, though some of them replace earlier, and one or two very early structures. The Roman bridge seems to have crossed the Ouse opposite to the present Guildhall, the very curious vault and boat-house attached to which are, however, of far later date.

Leland mentions several towers upon the city walls. At this time there remain, beside the gate-houses, but four, Lendal, the opposite North-gate Tower, the Roman Tower, and that at Fishergate Postern. Besides these, there

are records of two water-towers, corresponding to Lendal and North-gate, at the lower end of the city. Nor are there traces of any more. Had such existed, their foundations must have been carried down through the bank to the solid ground, and some trace of them would have remained. The bays and bastions still remaining upon the walls are not of substance to have carried lofty superstructures, and probably were always much as at present. The only solution is that by the term "towers," Leland did not mean lofty structures, but bastions.

Besides the eight posterns, Lendal, Layerthorpe, Fishergate, Castle, Castle-gate, New Walk, Skeldergate, and North-gate, already noticed, there were four great gates or bars, Bootham, Monkbar, Walmgate, and Micklegate, to which may be added Fishergate Bar. Besides these an opening has been made for the railway, and one for its passengers. There is also in Micklegate a new opening called Victoria Bar.

The four Bars deserve special notice. They are all structures of great interest, in part very old, and though not equal in grandeur to the Upper Bar at Southampton, nor to the West Gate at Canterbury, they belong to a greater city, and are part of a far superior line of defence. They are upon lines of Roman road, and one is certainly upon, or rather above, the site of a Roman gate, though none can claim in any degree a Roman origin. But though not, as was long fondly supposed, Roman, their older parts are probably older than any part of the walls upon which they stand. As church builders began with the choir, so the fortifiers of towns often began with the gates, and sometimes, as probably at Richmond, went no further. At York it would seem that the Norman works commenced, though they did not conclude, with the gates. Of the bars, Bootham and Monk Bars are to the north, and Micklegate to the south of the Ouse, while Walmgate is beyond the Foss. They are alike in general plan and character, and have undergone very much the same sort of changes, additions, and restorations.

Bootham Bar, the west gate of the city, is on the site, though much above the level, of the Roman gate. It is in plan rectangular, 24 ft. broad by 21 ft. deep, pierced centrally by the gateway, the arches at each end of which are half circles, or

nearly so, with plain chamfered abaci or caps at the springing. There are two portcullis grooves, one of which contains the grate of oak bars 4 in. by 3 in., framed in squares of 7 in., plated and spiked with iron, and having in it a small wicket. The passage has a flat timber roof. There is a first, second, and third floor, the whole being about 46 ft. high, and on each side are openings for foot passengers, probably additions. Two buttresses flank the outer portal, and ascend to the top of the upper floor, the level of which is marked by a string, and at which commence two cylindrical bartizan turrets, which cap the two angles, resting on the buttresses and on two corbels. Each turret has a long cruciform loop towards the field, and in the curtain between them are two small square-headed windows. The parapet, which is plain, has a string not continued round the turrets. Upon its coping are three stone warriors at full length. In the upper stage is a tablet with the royal arms, now defaced, within a garter, and on either side a shield of those of the city. The inner arch is also flanked by buttresses, which terminate in flat pilasters, which also support bartizans. In the first floor are two small lancet openings, and above on the parapet are more stone warriors. In the outer front two small shoulder-headed doorways show the level of the ramparts of the Barbican, an enclosure 50 ft. long by 27 ft. broad, and about 25 ft. high, removed in the present century, and shown in Halfpenny's drawing, with two low bartizans on the front angles, with embrasures and cruciform loops. Bootham is said to derive its name from a great fair, a hamlet of Booth's, held in this suburb under the Abbot of St. Mary's, and a fruitful subject of dispute with the city authorities.

Monk Bar, though on the line of the Roman wall, is a few yards south of the site of the old gate. It is a very handsome structure. It also is rectangular, 27 ft. long and 35 ft. deep. Its height to the crest of the turrets is 63 ft., and it has three upper floors. The entrance passage is vaulted by four diagonal and two ridge ribs; the whole being an insertion. There is a portcullis at the outer end, the winch for lifting which remains. Also there are rebates for two gates. All these fittings are additions to a Norman core. A front has been added to the inner face, with a flat segmental arch, and a narrow bay vaulted with plain transverse ribs, above which is a shallow recess and plat-

form probably intended for the making of proclamations. The two outer angles are capped from the first floor with round bartizans, four having cruciform loops. Over the portal, in advance of the arch, is an outer arch high up and pointed, which supports a battlemented screen, the top of which is lower than, and commanded by, the main building. On this screen is a shield of the arms of France (modern) and England, between two of the city arms. Above are six figures represented as casting down stones. A stair in the inner face of the north pier ascends to the first floor, a chamber 24 ft. 6 in. by 15 ft. 6 in. and vaulted, as is the second floor, which is reached by a stair from the first floor within the south wall. In the third floor is a well stair to the ramparts. There are no bartizans on the two inner angles. A lodge or guardroom has been removed from the south side, to make a way for foot passengers. The Barbican, lately removed, was an addition. It was 42 ft. deep by 27 ft. broad, and had a round-headed archway and two flanking dwarf bartizans, octagonal in plan.

Monk Bar was repaired by Richard III. Sir H. Slingsby says this bar was beaten down to the gateway by the Parliamentary forces, but the masonry looks much older than that century. The core is clearly Norman, and the superstructures Decorated and Perpendicular. Leland calls the road to this bar Wateling Gate. It is said that its present appellation was adopted to do honour to General Monk.

Walmgate Bar is 24 ft. broad and 21 ft. deep. The portals are round-headed, and the passage covered with timber. The outside has been faced and a portcullis inserted, the grate of which shows its iron teeth and stout oaken bars in the groove. The inner face is also an addition, probably of the Decorated period, and appended to it is a curious sort of portico or porch of timber, of the date of Elizabeth or James I. The two outer angles are capped, from the first floor, with circular bartizans. The parapet is plain, and without stone figures. On the front are the arms of Henry V. This is the only bar of which the Barbican has been preserved. It is a rectangular pen 56 ft. deep from the face of the bar, and 24 ft. broad. At the outer end is a large gateway without a grate, and flanked by two buttresses. The walls are parapeted on each face, front and rear, and there are two dwarf circular bartizans at the

front angles, rising about 3 ft. above the curtain. The ramparts are entered by two small doors from the first floor of the gatehouse. The area was always open. As the ditch is filled up, and the masonry has been much repaired, it does not appear how this barbican was defended. Probably there were lateral arches admitting the water below the timber floor, and a drawbridge, either attached to the main entrance, and therefore within the barbican, or outside of and in front of it, over a special loop of the ditch.

Micklegate Bar, the principal gate of York, is a fitting entrance to the metropolis of the Northern Province. It is 26 ft. broad by 35 ft. deep, and 53 ft. high, with a central passage portcullised with rebates for doors. It has three upper floors, and the two outer angles are capped by circular bartizans, from the second floor level upwards. These turrets rest upon a bold set-off of three steps, and rise considerably above the parapets. They are embattled and have cruciform loops in the merlons, ending in oillets. Over the outer gate is a square-headed loop, and above it a second, flanked by two of a cruciform figure, and on the coping above are placed three full-length figures. On the front are shields of France (ancient) and England, and two of the city.

The barbican has been removed. It measured 48 ft. deep by 27 ft. broad. Its outer gate was high-pointed between flanking bartizans.

In the 8 Richard I., Benedict Fitz Engelran had licence to build a house upon Micklegate Bar, on payment of a fine and an annual rent. This must have been upon the Norman basement before the date of the present superstructure, which is generally supposed to have been added about 1332, after the battle of Neville's Cross. The head of Thomas Lord Scrope of Masham was displayed upon this bar by Henry V., as was, in 1460, that of the Duke of York,

"When York did overlook the town of York."

These four bars have much in common. All are rectangular in plan, with superstructures of two or three stages, a central passage and a barbican.

Each gatehouse retains a central part or core which is evidently Norman, and represents the original gatehouse of the eleventh or early in the twelfth century. It is square, has a plain round-headed arch at each end or face, and the

passage between, but little wider than the arch, had a flat covering of timber. There was no portcullis and no intermediate rebate. as at Sherborne, but there were two doors which opened inwards from either face. No doubt there was an upper floor, as at Tickhill, where is a Norman gatehouse but little altered.

During the Decorated period, probably in the reign of Edward I., the old gatehouses were cased, exterior arches were added, and grooves worked for a portcullis. The walls were also cased, and the upper parts replaced by a far more elaborate structure of two stages embattled and with round tourelles or bartizans, one at each of the front angles, corbelled out from the first or second floor. Part of these additions, however, are Perpendicular. The chamber above the portal contained, and still in one case does contain, the portcullis winch, and had a communication on either side with the city walls, either directly or by means of a passage within the rear wall of the structure. At Monk Bar the entrance portal is vaulted, but the other gates retain the original flat timber roof.

In front of each bar was, until recently, an oblong pen or enclosure contained within four walls, and projected longways across the ditch. This was the barbican. The wall was about 15 ft. high, and had battlements front and rear, and a gateway in the outer end, and flanking this gateway two dwarf bartizans corbelled out over the two angles. The rampart walk was entered by two small shoulder-headed doorways from the portcullis chamber. This structure rose out of the ditch, usually having lateral openings through which flowed the water. The passage was planked, and there was a drawbridge in front of the inner gate. The Walmgate Barbican has been preserved, though most of what is now seen is a restoration. These defences served both to cover the gate and to flank the adjacent wall, and even when entered they could be defended from their ramparts, the area not being roofed. As to their age, the doors leading to their ramparts are of the date of the first floor of the gatehouses, that is Decorated; but it is very probable that the barbicans had been much injured and may have been restored in the Perpendicular period.

At Carlisle, the outer gate of the castle is covered by a barbican of this character, though rather differently placed,

as it occupies a hollow angle of the gatehouse, and consequently only needs two walls. At Alnwick is a much finer and more perfect one, though still of the York type. Traitors' Tower, in London, is rather a *tete du pont* than a barbican, but has some features of both works. The walls there are pierced by galleries, looped outwards and inwards. The barbicans at Leeds Castle and Bodiam, the one Decorated and the other Perpendicular, are of totally different character from the above.

The castles of York were evidently constructed for defence against a foreign foe ; but under the Norman rule, if not earlier, their main use was to over-awe the city. The castle proper, though an important part of the defences of the city, was therefore, like modern citadels, independent of the other works, and had walls of its own and ditches communicating with the Foss. Its earthworks have already been described. Upon the mound was placed the Keep, probably with a low wall at the foot of the slope, along the scarp of the circumscribing ditch, which in Leland's time was full of water. The lower ward has also its *enceinte* wall strengthened by drum towers, of which two remain, with a part of the southern curtain. Outside this curtain there was a narrow outer ward also with its curtain and towers at a lower level. Whether this was carried all round is doubtful, but the part next the Foss has only lately been removed. In Leland's time the castle had five towers and the Keep, all ruined. The Foss formed the castle ditch to the east and south. To the north was the ditch dividing the lower ward from the mount, and to the west was a ditch, now filled up and covered by Tower Street. At the southern angle a postern led to the castle mills. Halfpenny's drawing show this to have had a pointed and deeply recessed arch and jamb, probably of Decorated date. There is some doubt as to the position of the main entrance, which seems to have been in the lower ward opposite Fishergate, If so there must still have been another entrance from the city, probably at Castlegate. From the lower ward a drawbridge and steps communicated with the Keep. The old area of the castle is accurately indicated by the boundaries of the city, and the county of the city. It measured 250 yards northwest and southeast, and was 125 yards broad, including about 30,000 square yards, or above 6 acres. The main buildings were in the lower ward, pro-

bably at the south end of it. Roman coffins have been found in this area, as in most parts of the city and suburbs.

The Keep, known as Clifford's Tower, from the Earls of Cumberland, its later Constables, who claimed to bear the city sword before the king when he visited York, is a very remarkable structure, and the only English example of the kind, though excavations show that the shell-keep of Warwick was something of the same pattern. In plan it is a quaterfoil, each foil having an exterior radius of 22 ft., and walls 9 ft. 6 in. thick, and 31 ft. high to the rampart walk. The diameter, measured across the centre of the foils, is 79 ft., and at their intersections 62 ft. Internally these dimensions are 60 ft. and 43 ft., the acute angles at which the curves would meet being cut off. The entrance is on the south-east, between two of the foils, and is placed in a gatehouse 21 ft. broad and of 11 ft. projection, having walls 3 ft. 6 in. thick. There is some reason to regard this gatehouse as an early addition, and that the original entrance was a mere archway in the Keep wall at the junction of two of the foils, where it now is, but masqued by the exterior addition. At Tamworth the shell Keep, probably of Early English date, has such a door. At present the outer entrance is by a portal into a small rectangular lobby, within which is the older gateway, acutely arched, and provided with an original portcullis and a door behind it.

Entering, it is seen that the basement floor is at the level of the top of the mound. At that level, in each bay or foil are two rather acutely pointed recesses, 5 ft. to 6 ft. broad, and 6 ft. deep, each containing a loop. Besides these, in the walls right and left, are two well staircases, 6 ft. diameter, ascending to the first floor and the ramparts. In the two further bays are two recessed fireplaces, 4 ft. deep, with semi-octagonal backs and vertical funnels. Opposite the entrance the junction of the two foils is pierced by two small doors leading into mural garde-robes with exterior shafts. In the right hand bay on entering is the well, about 3 ft. 6in. diameter and descending 53 ft. to the river level. The smaller doorways throughout are shoulder-headed.

That there was an upper floor is clear, but its details are obscure. It was probably a shell or gallery of timber apartments resting upon posts, and applied to the wall all round. The two stages thus formed were, the basement,

18 feet high, and the upper, 13 ft. In the centre was probably a small open court. This upper floor was reached by two well staircases only, but two other staircases hollowed in the junction of the quaterfoils, led from thence to the ramparts, which thus had four approaches, and could be manned rapidly. In the other junction are two mural garderobes, above those already mentioned. The walls are recessed as below, some of the recesses containing loops, others small pointed windows, having an exterior hood or drip. There are no fireplaces on this floor.

The room above the entrance, entered by one of the well stairs, from below, is the chapel. It is 15 ft. by 14 ft., entered near the west end, is vaulted, and has against its wall a handsome arcade of lancet arches springing from wall-shafts in the Early English style, with a band of well-cut dog-tooth ornament. In the north wall, near the east end, is a plain square locker. As in Marten's Tower at Chepstow, and at Harlech, this oratory serves as a portcullis chamber. The arcade has been broken away to the south-east, and an attempt made to construct an independent staircase, of which the lower part, 6 ft. diameter, remains, and bears a Decorated character.

At the first floor level, outside the walls, three of the internal angles formed by the junction of the quaterfoils are occupied by segmental turrets, resting upon corbels, and rising to form part of the battlements. Two of these contain the well stairs; in the third are the upper garde-robes, and above them two others at the rampart level, six in all. These bartizans are original, and give a peculiar character to the structure. Over the portal are the arms of Charles II., and in a compartment immediately below, on the same stone, those of Clifford, now defaced. Originally, a steep flight of fifty steps, like those at Tickhill, descended the mound from the portal, and ended at a high and steep drawbridge, which communicated with the lower ward. The walls of the Keep are faced with excellent ashlar, and the foundations have been ascertained to descend from 6 ft. to 7 ft., which is by no means always the case with these shell Keeps.

The contents of the lower ward have been entirely swept away, and in its area are modern buildings. There still remains an excellent well, and a fragment of the curtain

and two towers. Leland describes the castle wall, meaning that of the lower ward, as of 1100 yards girth.

The mills, an appendage of every castle, great or small, were here probably on a grand scale, suitable to the water-power and to the demand for flour. They stood outside of, and to the south of the castle, between it and the Foss, and close to St. George's Chapel, now removed. They had belonged to the Order of the Temple, and were worked by means of a very strong dam in the line of the modern Castle Mills Bridge. It was probably this dam, constructed before the Conquest, and strengthened afterwards, which caused the Layerthorpe marsh to be silted up and the Foss Island to be formed.

The castle is not in any one of the ridings of the county, nor within the liberty of the city. It has from an early period been assessed with the parish of St. Mary Castlegate, "Ecclesia S^tæ.^ Mariæ ad portam Castri." It was always in the Crown, and usually in the custody of the Sheriff of the county, though now and then a special governor or Constable was appointed. Its repairs are charged in the Pipe Rolls, and notably in those of the reign of Henry III. The records mention various offices connected with the castle held by serjeantry, as "Portæ castri custodia," 55 Henry III., and in the reign of Edward I. certain lands were held under it by varieties of castle-guard tenure, providing archers for particular towers, &c.

The castle is generally supposed to have been the scene of a bloody tragedy in the reign of Richard I. In 1189, fearing the extension to York of the popular outrages perpetrated in London, the Jews, who were favoured by Richard, moved their valuables into the castle, and aided in its defence when it was, in consequence, attacked by the populace. After some days, fearing to be dishonoured if they surrendered, and hard pressed, they are said to have burned the castle and slain their families and themselves, 11th March, 1189-90. Richard, then absent, ordered the outrage to be punished. Osbert, brother of Longchamp, Bishop of Ely, one of the regency, was appointed governor, and the Sheriff was set aside. Osbert is said to have rebuilt the works of William Rufus in the castle. He proceeded, says Hoveden, "Firmare castellum in veteri castellaria, quod rex G^s.^ Rufus ibi construxerit." Long afterwards, Richard III.

so popular throughout the north, proposed to rebuild the castle, but unfortunately only proceeded so far as to pull down most of what remained. The Keep seems to have been long more or less in ruin, but to have been made use of during the wars of the seventeenth century, and to have been blown up and reduced nearly to its present condition. In 1673 the castle became a gaol, and has so continued, to the destruction of most objects of antiquarian interest. The domestic buildings and gatehouses have been removed, the ditches filled up, nearly all the wall replaced by an ugly mockery of castellated defences, and there is a modern gateway, constructed at a great expense, and only to be surpassed in bad taste by that which gives entrance to the gaol which has superseded the castle of Reading. The mound, if not too hot, was certainly too heavy for removal, and though nibbled at, pared, and walled, it was not actually cleared away, and the shell of its Keep was left, as it still remains, in undisturbed decay. Of the lower ward there remain about 120 yards of the original curtain, and two three-quarter round towers, which, however, being near the prison, are not permitted to be visited.

Clifford's Tower is probably of the reign of Richard I., when circular Keeps were in use, largely in France, and to some extent in England. Etampes and the Louvre were of that period, built by Philip Augustus. The quaterfoil modification of the circle may be a little later in the style. No doubt the Keep was rebuilt after the Jewish tragedy. The chapel is somewhat later, and is probably the work of Henry III., to whom may be attributed what remains of the outer wall and towers. It should, however, be mentioned that the chapel is generally regarded as the work of the first Robert of the house of Clifford, a great military commander, and Warden of the Northern Counties, who sat in Parliament from 1300 until his death at Bannockburn. He is said to have given his name to the whole structure.

But little is known of the other castle, the Bayle Hill. There is no record of any masonry upon the mound, nor are there any traces of it above ground. It is, however, scarcely probable that so strong a post, and one fortified by the Conqueror in a temporary manner, would be left without some permanent fortification. The lower area certainly was fortified, and contained many buildings. In 1326 the "Vetus

Ballium" was in the custody of the Archbishop, under his special jurisdiction, and exempt from the liberties of the city. The Archbishop, however, then William de Melton, when called upon to repair the fortifications, those probably which were common to his Bayle and to the city, pleaded that they were "inter fossatas civitatis," within the city ditches, and should be repaired by the citizens. The plea was overruled, and he had to execute the repairs, which he seems to have done most unwillingly. He employed timber and masonry in the work; planks 18 ft. long for the citadel, and an exterior stone wall. In 1380, the "Vetus Ballium" was still held by the Archbishop, and indeed for long afterwards.

In 1216, at the close of the reign of John, Robert de Ros and the Northern Barons, laid siege to York in the interest of Louis, the French prince, but were bought off by a payment by the citizens of 1000 marks. Henry III. granted the proceeds of a toll on goods entering the city to be applied to the repair and maintenance of the defences, for which purpose it was long levied and applied. In 1266 the Abbot of St. Mary's had licence to fortify that area, which thus covered a considerable part of the city wall.

Edward II. is said to have caused the walls to be put in repair in 1316, while expecting an attack from Thomas of Lancaster. In 1327 Edward III. called on the citizens to look to their walls, ditches, and towers, while he marched against the Scots. In 1385, Richard II. bestowed upon the chief magistrate the title of "Lord Mayor," and erected the city into a county, excepting from it the castle, its towers, and its ditches. Richard III., after his second coronation at York, rescinded the concession of Henry III. as to the tolls, but undertook himself to repair the walls. He is thought, however, to have done but little beyond the addition of the superstructure to Monk Bar. The taking down of the castle by Richard is referred to in a letter by the King to the Corporation of York, 2 Henry VII., and the new reign was commenced with great activity in the repairs of the defences. Fishergate was erected 1487, but burned by rioters in 1491.

In the 17 Henry VII., 1501, the Corporation seem to have restored the Fishergate Postern, and to have rebuilt part of the tower, and of the wall between Walmgate and the Foss. In 1639, King Charles mustered his army at York before

the expedition into Scotland, and in the following year he was in the city directing certain additions to be made to its defences. It then became his head-quarters, and he fell back upon it in 1641, after the failure at Hull. In 1642, the additional defences, chiefly advanced batteries of earth, were ready, and guns were mounted upon the mounds of the castle and the old Bayle.

In 1646 the city was besieged by Fairfax on the south-east, and by the Earl of Manchester on the Bootham fronts, and guns were posted by them upon La Muele and the other mounds in the suburbs. Walmgate Bar is said to have been mined and countermined, and if so must have had a narrow escape, and part of the *enceinte* wall of St. Mary's was actually blown up. Marston Moor gave the death blow to the royal cause about York; and on a threat of being stormed the city was surrendered, with the honours of war, after eighteen weeks' siege. The walls had suffered much, but were restored; Walmgate and Bootham Bars were almost rebuilt in 1648, and the chapel of Clifford's Tower was patched up to prevent its fall. In 1666, the wall was repaired between Monk Bar and the Leventhorpe Postern, and in 1669 repairs were executed near Bootham Bar.

In 1683, Clifford's Tower, then used as a magazine, was burnt and gutted, an event called by the citizens "The fall of the minced pie." In 1699 Castlegate Postern was rebuilt. In 1740. Fishergate Postern was roofed. In 1745, for the last time the heads of rebels were placed upon Micklegate Bar. In 1825, the Barbican was removed from Monk Bar, 1826 saw the last of the Castlegate Postern, as did 1827 and 1831 of the Barbicans of Micklegate and Bootham Bars. Since that time better taste and a more conservative spirit as regards its material remains have prevailed in the municipal councils; though what has been done when the railway was admitted through the walls, and what is now doing in the provision of a passage to the new station, can scarcely be cited as a proof of this. Nevertheless, a sum of money is annually voted by the Corporation for the maintenance of the walls and similar remains, and there is a general desire to do what is right, and to preserve as far as possible, and as is consistent with the health and comfort of the present generation, such memorials as have been bequeathed to it of the past.