

NYCC HER	
SNY	12022
ENY	2599
CNY	
Parish	3083
Rec'd	

**Malton Castle
Malton
North Yorkshire
Archaeological Evaluation
Interim Report**

February 1997
MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd.

**Malton Castle
Malton
North Yorkshire
Archaeological Evaluation
Interim Report**

Contents	Page
Figure List	2
Introduction	3
Archaeological and Historical Background	4
Excavation Methods	8
Excavation Results	9
Discussion and Conclusions	15
Bibliography	17
Appendices	
1. Context List	18
2. Finds Catalogue	19
3. Ceramic and Building Materials	23

Figure List	Page
1. Site Location Maps. (Scales 1:50 000 and 1: 10 000).	25
2. Trench Location Map. (Scale 1: 1250).	26
3. John Settrington's view of 'Malton in the County of York' (1728).	27
4. Detail of Joseph Dickinson's 'Map of the Burrow of New Malton' (1730).	28
5. Detail of Robert Wise's 'Map of the Borough of New Malton' (1840). (Scale c. 1: 2500).	29
6. Ordnance Survey County Series map of 1911. (Scale 1: 2500).	30
7. Trench 1 - Plan of Ditch Cut 1006.	31
8. Trench 1 - Plans of Demolition and Building	32
9. Trench 1 - East Facing Section	33
10. Trench 2 - Plan and Section.	34
11. Trench 3 - Plan and Section	35
12. Trench 4 - Plan and Section	36
13. Trench 5 - Plan.	37

**Malton Castle
Malton
North Yorkshire
Archaeological Evaluation
Interim report**

Introduction

During three days in July 1996 MAP Archaeological Consultancy Ltd. provided a team of six professional archaeologists to excavate five trenches in the grounds of the Lodge, Old Maltongate, North Yorkshire (Figs. 1 & 2 - SE 7905 7160 centre).

The site lies to the south of the Lodge, between Old Maltongate and Castlegate, in an area scheduled for its significance as the site of Malton's medieval castle and subsequent Jacobean mansion (SAM Co. No. NY 1261). The geology of the site consists of coralline oolitic limestone of the Middle Lias (OS 1960) with overlying soils of the Elmton 1 Association (Mackney 1983 et al.). The elevation of the site falls gradually from c.35m AOD at the north to c.30m at the south, where there is a steep drop at the natural bluff overlooking the River Derwent. However, within the general fall of the site there are a number of platforms and sunken areas.

The Lodge grounds have become heavily overgrown in recent years. The Lodge and a small area of the surrounding grounds have been sold by the Fitzwilliam Estate for conversion into a hotel. Ryedale District Council (RDC) wish to open up the remainder of the Grounds as a public park. This proposed change of use for the site made it necessary to ascertain the extent, nature and quality of preservation of any archaeological deposits present, particularly any connected with the former castle and Jacobean mansion. As a way of achieving that aim, and with maximum publicity in mind, RDC approached the Channel 4 television programme 'Time Team' to examine the area. Scheduled Monument Consent was obtained for the excavation of a maximum of 200m².

This report has been compiled from the excavation's archaeological information, with a consideration of published maps and sources to provide the historical background. No reference is made to any detailed documentary research which 'Time Team' may have undertaken, or the detailed geophysical survey (which in any case the excavators were not party to). In that sense, this report can be seen as a 'control' to the conclusions of 'Time Team'.

The work was funded by Video Text Communications Ltd. (the makers of 'Time Team') and Ryedale District Council.

The maps within this report have been produced from the Ordnance Survey with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, Crown Copyright, Licence no. AL 50453A.

Archaeological and Historical Background

The archaeological and historical background of the site can be broken down into three main elements: (a) Roman Fort and Settlement, (b) Medieval Castle, and (c) Jacobean Mansion and Gardens.

(a) Roman Fort and Settlement

The remains of a large Roman fort covering 8.4 acres (3.4ha) lie partly within the Lodge grounds, the eastern half surviving as earthworks in Orchard Field. Corder's 1920s excavations in Orchard Field and in the Lodge grounds showed a long history for this fort, from its foundation in c.A.D. 79, through various periods of abandonment and rebuild to early 5th century occupation and defensive measures (Corder 1930). It has also been suggested that there was a much larger Flavian camp or fort of 30 acres (12.15ha), associated with the reinforcing of the Parisi's territory by Bolanus during Venutius' uprising (Frere 1972). Corder dug a number of trenches outside the line of the western defences of the Agricolan fort, finding two "wide and deep" Roman ditches, and noting that the Roman surface was buried under a "great accumulation of later rubbish". A post-Roman well was also discovered.

An enclosed civilian settlement (vicus) lay outside the south-eastern defences of the fort. Stone buildings associated with the vicus have been excavated by D. Smith (1949-52, Mitchelson 1964) and T G Manby and L P Wenham 1968-70, (Wenham 1974). Wenham's findings are in the process of re-evaluation by Brenda Heywood. Smaller-scale work by MAP also revealed stone buildings within the vicus (MAP 1991 and 1993a).

The 1996 trenches within the Lodge grounds lay outside the known limits of the Agricolan fort, with the exception of Trench 5, which overlay the general vicinity of the north-west defences. Roman activity to the west of the fort has been recently shown by excavations and a Watching Brief on the new Parish Centre in St. Leonard's churchyard (by York Archaeological Trust, in 1992, B. Antoni pers. comm.), which showed a horizon of 3rd / 4th century levelling.

A Roman stone building at the junction of St. Leonards Hill and Old Maltongate was recorded during the installation of services. Further south, towards the Parish Centre, a spread of demolition debris consisting of painted plaster, limestone rubble and tile was observed (ibid.).

Another Roman building, constructed of limestone and associated with 3rd / 4th century pottery, was revealed by ERARC in 1989 at Sheepfoot Hill (ERARC 1989).

The St. Leonards and Sheepfoot Hill sites are important as they demonstrate significant Roman settlement west of the fort, rather than simply the vicus to the south and the large settlement across the river Derwent in Norton.

(b) Medieval Castle

The Lodge grounds have long been presumed to include the site of Malton's medieval castle. The castle is believed to have been constructed in stone in the early 12th century, and was granted by Henry I to Eustace Fitzjohn (Robinson 1978, no. 174). Fitzjohn was an ardent supporter of Matilda against Stephen, and in 1138 he marched into Yorkshire with David of Scotland. After the Scots' (and Fitzjohn's) defeat at the Battle of The Standard, Malton castle was besieged, but after an eight day truce, the siege was abandoned (VCH, 1914, 529). Later in the 12th century the castle was the venue for an interview between Richard I and William the Lion, king of Scotland (in 1194). King John visited the castle in February 1213, but ordered its destruction the following year. The castle must have been restored by 1251, when Agnes de Vescy founded St. James' chantry at the castle. Joan Comyn and Lady Isabella de Kildare were contemporary 13th century residents of the castle. John de Mowbray was granted custody of the castle by the king in 1317, but 'Evildoers' and 'ill-disposed persons' refused him admittance (ibid.).

In 1322, Robert de Bruis occupied the castle after the Battle of Byland, using it as a base to despoil the surrounding area. The castle was apparently wrecked when de Bruis abandoned it before his retreat northwards in October 1322. Again, the castle must have been restored as it was mentioned in deeds of 1487 and 1490 (Hudleston 1962, 73). However, the castle had been demolished or let into decay by the time of Leland's visit to Malton c.1540. Leland wrote that although Malton castle had been large, as appeared from the ruin, there was at present no habitation there, "but a mean house for a farmer" (Leland, i 57).

Prior to the 1996 excavations, there was very little firm archaeological evidence relating to

the castle. The wall forming the southern boundary of the site, at the rear of Castle Dikes House on the north side of Castlegate has long been suspected to relate to the castle (e.g. Hinderswell's 1825 plan refers to it as "Castle Walls"). Surviving areas of this wall's original masonry, including a shallow pilaster buttress, were recorded prior to its re-pointing (MAP 1993b). Although the survey could draw no firm conclusions about the origin of the wall, the pilaster buttress is consistent with an early Angevin date (mid 12th century - information from Beric Morley), and so this wall can be seen as part of the castle's southern boundary.

(c) Jacobean Mansion

The site of the medieval castle was occupied by Lord Eure, who had a house there in 1569 (VCH, 529). In the early 17th century the Eures are believed to have built a large house at the site, but it is unknown how this related to their 16th century house. The grounds of a large house of this period would have been laid out as formal gardens, perhaps along the lines of the arrangement of planting beds and paths depicted on John Settrington's 1728 view of 'Malton in the County of York' (Fig. 3).

The mansion had a short, but eventful history. The Eures were Catholic, and the mansion was a recusant stronghold, to the extent that it was besieged by the Sheriff of Yorkshire's forces in 1625 and 1632. On the latter occasion the walls were damaged by a barrage by artillery brought from Scarborough castle.

Malton was besieged during the Civil War. It seems likely that the mansion formed a strong point in the town's defence, and may have been damaged during the defeat of the Royalist forces under the Earl of Newcastle by Sir William Constable in 1644.

Lord Eure died in 1652, and the property was sequestered. Sequestration was later removed in favour of Eure's Protestant nieces, Margaret and Mary. However, it is recorded that the co-heiresses could not agree as to the settlement of the estate. A judgement by Henry Marwood, High Sheriff of Yorkshire, called for the demolition of the mansion and its division stone by stone, and this was carried out in 1675 (Hudleston 1962, 121).

Celia Fiennes, writing about 1698, mentions the "defacing" of the "very great house" and states that the out-buildings and Gatchouse (now the Lodge) were used as a linen manufactory "which does employ many poor people". Lord Eure's co-heiress (which one is not specified) was by that time living in a "pretty house", which could have been the late 17th century building

discussed below or York House on Yorkersgate.

The Gatehouse, plus the enclosure wall and gate-arches at the Old Maltongate frontage, and the walls on the eastern and western boundaries of the plot, comprise the major recognisable remains of this substantial and important Jacobean landscape complex.

The Gatehouse is described by Pevsner as being of remarkable size (Pevsner 1966, 236), which is an indicator of the scale of the vanished dwelling. The Gatehouse (minus its later additions) forms a substantial embattled block of five bays and two storeys. The central bay is wider than the others, to allow the passage of carriages, and is flanked by coupled Tuscan columns on the ground and first floors. The windows are believed to have been originally all mullioned and transomed. A rain-head (now vanished) is said to have been dated '1608' (Hudleston 1962, 120). The Gatehouse would have formed the northern element of a complex of buildings with a symmetrical C-, E- or even quadrangular-shaped range to the south. The exact form of this range is being considered separately by the RCHM(E), but 1996 excavation went some way to support the former existence of the range's eastern wing (see below, Trench 4).

John Settrington's view of "Malton in the County of York" (1728 : Fig. 3) shows the Lodge and grounds from the south-east. Although the position of the Lodge and northern part of the grounds in relation to St. Leonard's church seems accurate, the perspective with much of the town is eccentric. There are no indications of the Jacobean mansion in the area south of the Lodge, where a broad path leads to a terrace surmounted by a wall. Steps lead down off the terrace into an area of lawns separated by geometric paths, with another area enclosed by a topiary hedge.

A building is shown at 90 degrees to the Lodge, and extending southwards from the Lodge's south-east corner. The building has a hipped roof, tiled with stone or ceramics, over a six-bay arrangement, with long and short quoining at the corners. This building is late-17th century in appearance, and was therefore apparently built within 25 years of the mansion's demolition. The fact that no entrances are shown in the building's west facade or southern gable could mean that it forms a unit along with the paddocks and outbuildings to the north-east.

Although Dickinson's map is only two years later than Settrington's view, the garden plan is shown as a less formal arrangement (Fig. 4). Although this could be due to simplification on

Dickinson's part, or idealisation on Settrington's, there would have been in any case a moving away from the fashion for formal gardens to informal park-like grounds, with greenswards, "wilderness" areas and the like. Dickinson shows the six-bay building in plan, with a "fold" to the north-east and a "paddock" to the south-west.

The late-17th century building survives on the 1850 Ordnance Survey map (Fig. 6 - 6'' scale), but is absent from the 1911 County Series map (1: 2500 scale), having been demolished between those dates. The Lodge itself had been extended at both ends, with the extension at the eastern end forming a large rectangular structure which could incorporate parts of the late 17th century building. Wise's plan of 1840, which accompanies Copperthwaite's survey of Malton, also shows the late 17th century building, but unfortunately there are no indications of its function or status (Fig. 5). Wise's plan shows little detail in the Lodge grounds, other than a C-shaped range of buildings facing west in the south / central area, which may have been horticultural outbuildings. The 1850 OS map also shows these buildings, but they were demolished by 1911 (Fig. 6).

Excavation Methods

The positions of the five trenches were decided by the 'Time Team' in consultation with the Inspector of Ancient Monuments for the area, Jonathan Ete. Trenches 1-3 were located to examine earthwork features. Trenches 4 and 5 were positioned to examine geophysical anomalies, following a geophysical survey by Geophysical Surveys of Bradford.

Essentially, direction for the excavation came from Mick Aston, Phil Harding and Carena Lewis of Time Team, with MAP supervising and undertaking the recording and physical excavation.

The modern topsoil at the top of the trenches was removed by a rear-acting JCB excavator using a toothless bucket. Machining initially ceased at the top of the archaeological deposits, but there was additional machining of rubble deposits in Trenches 1 and 2. The remainder of the excavation was by hand.

Plans and sections were drawn at 1:20 and 1:10 respectively, and a written record was compiled on standard forms under the continuous context recording system. A photographic record was taken in monochrome print and polychrome print and transparency.

The position of the trenches within the site was recorded by RCHM(E) staff using a total station.

A total of c.1200 litres (c. 1200kg) of context 2006 was dry-sieved on the site to recover artefacts and environmental information.

At the end of the excavation, the trenches were back-filled by machine under archaeological supervision. In addition, sensitive floor or surfacing deposits in Trenches 1 and 4 were carefully covered by hand with the dry sandy residue from the bulk-sieving. Wall 1024 was also protected before the backfilling.

Excavation Results

Trench 1

Trench 1 was positioned at the extreme south of the site and its southern end was c.4m north of the wall forming the boundary of Castle Dikes House, mentioned previously (Fig. 2). It was located to examine a noticeable earthwork mound. The trench aligned north to south, was c. 1.5m in width, and c.29m in length.

The earliest deposit revealed was a pale, gravelly sandy silt (context 1012) at the southern end of the trench. This context represents a natural soil resulting from the weathering of the underlying limestone bedrock. A darker, more loamy material (context 1005), contained Roman sherds, and apparently represents a Roman subsoil.

A very large feature (context 1006) cut into context 1005 in the central part of the trench (Figs. 7 & 9). This feature was 10m wide, and over 1.1m deep, with edges falling at c. 45 degrees towards the base (which was not observed, as the safety limit had been reached). The two edges were not parallel. The fills (contexts 1003, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1010 and 1011) were clean sands with varying amounts of limestone gravel. Tip lines were observed, running downwards into the feature from south to north. Contexts 1003 and 1007 contained Roman pottery, the only diagnostic sherd being a rim with military associations dateable to A.D. 80-130.

Interpretation of this feature is problematic, not least because of the difficulties of understanding a large feature within a narrow trench. Even though the two edges were not

parallel, the impression is of a large ditch. The sandy, gravelly nature of the fills, with no loamy elements present, indicate that the feature was back-filled rapidly at the same time, with slightly different dumps, basically variations on the same theme. Given that only a small number of sherds were found in the feature, the sherds were relatively small and abraded, and may have been incorporated into dumping material brought in from elsewhere, a Roman date is not conclusively proved. That being said, this massive cut would appear to represent a large ditch, whose scale suggests a defensive function; one possible scenario for such a defensive ditch would be the postulated Flavian fort.

At the extreme southern end of the trench a sandy silt (context 1004) overlay context 1005. This context contained Roman and medieval sherds, and may represent infilling or levelling behind the assumed curtain wall lying immediately south of the trench.

The northern end of the trench was occupied by a building and associated demolition deposits (Figs. 8 & 9). Examination of the building was confined to the removal of the demolition and robbing debris, plus the cleaning and recording of the interior surface and the remains of the southern wall. The wall remains (context 1024) consisted of an east to west line of five roughly shaped stones of limestone and sandstone, set in a matrix of silty sand and small limestones. These blocks represented the foundations of the inner face of the wall, the remainder having been robbed, a process illustrated by a robber trench (cut 1026) to the south. Together, the inner face of the wall and the southern edge of the robber trench had a width of 1.3m, indicating a massive wall.

The interior surface of the building consisted of an undulating, compact spread of fine sandy mortar (context 1023), which in places had been eroded to reveal a dark charcoaly silt. No finds were directly associated with the building, but the deposit of rubble (context 1017) immediately overlying the mortar surface contained glazed roofing tile fragments (crested and plain) of 13th century date, plus sherds of 13th to 15th century date. Assuming that this rubble derived from the demolition of the building the presence of the glazed tiles indicates a building of high status.

To the south of the building a gravelly silt deposit (context 1018), and two rubbly sand deposits (contexts 1019 and 1020) could represent construction debris or surfacing outside the building. The remains of wall 1024 and its robber trench were overlain by a patch of sandy rubble (context 1016), containing both Roman and medieval sherds, and which presumably

represents more demolition debris.

A distinct mound of rubble (contexts 1015 and 1017) existed over the building. The absence of re-usable stone and roofing tile within these deposits showed that they were demolition debris rather than building collapse. It is likely that this mound is a garden feature, the tempting scenario being the demolition of the castle buildings and the landscaping of the resulting debris to create features of the formal Jacobean gardens.

Whatever the origin of the "mound", a wall (context 1021) was built on top of it, at the crest of the slope. The wall consisted of three roughly dressed, unbonded limestones, one course in height, and up to 0.25m in length, on a south-west to north-east alignment. No associated floor surfaces were present, and this factor, coupled with the small size of the stones, make it likely that this wall was part of a garden feature such as the edging for a planting-bed or path. A dark sandy silt deposit (context 1022), situated north of the wall and at the same horizon, could represent an associated topsoil. A small area of mortar (context 1014) overlay the eastern part of the wall.

Both contexts 1014 and 1022 were overlain by a substantial deposit of rubbly sandy silt (context 1013), and this extended southwards almost as far as the northern edge of the large ditch. Context 1013 contained medieval and post-medieval sherds, and would seem to represent further post-medieval landscaping, perhaps a remodelling of the formal Jacobean gardens.

A linear band of mortar (context 1027), crossed the southern end of the trench on an east to west alignment. This 0.90m wide feature could represent a relatively recent path running alongside the property's southern boundary.

A sandy silt deposit (context 1002) lay across the top of the whole trench, and represented a modern topsoil.

Trench 2

Trench 2 was situated on the eastern slope of the same mound examined by Trench 1 (Figs. 2 & 10). The trench was aligned south-west to north-east, and was 12.6m in length and 1.5m wide.

The excavated deposits in the trench consisted of deposits of varying concentrations of limestone and sandstone rubble and gravel in mortar or silty matrices (contexts 2002 - 2014). These deposits dipped down to the north-east. The earliest deposits observed (contexts 2013 and 2014) consisted of limestone rubble in mortar matrices; the mortar character of these deposits implies that they fill an actual robbing trench, or else were demolition rubble. The remainder of the contexts (2002 - 2012) had more loamy matrices, which does not contradict the interpretation from Trench 1 of the mound as a garden feature. Pottery from the deposits in Trench 1 ranged from Roman to post-medieval in date; sherds of 18th century date were found in context 2006, but these were small and could be intrusive. Another dating consideration for these deposits is the total absence of clay tobacco pipe (this despite the sieving of 1000 litres of deposit from context 2006), which suggested a date prior to the first quarter of the 17th century, after which clay pipe became more common.

A heavily rooted topsoil (context 2001) completed the sequence.

Trench 3

Trench 3 was positioned c.50m west of Trenches 1 and 2 perpendicularly over a slight bank and ditch, which ran on a north-west to south-east alignment parallel to the site's western boundary, to assess the remains of the Castle's western defences (Figs. 2 & 11). The trench was 9m long and c.1.2m wide.

The earliest deposit in the trench was a silty sand with angular limestones (context 3011), which is believed to represent the weathered surface of the underlying limestone bedrock.

A large, presumably linear, feature (context 3010) cut into the natural (context 3011) in the western half of the trench. Very little of the cut was seen, but this was clearly a massive feature over 5m in width and 0.6m in depth. The earliest observed fill (context 3009) was characterised by the presence of angular limestone rubble, possibly caused by the erosion of the stony edge of the ditch. The two subsequent fills (contexts 3008 and 3007) were largely stone-free sandy silts. Context 3008 contained a sherd of 15th century pottery. There can be little doubt that this feature is a ditch, as it continues as a shallow linear depression to both the north and the south of the trench.

A large deposit of stony, sandy silt (context 3006) was situated c.1m east of the lip of the ditch. The fact that this deposit had a convex profile, coupled with its position relative to the

assumed ditch and the surface evidence, points to it having been a bank. Context 3006 contained 12th - 14th century sherds.

A deposit of mortary rubble (context 3005), whose lower surface had an uneven appearance, overlay the top of the assumed bank. Although no traces of a robber trench as such were readily identifiable in the top of bank 3006, it is likely that 3005 represents debris from a demolished wall which had stood at the crest of the bank.

A thin deposit of mortary silt (context 3004) dipped down into the top of the ditch and this may echo the episode of demolition represented by context 3005. Two subsequent deposits of sandy silt (contexts 3002 and 3003) could represent attempts to level off all traces of the bank and ditch.

A deep, well-rooted topsoil (context 3001) completed the sequence, and this would seem to represent horticulture.

The large ditch along with the bank and wall traces, can be dated by associated sherds to the medieval period, and must therefore represent the western defences of the medieval castle. The two ditch fills (contexts 3007 and 3008), after dipping from the east, begin to rise again towards the western edge of the trench, presumably to eventually meet the western edge of the ditch, which probably underlies the stone-wall forming the site's western boundary (and the grounds of the Jacobean mansion) which lies c.5m beyond the edge of the trench.

Trench 4

Trench 4 was situated in the northern part of the site, in an overgrown rose-garden, c. 50m south of the Lodge (Fig. 2). Geophysical survey showed a broad north-west to south-east anomaly at this location. The excavation was to determine if the anomaly was the western ditch of the Roman fort, or part of the Jacobean mansion, whose presence was also suspected in the vicinity. The trench was 19.6m long and 1.6m wide. Excavation was confined to the removal of topsoil and rubble deposits (Fig. 12).

A series of mortary deposits (contexts 4015 - 4020) were located at the base of the eastern part of the trench. These mortar deposits appeared to represent the internal floor surface of a building with a width of at least 9m. The variations between the different mortars could be due to wear patterns or zoning, but could also have been caused by damage during the building's

demolition or later root disturbance.

The mortar surface was bounded on both its margins by deposits of mortar and angular rubble (contexts 4010 and 4021) suggestive of the fills of robber trenches. Subsequently the mortar surfaces were overlain by a layer of mortary, silty sand with angular and sub-angular limestone fragments and broken stone and ceramic roofing tiles (context 4008), clearly demolition debris.

A further three features at the western end of the trench occupied the same horizon as the mortar surfacing, and were parallel to the mortar's western edge. Contexts 4002 and 4003 were north to south bands of loamy silt, with a band of compact band of stoney material (context 4004) between them. It seems likely these features represent a path (context 4004) flanked by two planting-beds (contexts 4002 and 4003). Another loamy silt deposit (context 4005) at the same horizon contained late 17th / early 18th century pottery and clay pipe.

A linear band of compacted small rounded limestones (context 4012) at the eastern end of the trench is interpreted as a fairly recent path, probably associated with the former rose-garden. The path had a dark sandy silt deposit (context 4009) on its eastern edge, and this was probably an associated flower bed.

A recent topsoil (context 4001) covered the top of the trench, and its relative shallowness is suggestive of a lawn rather than horticulture.

The dating evidence for this trench puts the activity in the 17th and 18th centuries, and this would tie in with the demolition of the Jacobean mansion in the late 17th century.

Trench 5

Trench 5 was situated c.60m north-east of Trench 2, in the central part of the site (Fig. 2). This location was chosen to examine a number of geophysical anomalies, which were provisionally interpreted as relating to a building associated with the Castle. However, the anomaly also seems to have been, at least in part, related to a C-shaped range of outbuildings shown on Wise's plan. The trench was 12m long and 2m wide. Evaluation in this trench was restricted to the removal of the topsoil and the cleaning and recording of the archaeological deposits (Fig. 13).

Four differing bands of material were noted, running north-west to south-east across the trench. A dark gravelly, silty sand deposit at the western end of the trench (context 5002), contained a post-medieval sherd and pan-tile, giving a 17th century or later date. A limestone gravel in a sandy matrix (context 5003) lay immediately east of 5002. The remainder of the trench was taken up by contexts 5004 and 5005, similar in texture, but the latter less stoney than the former.

Interpretation of this trench is hampered by the limited scale of the work undertaken. The deposits were seemingly all of post-medieval date. It seems likely that the deposits were a parterre, with context 5003 representing a path, and contexts 5002, 5004 and 5005 being the traces of separately cultivated plots. However, it is probable that the eastern end of the trench is influenced by the proximity of the post-medieval outbuildings, so that contexts 5004 and 5005 might be associated surfacing.

Discussion and Conclusions

The 1996 excavations revealed activity associated with the three main activity phases predicted at the site: the Roman period, medieval castle and Jacobean mansion.

As stated above, the massive ditch-like feature in Trench 1 could represent the southern defence of the large pre-Agricolan fort. An early fort situated west of the Agricolan fort would seem appropriate on topographical grounds as it would make full defensive use of the bluff overlooking the Derwent to the south, and the slope down to the present town of Malton to the west. The Agricolan fort was apparently located to directly control and protect the crossing of the Derwent.

However, the ditch is not conclusively Roman in date, and it is just possible that it could belong to a ringwork or timber castle erected in haste before the construction of the stone castle. This is of course pure speculation, and a consequence of the limited amount of excavation that it was possible to undertake in 1996. However, assuming the ditch does pre-date the construction of the medieval castle, its position within the defended area would have necessitated its back-filling. The clean, generally uniform, nature of the ditch's fills, as stated previously, suggests deliberate back-filling as opposed to natural silting.

Trench 3 also located a large ditch, and this feature can confidently be seen as part of the western defence of the castle. The defences at this point seem to have consisted of a broad

ditch, with an interior bank surmounted by a stone wall. The position of the bank and ditch makes maximum defensive use of the crest of the slope which drops away to the south-west. As the wall behind Castle Dikes House is now seen to be 12th century in origin, the south-western and western circuit of the castle's defences can now be plotted with some certainty. A castle at this location would have dominated the river crossing and the town of New Malton, and controlled the junction of the York - Scarborough and Pickering - Wolds.

The excavation located a substantial building contemporary with the castle in Trench 1. Glazed crested ridge tile and roof tile fragments form the overlying rubble, suggest that the building was of high status, rather than part of a service range. The high number of glazed medieval sherds from Trench 1 and Trench 2 compared to the paucity of coarsewares also suggests that medieval activity here was related more to habitation and food consumption than predominantly food preparation or storage. The substantial nature of the building's wall suggest that it could have been partly defensive or at least several stories in height.

The mortary rubble encountered at the lowest excavated part of Trench 2 (?robber trench, context 2014) is situated at a similar level AOD as the Trench 1 building, and must represent the same general activity phase. The edges of context 2014 are roughly perpendicular to wall 1024, but there is not enough evidence to do more than tentatively suggest that they relate to the same structure.

The medieval building was comprehensively demolished down to foundation level, and judging from the character of the excavated rubble, all useable stone and tiles were taken away for re-use elsewhere. The latest finds from the rubble deposits were 16 / 17th century sherds and metalwork. This provides a date for the demolition process itself, and the apparent landscaping of the resulting rubble into the mound presumed to be an element of the formal Jacobean gardens. The insubstantial wall in Trench 1 (context 1021) and an apparent path (context 1027) were probably also features of the Jacobean gardens.

Lord Eure's mansion, for which the gardens were constructed, left traces in Trench 4. Here, the interior mortar surface with flanking robber trenches would seem to represent the demolished remains of the east wing of a symmetrical C- or E-shaped range which would have faced directly on to the surviving Lodge / Gatehouse. Little can be gleaned about the physical character of this structure, but it must have been similar in build to the Gatehouse. A stone mullion fragment of early 17th century style, and stone roof tiles from the demolition rubble, in

Trench 4 added to this general picture.

In conclusion, the excavations raised the possibility of additional Roman military features west of the known, Agricolan fort. For the first time the south-western and western circuit of the medieval castle's defences can be located with certainty, and a substantial building associated with the castle has been identified. It is now possible to suggest an arrangement for the Jacobean mansion and parts of the associated formal gardens. The quality, date range, and wide-spread distribution, have all illustrated the great importance of the archaeological deposits present at the site.

Bibliography

- Corder, P (1930) *The Defences of the Roman Fort at Malton.*
- ERARC (1989) *Sheepfoot Hill, Malton. Archaeological Testhole Survey.*
- Frere, S (1974) *Brittania.*
- Hudleston, N A (1962) *History of Malton and Norton.*
- Leland, J, Toulmin Smith, L ed. *Itinerary.*
- Mackney, D et al. (1983) *Soil Survey of England and Wales. Sheet 1: Northern England.*
- MAP (1991) *Derventio. Orchard Fields. Archaeological Watching Brief*
- MAP (1993a) *Orchard Fields - Derventio. The 1992 Excavations.*
- MAP (1993b) *Archaeological Survey. Castle Wall, Castlegate, Malton.*
- Mitchelson, N (1964) 'Roman Malton. The Civilian Settlement' in *YAJ* 41, 209-61.
- OS (1960) *Geological Survey of England and Wales: Pickering, sheet 53.*
- Pevsner, N (1966) *The Buildings of England. Yorkshire: North Riding.*
- Robinson, J F (1978) *The Archaeology of Malton and Norton.*
- VCH (1914) *Victoria County History. North Riding of Yorkshire. Vol. 1.*
- Wenham, L P (1974) *Derventio, Malton.*

APPENDIX 1

Context Listing

Trench 1

- 1000 - machine cut trench
- 1001 - unstrat. finds
- 1002 - 10 YR 3/1 medium sandy silt - deposit
- 1003 - 10 YR 5/4 medium silty sand - upper fill of ditch 1006
- 1004 - 10 YR 5/4 sandy silt - fill / deposit
- 1005 - 10 YR 4/2 sandy slit - fill / deposit
- 1006 - cut
- 1007 - 10 YR 5/4 medium sand - fill of ditch 1006
- 1008 - 10 YR 5/4 medium sandy silt - fill of ditch 1006
- 1009 - 10 YR 5/4 silty sand - fill of ditch 1006
- 1010 - 10 YR 5/4 medium sand - fill of ditch 1006
- 1011 - 10 YR 5/4 silty sand - fill of ditch 1006
- 1012 - 10 YR 3/3 sandy silt - deposit
- 1013 - 10 YR 4/3 sandy silt - deposit
- 1014 - 10 YR 8/3 sandy mortar - deposit
- 1015 - 10 YR 4/2 silty sand - deposit
- 1016 - 10 YR 4/2 silty sand - deposit
- 1017 - 2.5 Y 6/3 fine sand - dump / demolition deposit
- 1018 - 10 YR 4/2 fine sandy silt - deposit
- 1019 - 10 YR 4/2 fine sand
- 1020 - 10 YR 3/3 fine sandy silt - deposit
- 1021 - 3 dressed limestone blocks - structural
- 1022 - 10 YR 4/2 sandy silt - deposit
- 1023 - 10 YR 6/4 - mortar floor
- 1024 - stone floor raft? - structure
- 1025 - 10 YR 4/2 sandy silt - fill of robber trench 1026
- 1026 - cut for robber trench
- 1027 - 10 YR 6/6 sandy mortar

Trench 2

- 2000 - machine cut rench
- 2001 - 5YR2.5/1 sandy silt - topsoil
- 2002 - 10YR3/2 sandy silt
- 2003 - 10YR3/4 silty sand
- 2004 - 10YR3/4 silty sand
- 2005 - 10YR3/4 silty sand
- 2006 - 10YR4/4 silty sand
- 2007 - 10YR3/4 silty sand
- 2008 - 10YR3/2 silty sand
- 2009 - 10YR3/2 silty sand
- 2010 - not used
- 2011 - 10YR4/3 sandy silt
- 2012 - 10YR6/4 moratry sand
- 2013 - 10YR6/4 sandy mortar
- 2014 - 10YR6/4 mortary sand

Trench 3

- 3000 - unstrat. finds
- 3001 - 10 YR 3/1 fine sandy silt - topsoil
- 3002 - 10 YR 5/3 sandy silt - reused topsoil
- 3003 - 10 YR 4/2 sandy silt - subsoil
- 3004 - 10 YR 5/3 fine sandy silt - demolition deposit?
- 3005 - 10 YR 7/3 medium sandy mortar - demolition rubble
- 3006 - 10 YR 4/6 fine sandy silt - ?bank
- 3007 - 10 YR 3/3 fine sandy silt - fill of ditch 3010
- 3008 - 10 YR 4/3 silt - fill of ditch 3010
- 3009 - 10 YR 4/4 fine silty sand - fill of ditch 3010
- 3010 - cut of NW - SE linear ditch
- 3011 - 10 YR 5/6 - silty sand - deposit

Trench 4

- 4000 - machine cut trench
- 4001 - 10 YR 3/2 sandy silt - topsoil
- 4002 - 10 YR 3/2 loamy silt - deposit
- 4003 - 10 YR 3/2 loamy silt - deposit
- 4004 - 10 YR 3/2 loamy silt - deposit
- 4005 - 10 YR 4/3 loamy silt - deposit
- 4006 - 10 YR 4/3 sandy silt - poss. ground surface
- 4007 - unstrat. finds
- 4008 - 10 YR 4/2 silty sand - spread of demolition debris
- 4009 - 10 YR 4/2 sandy silt - deposit
- 4010 - 10 YR 4/2 silty sand - poss. robber trench fill
- 4011 - 10 YR 6/4 mortary sand - poss. recent garden path
- 4012 - 10 YR 6/4 mortary silt - rubble deposit
- 4013 - finds recovered during cleaning of mortar surfaces 4015, 4016, 4017, 4018, 4019, 4020 and 4021
- 4014 - 10 YR 4/2 sandy silt - poss. fill of robber trench
- 4015 - 10 YR 6/4 medium sandy mortar - ? floor surface
- 4016 - 10 YR 6/4 medium sandy mortar - demolition debris
- 4017 - 10 YR 7/4 sandy mortar - mortar surface ?
- 4018 - 10 YR 4/2 sandy silt - area of disturbance in mortar floor
- 4019 - 10 YR 4/2 sandy silt - area of disturbance in mortar floor
- 4020 - 10 YR 6/4 medium sandy mortar - mortar surface
- 4021 - 10 YR 7/4 deposit

Trench 5

- 5000 - machine dug trench
- 5001 - 10 YR 3/1 sandy silt - topsoil
- 5002 - 10 YR 4/2 silty sand - garden soil
- 5003 - 10 YR 5/4 silty sand - path or garden feature
- 5004 - 10 YR 3/2 silty sandy clay - garden soil
- 5005 - 10 YR 3/2 silty sandy clay - old garden soil

APPENDIX 2

Finds Catalogue

Context	Description
1001	Total Pottery - 10 sherds, 0.12kg (R-B Greyware, York Glazed, Humber Ware, German Stoneware) Ceramic tile - 1 frag., 0.2kg. Clay tobacco pipe - 1 stem frag. (lge. bore, 17th century type).
1002	Total Pottery - 27 sherds, 0.4kg (Samian, calcite-gritted, amphora, Greyware)
1003	Total Pottery - 2 sherds, 0.05kg (R-B Greyware)
1004	Total Pottery - 18 sherds, 0.7kg (R-B amphora, calcite-gritted, Greyware, Orangeware, SF 1: Samian stamp 'OF.F.GER' Flavius and Germanus of La Graufesenque and Banassac [South Gaul] A.D. 54 - 79; Humber Ware, Cistercian Ware) Stone tile - 3 frags., 0.11kg
1005	Total Pottery - 7 sherds, 0.05kg (R-B Greyware, Orangeware, Samian)
1007	Total Pottery - 2 sherds, 0.08kg (R-B Orangeware [Gillam no. 305, AD 80-130], Samian)
1013	Total Pottery - 4 sherds, 0.5kg (Hambleton-type, Purple-glazed Ware, German Stoneware, Post-med. red coarseware) Ceramic tile - 4 frags., 0.16kg Stone tile - 6 frags., 0.05kg
1015	Stone tile - 8 frags., 6.24kg
1016	Total Pottery - 5 sherds, 0.05kg (R-B Greyware, Samian; Gritty Ware, York-Glazed Ware) Stone tile - 2 frags., 1.65kg
1017	Total Pottery - 7 sherds, 0.1kg (?R-B; Scarborough Ware, Humber Ware, Brandsby-type) Ceramic tile - 13 frags., 1.02kg
2001	Total Pottery - 1 sherd, 0.02kg (Siegburg Stoneware)
2002	Total Pottery - 27 sherds, 0.35kg (R-B Greyware, calcite-gritted, Orangeware, Samian; York-Glazed Ware; ?Saiantonge cruet / salt cellar) Ceramic tile - 4 frags., 0.2kg Stone tile - 7 frags., 0.6kg Glass object - green glass bottle frag.
2003	Total Pottery - 25 sherds, 0.3kg (R-B Orangeware, calcite-gritted, Greyware; Humber Ware; Cistercian) Stone object: Whetstone frag., oval cross-section, pointed at one end. L. 55, W. 32, T. 25mm. Stone tile - 7 frags., 0.27kg
2004	Glass Objects: 2 window frags. Total Pottery - 27 sherds, 0.4kg (R-B calcite-gritted, Greyware; York-Glazed, Brandsby-type, Humber Ware, Hambleton-type, Racren / Langerwehe Stoneware; Cistercian, post-med. red-bodied coarseware) Stone tile - 28 frags., 4.05kg
2006	Total Pottery - 233 sherds, 1.4kg (R-B Greyware, calcite-gritted; Splashed Ware, York-Glazed, Staxton-type, Brandsby-type, Beverley, Scarborough Ware, Humber Ware, Hambleton-type, Siegburg Stoneware, Racren / Langerwehe Stoneware; Cistercian, Yellow-

glazed Ware, tin-glazed ware)
 Ceramic tile - 1 frag., 0.32kg
 Stone tile- 17 frags., 2.05kg
 Copper Alloy
 SF 2: Pin, simple spherical head. L. 31mm. Head D. 1.5mm.
 SF 6: Token.
 SF 11: Pin, silvered surface, spherical head with medial groove. L. 37mm. Head. D. 5mm.
 SF 21: Pin, square head with domed top. L. 54mm. Head W. 3mm.
 SF 26: Pin, spherical head with medial groove. L. 55mm. Head D. 3.5mm.
 SF 28: Pin, simple spherical head, shank bent. L. 35mm. Head D. 3.5mm.
 SF 3: Lace-end, tapers to one end. L. 29mm.
 SF 4: ?Buckle plate, formed from folded sheet, corners of one end cut off. No decoration. L. 21, W. 18, T. 0.5mm.
 SF 14: Buckle plate frag. pierced by 1 rivet hole. Decoration of double-row of punched dots along edge. L. 17, W. 14, T. 0.25mm.
 SF 27: Strap-end pierced by 2 fe rivets. Decorated with a gothic monogram ?'J R-' and cross-hatching. L.22, W. 23, T. 0.25mm.
 SF 17: Strap-end hook / clothes fastener. Open-work decoration. L. 33, W. 18mm.
 SF 20: Strap-end hook / clothes fastener. Cast open-work decoration. L.30, W. 16, T. 2mm.
 SF 5: Domed-button, solid cast: circular suspension loop to reverse. D. 11mm.
 SF 7: Wire ring, ends twisted together. D. 12mm.
 SF 32: Wire ring, ends twisted together. D. 12mm.
 SF 31: Boss frag. Thin domed sheet, 1 circular perforation. D. 25mm.
 SF 29: 2 sheet frags., ?boss as SF 31.
 SF 33: Triangular sheet frag. L. 38, W. 24mm.
 Lead Object: SF 39: run-off frag.
 Iron Objects
 SF 36: Bracket frag., flat bar with tapering tang. L. 56; bar W. 10, tang W. 3mm.
 SF 37: Bar frag. L. 67, W. 12, T. 7mm
 SF 41: ?Punch / awl frag. Tang and body have square cross-section. L. 87; body W. 9, tang W. 6mm
 SF 42: ?Tang, widest end ?forked. L. 68, max. W. 8, T. 3mm
 SF 43: ?Bracket frag. L. 53, W. 11, T. 1.5mm.
 SF 44: Hooked bar, end of tang folded over. L. 62, W. 9, T. 3.5mm.
 SF 46: Sheet frag. L. 33, W. 15, T. 0.5mm.
 SF 47: T-shaped object. L. 24, W. 27, T. 5mm.
 85 timber nails.
 Jet Object: SF 25: Spherical bead frag. D.13mm. Hour-glass-shaped perforation, max. D. 3mm.
 Glass Objects
 SF 12: vessel frag.
 SF 18: plain vessel frag.
 SF 24: thickened vessel rim in greenish glass.
 SF 23: window frag.
 SF 15: painted window frag.
 SF 13: circular ?paste bead frag. (or ?frit).
 Painted plaster - frag. with white painted surface; traces of red painted decoration.
 Total Pottery - 29 sherds, 0.45kg.
 (R-B calcite-gritted, Greyware, Splashed Ware, Staxton-type, York-Glazed, Humber Ware, Hambleton-type; Cistercian, Ryedale-type, Yellow-glazed)
 Ceramic tile- 4 frags., 0.15kg
 Stone tile - 2 frags., 0.21kg
 Lead Objects

- SFs 10, 16 and 38: window came frags.
 SF 8: ?weight; flat, elongated oval with suspension loop at one end; two lateral grooves. L. 60, W. 28, T. 10mm.
 Iron Objects
 SF 45: Hooked bar, end of tang folded over. L. 62, W. 9, T. 5mm.
 7 timber nails.
- 2009 Total Pottery - 12 sherds, 0.15kg.
 (R-B Greyware; Brandsby-type, York-Glazed, Scarborough Ware)
 Stone tile - 15 frags., 3.87kg
 Iron Object: 1 timber nail.
- 2010 Total Pottery - 5 sherds, 0.25kg
 (Humber Ware, Hambleton-type, Purple-glazed)
 Ceramic tile - 2 frags., 0.12kg
- 2012 Total Pottery - 5 sherds, 0.1kg
 (Gritty Ware, York Glazed, Brandsby-type)
 Ceramic tile - 2 frags., 0.06kg
- 2017 Stone tile - 1 frag., 0.10kg
- 3000 Total Pottery - 8 sherds, 0.7kg
 (R-B Greyware, amphora, calcite-gritted, mortarium; post-med. red-bodied coarseware)
 Stone tile - 1 frag., 0.1kg
- 3001 Total Pottery - 1 sherd, 0.7kg
 (R-B calcite-gritted)
 Iron Object: 1 timber nail.
- 3006 Total Pottery - 3 sherds, 0.05kg
 (York Glazed, Staxton-type)
 Ceramic tile - 2 frags., 0.02kg
 Glass objects: 4 window glass frags.
- 3008 Total Pottery - 1 sherds, 0.05kg
 (Hambleton-type)
 Ceramic tile - 2 frags., 0.08kg
- 4002 Glass object: 1 window frag.
- 4005 Total Pottery - 2 sherds, 0.05kg
 (Humber Ware; tin-glazed earthenware)
 Ceramic tile - 0.03kg
- 4007 Total Pottery - 10 sherds, 0.1kg
 (R-B calcite-gritted; Staxton-type, Humber Ware, Hambleton-type, Siegburg / Langerwehe Stoneware; post-medieval red-bodied coarseware; 1 blue and white transferware)
 Ceramic tile - 345 frags., 7.68kg
 Stone tile - 84 frags., 7.29kg
 Iron object: 1 timber nail.
 Glass object: large sherd from an upturned bottle base in dk. green glass (17th century or later type).
 Clay tobacco pipe: 4 stem frags. (large-bore, 17th century type).
 Painted plaster - frag. with white painted surface.
- 4008 Ceramic tile - 19 frags., 0.85kg
 Glass objects: 2 green glass bottle frags.
 Clay tobacco pipe: 1 stem frag. (large-bore, 17th century type).
 Plaster - rounded frag., no paint remaining.
- 4013 Ceramic tile - 7 frags., 0.34kg
- 5002 Total Pottery - 1 sherd, 0.05kg
 (Post-medieval Blackware)
 Ceramic tile - 1 frag., 0.1kg
 Clay tobacco-pipe: 1 stem frag. (large bore, 17th century type)
- 5004 Stone tile - 1 frag., 0.05kg

The Pottery

A total of 481 sherds of pottery were recovered from the excavation, of which 122 (25.4%) were Roman, 263 (54.7%) medieval, 83 (17.20%) post-medieval, 1 (0.2%) modern and 12 (2.5%) unidentified. The majority of the sherds came from hand-recovery, but 233 (48%) sherds were recovered from the bulk-sieving of 1200 litres from one deposit, context 2006 in Trench 2. Another consideration is the fact that many of the contexts from which pottery was recovered were secondary, being demolition rubble, spreads or subsoils. That being said, the assemblage viewed as a whole can be informative, not least as one of the few scientifically recovered assemblages for Malton, and the only one from this site.

The Romano-British pottery is of 1st - 3rd century date, and is made up by calcite-gritted ware, Greywares, amphorae, mortaria, Samian and military associated Orangewares. There is a lack of 4th century types such as Crambeck Greyware and Parchment Ware, and Huntcliffe-type calcite-gritted Wares.

The medieval fabrics show a date range from the late 11th century, through to the late 15th century. The earliest sherds are 2 of Splashed Ware and a single Gritty Ware sherd, which are late 11th - 12th century in date. The Gritty Ware sherd and the 6 Staxton / Potter Brompton Ware sherds are the only coarse wares represented, the remainder of the medieval pottery being from glazed jugs, with some mugs. The glazed fabrics consist of York Glazed Ware, Scarborough Ware, Brandsby-type Ware, Beverley Ware, Humber Ware and Hambleton-type Ware. German Stonewares (Siegburg, and Raeren / Langerwehe) are also represented. This overwhelming proportion of glazed vessels points to an assemblage of relatively high status, which could reflect the kinds of activity (habitation and food / drink consumption) being carried out in Trench 1 and Trench 2 where the bulk of the medieval sherds were located.

The early post-medieval period (16th century) was represented by Cistercian Ware, Purple-glazed Ware and red-bodied coarseware. Contemporary to these fabrics was the cruet or salt-cellar with anthropomorphic design (context 2002), which may be a Saintonge import; more research is needed on this vessel.

There is a minimal amount of 17th / 18th century pottery, represented by 2 sherds of Staffordshire-type Yellow-glazed Ware, the same number on Tin-glazed earthenware sherds, and a single sherd of Black Ware. A single factory-made blue and white transferware sherd was also recovered.

APPENDIX 3

Assessment of Ceramic / Stone Building Materials

Sandra Garside-Neville

Medieval Material

The stone roof tile was mainly a fine limestone, and the tiles had one nailhole measuring c.11mm across. One of the tiles was complete enough to ascertain that it was a roughly diamond shape. The stone roof tiles made up the bulk of the sample. There were also fragments of oolitic limestone, which were probably building stones. Some stone fragments showed signs of burning.

Ceramic building materials consisted of plain roof tile (with both peg and nib methods of suspension), crested ridge tile, and probably brick. The crested ridge tile had a bright copper glaze with sharply cut crests and a sharp apex to the ridge (fragments were found in contexts 1015 and 1017). The plain roof tiles showed signs of re-use (with mortar along broken edges). Some fragments of the plain roof tile were glazed. This and the glazed ridge tile may well hint at the high status of the associated building. The brick was possibly medieval, though the fragmentary nature of the pieces make this identification a little uncertain. In particular, there was a brick fragment made of very silty clay with shell added.

Post-medieval Material

Pan tile, which will date no earlier than the 17th century, was found in two contexts (4007 and 5002).

Conclusions

The stone roof tiles, and other stone samples, would benefit from identification by a geologist, particularly to identify if the material is actually burnt. The ceramic building material would benefit from more detailed recording, the information from which could be added to the study of ceramic building materials in the Malton area.

Context Listing

Context	Form	Date
1001	Peg (re-used)	13th+
1004	Stone ?roof tile, ?brick	?14th+
1015	Stone roof tile, crested ridge tile	?
1017	Nib, crested ridge (glazed), plain (glazed), plain, stone roof tile	13th+
2002	Oolitic limestone, stone roof tile	?
2004	Stone roof tile, plain roof tile	13th+
2006	Brick, stone roof tile	14th+
2007	Plain roof tile (re-used and glazed), stone roof tile,	13th+
2009	Stone roof tile (possibly burnt)	?
2010	Plain roof tile (spot of glaze), mortar, ?brick	?14th+
2012	Plain roof tile	13th+
4005	Plain roof tile, sandstone	13th+
4007	Stone roof, plain, glazed plain, pan, peg and re-used peg tile; brick	17th+
4013	Plain roof tile, ridge tile (re-used)	?
5002	Pan tile	17th+