The form of the medieval nucleated village (Figures 8 and 9), which Beresford initially anticipated might have remained virtually static from the time it was first laid out, is perhaps better understood almost as a living organism. While it was appreciated very quickly that the settlement showed evidence of planning, it was several decades before it was first suggested that in addition to more than one episode of planned expansion, some evidence for more piecemeal changes could be detected from the earthworks (Wrathmell 1989, 41-5). Changing patterns of access through the village seem to have been closely linked to, if not directly responsible for, major changes in the settlement pattern and these routes are therefore discussed at the outset, in Section 5.2. The village lies at what is effectively a T-junction of three principal through routes, previously called Roads 1 to 3 (Beresford and Hurst 1990, fig 55). Road 1, which both aerial survey and excavation have shown to be of Romano-British origin, enters the northern end of the village from the west. The English Heritage investigation suggests that Road 2, which heads eastwards, was once a continuation of Road 1, and the suspicion remains that Road 3, which heads southwards, may be of similarly early origin. A number of the access routes within the village, originally called Tracks 1 to 12 and now increased to twenty in number, can be shown to relate to the various episodes of planning evident in the plan of the settlement. In several places, medieval buildings encroach onto these tracks, while a few tracks can be shown to be of post-medieval origin.

Changing patterns of access may also contribute to the understanding of what has often been regarded as one of Wharram's most intractable puzzles. It is common for medieval churches to stand next to manor houses and for the remainder of the village to huddle around this focus, but this is conspicuously not the case at Wharram Percy. Although the English Heritage survey carried out no further analysis of the architecture, a few observations in Section 5.3 concerning the setting of the church may help to advance the debate, though not to resolve it.

The so-called South Manor, discussed in Section 5.4, was first identified as a result of the excavation of an overlying peasant house surviving as an earthwork (Building 10), beneath which was revealed an ornate stone-built *camera*, or undercroft. However, the existence of the manor is clearly indicated by the existence of a well-defined *curia*, or enclosure surrounding the manorial complex, which contains several unusual features including a large building platform, which has not previously been explicitly recognised.

The earthworks of the so-called North Manor on the northern edge of the village, discussed in Section 5.5, are equally distinctive, including structures that have been interpreted, almost certainly correctly, as a hall house, a dovecote and a large barn. A bold attempt at reconstructing of the lay-out of the complex was made on the basis of a survey of the earthworks made by WJ Hopkins in 1976 (see Figure 13). The English Heritage investigation suggests that despite the large scale (1:20) of the earlier survey, the plan of the complex is actually simpler in some respects than has previously been thought. However, the previous reconstruction did not allow for any change over time in the form of the complex; the new survey suggests that the manor underwent a major phase of expansion and that a number

of structures previously thought to be contemporary with the manorial complex are more likely to post-date its disuse.

The domestic settlement itself, described in Section 5.6, comprises the earthwork remains of as many as seventy-two buildings, the majority lying within a maximum of thirty-seven rectangular plots (tofts) of regular size and layout. Enclosed strips of agricultural land (crofts) back directly onto the tofts, probably in some cases with a narrow footpath, or 'back lane', running along the boundary between them. The plots are arranged in rows fronting onto access tracks. Two rows, here distinguished as West Row (north) and (south), join each other end-to-end to form a continuous line, interrupted only by the South Manor, stretching for 380m from north to south and set back slightly from the edge of the western plateau. Another row, here termed East Row, occupies the lower slope of the western side of the valley, fronting onto Road 2B, which ascends the slope obliquely from the north. The row seems to have extended at least as far south as the northern side of the 18th-century Improvement farm, although excavations have demonstrated that there were other buildings between there and the church. A shorter row, technically known as a 'headrow' but here termed North Row, extends from west to east across the northern end of the village, the three northern rows thus defining what has previously been interpreted as a triangular green. The new survey indicates that while the area probably was a green, containing two approximately circular stock pounds, a fair number of small buildings were also present. Whether these are earlier than the planned village or represent later encroachment onto the green remains uncertain. There is considerable evidence for different types of houses, and some stratigraphic evidence to support the theory that the latest settlement comprised a small number of courtyard farms. This change may have been associated with the amalgamation of crofts to form larger plots (Wrathmell 1989, 44-5).

Section 5.7 singles out for discussion an earthwork whose interpretation has long lain at the heart of the understanding of the origin, form and development of the settlement: the so-called 'lynchet bank'. This is a pronounced scarp which runs the length of the village, dividing the tofts of West Row (south) and (north) from their adjacent crofts. The new evidence brought to light by the English Heritage investigation does not categorically support any single one of the theories previously proposed as to its origin. Rather, it seems likely that the earthwork did not originate as a single entity and that its present form is the result of differential modification.

Section 5.8 is concerned with the agricultural landscape, or at least, with what little of this can be identified through earthwork as opposed to aerial survey. The remains of medieval ridge and furrow cultivation survive beyond the limit of modern ploughing above the east side of the valley, in the north-west corner of the site and, most extensively, on the south side of Drue Dale. These remains were widespread until the Second World War and are still not particularly rare, either in a regional or national context, but at Wharram Percy they are of some importance in understanding the village remains. For example, part of the North Manor seems to have been laid out over ridge and furrow, while the latest episode of ploughing in the north-western corner of the Guardianship Area respected the boundary of the former

manor, but encroached into Road 1B. One of the most important observations arising from the English Heritage investigation is that a form of ridged cultivation characterised by unusually broad furrows predates the typical ridge and furrow mentioned above, as well as the establishment of the South Manor and West Row (north) and (south). Therefore, this episode of cultivation may be associated with the earliest incarnation of the village, perhaps before the Norman Conquest.

Section 5.9 deals with aspects of the southern millpond, which was enlarged to form a fishpond in the later 13th or 14th centuries. Although the pond was cleaned and the dam was reconstructed following excavation, a number of observations can still be made. The evidence for a second mill known to have existed on the northern side of the village is also discussed.

Section 5.10 covers a number of miscellaneous remains thought to be of medieval or earlier origin, including a possible woodland enclosure on the eastern side of the valley.

Sections 5.11 and 5.12 cover the post-medieval remains. Section 5.11 deals with the evidence for the changes that accompanied the construction of the 18th-century Improvement farm and the architectural evidence for the last standing building of that date. Excavation has shown that the farmyard and farmhouse constructed in the late 1770s were buildings of some size and architectural pretension, but it is easy to overlook the effects of the farming regime on the wider landscape. Yet in addition to the imposition of several field boundaries, the intensive grazing that took place throughout the post-medieval period is largely responsible for the preservation of the remains in the excellent condition in which they survive today. Section 5.12 deals with the minor changes that took place subsequently, mostly associated with the construction of the Malton and Driffield Junction Railway, and specifically the Burdale Tunnel between 1847 and 1853.

5.2 Roads and trackways

The network of tracks at Wharram Percy potentially covers a longer date range than any other category of remains surviving as earthworks. The tracks are important for understanding the internal chronology of the settlement, since some are pre-medieval in origin, and some clearly overlie, or are overlain by, other earthworks. They also demonstrate the articulation between the different parts of the village, and between the village and its environs. The routes have previously been subdivided into through-routes, termed 'roads' and numbered 1 to 3, and trackways and paths providing access around the village, termed 'tracks' and numbered 1 to 12 (Beresford and Hurst 1990, fig 55). This report retains the earlier categories and numbering, but the road numbers are sub-divided in order to pinpoint specific sections, while the sequence of track numbers is both sub-divided and extended (see Figure 10).

Road 1 enters the northern end of the village from the west. Its relationship to the pattern of field boundaries and settlements detected by aerial and geophysical survey to the north-west indicates that the route originated in the late Iron Age or earlier (Beresford and Hurst 1990, fig 67; Stoertz 1997, map 1). Earlier analysis of the road pattern has concentrated on the final incarnation of the route, here termed Road 1B, of which a stretch *c* 200m in length

is preserved in earthwork form. This seems likely to have come into existence in the Romano-British period, for excavation revealed two Anglo-Saxon *Grubenhäuser* or 'sunken-featured buildings', dating from the 6th century, built into its base immediately to the south of the North Manor (Beresford and Hurst 1990, 71-5; Milne and Richards 1992). It can presumably be inferred from their presence that at that date, Road 1B was used irregularly, if at all, though it has not been proved that this is symptomatic of any more widespread deterioration.

Geophysical survey indicates that the earliest recognisable course of the road, here termed Road 1A, ran about 15m to the north of the track surviving as an earthwork (see Figure 10). There is no hint of this on the surface; Boundary 2, a slight bank which apparently served at some stage as a headland for Field 2, but was eventually ploughed over, actually runs along almost the same line as the earlier road. Road 1A was slightly broader than its successor, with a series of rectangular enclosures adjoining its sides, including the large enclosure to the north-west of the Guardianship Area (Beresford and Hurst 1990, fig 52; Linford and Linford 2003). Trackways similar to Road 1A, with embankments on either side that were presumably originally augmented by hedges or fences, were a common feature of the late Iron Age and Roman periods. They are generally thought to have acted as droveways for moving livestock through arable areas (for example, see Gates 1982, 30).

Approaching initially from the north-west, Road 1A turns sharply just outside the Guardianship Area and heads due east (Beresford and Hurst 1990, figs 55 and 67; Stoertz 1997, map 1). Geophysical survey demonstrates that Road 1A did not bend southwards to become Road 1C, as its successor Road 1B did, but continued eastwards. The same conclusion can also be reached on the basis of the earthwork evidence alone, for the abrupt and awkward change of alignment from Road 1A to 1C, which influences the whole structure of the village, would otherwise beg the question as to why the route was not originally aligned on a point further to the south, where the slope of the valley side is gentler. Geophysical survey hints that Road 1A may have continued eastward along the route later followed by Track 3, which provides a fairly gentle descent at least as far as the eastern end of North Row. An early episode of cultivation, discussed further in Sections 5.6 and 5.8, extended as far as the edge of the escarpment south of the frontage of North Row. If the road was still in use at the date when the cultivation commenced, the ploughing may have put an end to the use of the route and also erased any earthwork traces. On the steeper slope east of the end of North Row, severe slumping, partly associated with the nearby spring at the foot of the slope, suggests that any trace of the route here would probably have been removed by erosion. However, the geophysical evidence is not conclusive as to whether the road did indeed follow the same route as Track 3. Nearby earthworks which have previously been overlooked suggest another possible route, although it is of course possible that two routes were in use at the same time. A branch of the road (here termed Road 1D), continued the line of Road 1A almost straight to the east, making good use of a natural indentation to descend the valley side and so avoid the need for any deviation to the south. Road 1D was cut away and eventually made impassable by the prolonged use of Road 2B, which links Road 2A with Road 3E and forms the eastern street of the village. The depth to which Road 2B developed, in part apparently by the time East Row was laid out, suggests that Road 1D must be

relatively early. However, it would be unwise to leap to the conclusion that the route represents an intact element of the original late Iron Age or Romano-British road, for it seems to have given access to a number of previously unidentified buildings which had evidently encroached onto the village green. In this early form, the alignment of Road 1B, and its eastward extension, whether Track 3 or Road 1D would have been continued by that of Road 2A, which heads eastwards from the village. The alignment of Road 1B can therefore be seen as significant because it supports the suggestion made previously that the east to west route was initially the more important (Beresford and Hurst 1990, 69). By the medieval period, Road 1D was redundant as a major through-route apparently due to the increased importance of Road 3, and Roads 1B/1C and 2B were dominant. As a result, travellers passing through the village from east to west or *vice versa* would have been forced to deviate to the south though the heart of the village before resuming their original course.

Road 1B is hollowed to an average depth of 0.5m, with embankments on both sides standing to an average height of 0.2m. However, the earthworks were almost certainly redefined to some extent in the medieval period. The bank along the northern side was probably also built up further when a hedge was planted along it in the post-medieval period (see Section 5.11). Two shallower hollow ways, presumably the product of the later episodes of use, are discernible in the base of the broader track and these converge immediately to the south of the North Manor. The latest episode of ploughing in Field 2 encroached southwards across almost the whole width of the road, indicating that this section of the route was disused by the end of the medieval period.

Road 2A, which heads eastwards from the village, climbs a side valley and reaches the top of the Wolds again on the south side of the modern visitor car park, 600m to the east. At this point, it intersected with, and probably continued beyond, a major route running north to south, which has been mapped by aerial survey (Stoertz 1997, map 1). As described above, it seems to represent a continuation of Road 1B, and must therefore be of late Iron Age or Romano-British origin, as previously suspected (Beresford and Hurst 1990, fig 67). Historic maps, starting with that surveyed by Jefferys between 1767 and 1770, indicate that the route has remained in use for much of the post-Medieval period (Jefferys 1771). Indeed, it was the route followed by Beresford on his first visit to Wharram Percy in 1948. A detailed large-scale survey made prior to the construction of the railway indicates that this had little effect on the route, the timber bridge across the cutting lying immediately to the south of the point where the road had formerly crossed the valley floor (Birkinshaw and Dickens 1845). Road 2B, like Road 1C, evidently developed to avoid the unnecessary ascent or descent of the steepest part of the slope when travelling to and from the south via Road 3E. It was clearly established at or before the time house plots of East Row were laid out fronting onto it, probably at some point between the 10th and 12th centuries. It has apparently remained in use ever since, providing access to the various post-medieval farms and, eventually, access westwards to Wharram Percy Farm via Track 6a (see below).

There is circumstantial evidence in the alignment of the lynchets underlying East Row (see Section 5.8) and in the fact that Road 2B ascends the slope, only to descend it again via

Road 3E, that a precursor of the route may have ascended the slope at a shallower angle. This putative route, here termed Road 2C, may have followed the uppermost of the lynchets, which, like the so-called 'lynchet bank' described in Section 5.7, was apparently used to define the boundaries between the tofts and crofts that make up the row. If so, Road 3E could effectively be seen as a continuation of Road 1C, and the intersection of all three roads would have lain considerably further to the south, possibly not far north of the church. This may have implications for the understanding of the siting of the church, which has generally been regarded as puzzling for its isolation (see Section 5.3) and for the dating of the origins of East Row.

Road 3 approaches the village from the south, that is, from the direction of Thixendale. On the southern outskirts of the village, and beyond the area surveyed in detail by English Heritage, the route most clearly evident as an earthwork, here termed Road 3A, follows the crest of the eastern side of the valley, occupying the narrow strip between the edge of the steep slope and the western limit of the medieval open fields. A massive positive lynchet, up to 1.6m high, has developed along the western edge of the fields, suggesting that the route originated at an early date and remained in use over a considerable period.

The section of the floor of Deep Dale immediately south of the intersection with Drue Dale is boggy today due to the nearby spring, but for the rest of its length the valley floor is dry. There is circumstantial evidence that some traffic, at a relatively late date possibly in the post-medieval period, may have followed this more sheltered route. Although there is no recognisable sign of a track in the final approach to the village, a hollow way descends the eastern side of the valley *c* 1.1kms to the south, centred at SE 8557 6300, descending obliquely from south to north. Its alignment and depth suggest that it was used fairly intensively by traffic travelling to and from the direction of Wharram Percy. The upper end of the hollow way joins the course of Track 3A, but physically cuts into it, suggesting that it is of later date, and potentially of post-medieval origin. The earthwork has previously been interpreted as a Bronze Age land boundary or 'linear earthwork' (Beresford and Hurst 1990, fig 63). However, its relationship to Track 3A, together with the existence of a second trackway descending the slope on the opposite alignment, indicate that this interpretation is incorrect.

Road 3B obliquely descends the eastern side of the valley, running almost straight from the crest of the escarpment to the eastern end of the dam of the millpond/fishpond, at which point it makes use of the top of the dam to cross to the other side of the valley. This has been interpreted as the principal approach of Road 3 into the village in the medieval period and, today, the Wolds Way long distance footpath follows its course. The track was marked on the Ordnance Survey First Edition 6-inch scale map (Ordnance Survey 1854). It is not shown on the 1836 estate map, but is probably the route shown on Greenwood's map surveyed between 1815 and 1817, although his depiction is necessarily more schematic (Dykes 1836; Greenwood 1818). Clearly, then, the route was in use in the 19th century. However, the use of the route has produced only negligible earthworks, indicating that it was not used either intensively or for a prolonged period. It seems unlikely to have been used until after the creation in the 1320s of the larger dam that retained the fishpond. Indeed,

some doubt must hang over whether it was used at all in the medieval period, for allowing traffic to pass across the top of the dam would inevitably have led to the erosion of the earthwork.

Road 3C is far better defined as an earthwork than Road 3B: two deeply hollowed and terraced tracks make use of a natural coomb to descend the slope in a sharper curve. The greater size of these earthworks compared to Road 3B suggests that this was a much more intensively used route in the medieval period. Although part of the upper track has been lost through quarrying and erosion, the curve of the lower suggests that both would have reached the level ground of the valley floor near the former southern end of the fishpond. Prior to the enlargement of the pond in the 1320s, the route may well have crossed the stream nearer the point at which the watercourses from the two major springs intersect, that is, near the modern timber sluice. Once the extension of the pond made this route impassable, the route might have been forced to follow the level ground along the water's edge for some 100m to reach the eastern end of the dam, where, like Road 3B, it could have passed across the top of the dam. However, the same doubt applies as to whether the earthwork of the dam could have coped with regular use as a thoroughfare, especially in view of the massive erosion at the point where the road descends the slope. It is not impossible that after the 1320s, travellers were forced to ford the stream at the extreme southern end of the extended pond, near the site of the modern ford, and then to reach the village via a track which no longer survives as an earthwork, or even by means of Drue Dale and Track 8.

Road 3D skirted the western edge of the churchyard, climbing half way up the western side of the valley and then descending again onto the relatively level ground occupied by Wharram Percy Cottages and the post-medieval parsonages. To the west of the churchyard, it survives as a narrow terrace in the natural slope, which has been utilised by the modern fenceline. Thereafter, Road 3E resumes a gentle ascent following an oblique course to the point where Roads 1C, 2B and Track 5 intersect. Road 3D deviates so far from the most physically practical route up the slope, which is essentially that followed by Track 11, that its course seems very likely to reflect the modification of an earlier route (Beresford and Hurst 1990, 103-4). In plan, the relationship of the route to Track 8c suggests that the access track is the earlier and that the lower part of its course was subsequently borrowed by Road 3D. The possible original course of Road 3 is discussed further in Section 6, but it seems likely that the creation of the fishpond and probably the enlargement of the graveyard resulted in the diversion of what may have originally been a fairly straight course obliquely across the valley.

Track 1 evidently provided access from Road 1B to the south-western corner of Field 1; it could have been created when the North Manor was laid out, since this may have encroached upon the former extent of the open field and would otherwise have blocked access to it. The track is embanked on both sides to an average height of 0.2m. The latest episode of ploughing in Field 2 encroached onto the track, partially levelling the western embankment to form a narrow cultivation ridge.

Track 2, as defined previously, ran northwards from the northern edge of the village green along the eastern side of the North Manor to the southern edge of Field 1. There is scant earthwork evidence to support the existence of an actual track, but this does seem to have been the enclosure through which the North Manor was approached in its final form. Its existence was perhaps suggested by the sharp change of angle from Road 1B to 1C and by the gap in the bank enclosing the manorial *curia*. It seems more likely that the track did not extend so far northwards and essentially served to give access into the manorial complex and perhaps initially to the western end of Track 14 (see Figure 15).

Track 3 follows the narrow strip of land between the southern frontage of North Row and the crest of the steep slope of the western side of the valley. Its eastern end is indeterminate, apparently due to the effects of land slippage, which become increasingly severe to the north. The eastern boundary of Field 1 lies just short of the crest of the valley side, hinting that the route may have continued northwards. Its western end may have been slightly re-aligned when the frontage of North Row was adjusted, and was perhaps eventually blocked by Building 19.

Track 4, as previously defined, comprises two parts: a route along the frontage of West Row (north), and a hollow way that obliquely descends the western side of the valley to the intersection of Roads 1C, 2B and 3E. Only the first part of the track is referred to here as Track 4; this must have given access to the medieval tofts and almost certainly extended along the whole frontage of West Row (north), that is, further southwards than has previously been recognised. The other part, the hollow way, is described below as Track 19; it is likely to be of later origin, or if of medieval origin, continued in use to a much later date.

Track 5, as it has been defined previously, can be divided into two elements: one stretch (here termed Track 5a) climbs obliquely south-westwards up the western side of the valley from the intersection of Roads 1C, 2B and 3E. Track 5b then turns westwards along the southern edge of the bank that defines the boundary of the *curia* enclosure of the South Manor before curving gently to north-westwards. Although the hollow way becomes increasingly shallow to the west, the deepest stretches have been worn by use to a maximum depth of 1.0m. The date of the track has not been established by excavation but has been interpreted on the basis of geophysical results as being of Iron Age or Romano-British origin (Beresford and Hurst 1990, figs 52 and 53). It has been thought that it continued in use as an important route out into the open fields west of the village into the medieval period. However, the English Heritage investigation suggests that the two elements of the track may have originated at different dates. The First Edition of the 6-inch scale Ordnance Survey map and subsequent editions indicate that both sections have certainly remained in use since 1851, and probably somewhat earlier, since they approximately correspond to a route marked on Thomas Jefferys' map (Ordnance Survey 1854; Jefferys 1771). The origins of Track 5a may well be medieval, if not earlier, for it smoothly continues the line of Road 2B onto the western plateau, giving access to the South Manor and Tracks 4 and 8a, which run along the frontages of West Row (north) and (south) respectively.

On the other hand, several stratigraphic relationships run contrary to the suggestion that Track 5b is even of medieval origin, let alone of Romano-British or late Iron Age. Firstly, the track cuts through the lynchet bank, although the date of that feature has yet to be securely established. The argument that the lynchet bank is of 10th-century origin, which has been put forward previously, would certainly make an Iron Age origin for the track untenable. Secondly, the track also seems to cut through the frontage of West Row (south), which was first identified as an earthwork by Stuart Wrathmell (1989, 4). Thirdly, the track cuts both the south-east and south-west corners of the bank and ditch that define the southern boundary of the *curia* enclosure of the South Manor and diverges by up to 5m from the straight southern side (see Section 5.4). Lastly, the earlier survey of the earthworks, historic maps and aerial photographs all concur that the course of the track to the west cut obliquely across Field 3, both its alignment and its stratigraphic relationship to the cultivation ridges indicating that its origin post-dates their disuse (Ordnance Survey 1854; 1890). Given that ploughing in Field 2 and elsewhere appears to have continued to a late stage, we may assume that Field 3 may have been ploughed until the latest occupation of the village, that is, around the beginning of the 16th century. In other words, Track 5b originated after that date; in the context of the documented history of Wharram Percy, this probably points to a date in the late 18th century.

Track 6a, like Track 5 from which it diverges, has not been sampled by excavation, but has also been interpreted as giving access to the open fields in the medieval period (Beresford and Hurst 1990, fig 55). There is some evidence to support this, in that the line of the track follows the southern edge of Field 3, hinting that the two may have been in contemporary use. Again like Track 5, Track 6a is fairly deeply worn and cuts through the lynchet bank, but it also appears to cut through the boundaries of Tofts 9 and 10. These were evidently in a degraded condition by the time they were cut by the track, but whether this points to a medieval or later origin is uncertain. Track 6b, a more southerly branch of the same route, is not evident as an earthwork, but is depicted on the First Edition 25-inch scale map surveyed in 1888 (Ordnance Survey 1890). The breadth of the track as depicted suggests that it was the principal route to the west at that date, effectively continuing the course of Road 2A and 2B towards Wharram Percy Farm.

Track 7 provided more direct access between the junction of Track 5a/b and 6, and Track 11 to the south. The depth to which the hollow way developed suggests that the route was much less intensively used than Track 5a, which makes the corresponding link to the north. It is not depicted at all on the First Edition 6-inch scale map and only as a minor path on the later 25-inch scale map (Ordnance Survey 1854; 1890). A medieval origin is possible, but it may have experienced its most intensive use from the late 18th century onwards.

Track 8, like Track 4, appears to conflate two elements as defined previously, but in this case it is quite possible that both elements are of medieval origin. What is here termed Track 8a runs along the narrow strip of level ground between the frontage of West Row (south) and the crest of the western side of the valley, apparently serving the whole row and thus extending further northwards than has been recognised previously. The southern end

of Track 8a, contrary to the interpretation reached previously, does not seem to have turned sharply westwards but rather to have followed a more gentle curve that gradually converged with the line of Track 9. Most of Track 9, as defined previously, is probably of post-medieval origin, while its antecedent is here referred to as Track 8b. Track 8c obliquely climbs the slope of the western side of the valley from north-east to south-west, giving access between the mid-point of Track 8a and Road 3D. In plan, the relationship of the two routes to each other suggests that Track 8c is the earlier and that its course was subsequently borrowed by Road 3D.

Track 9 was interpreted on the evidence of the earlier survey as a straightforward continuation of Track 8. However, while the lower section of Track 9, as defined in this report, follows the line of the medieval Track 8b, its northern end diverges and cuts straight through the southern boundary of Toft 1, which appears to have remained in use to a relatively late date, indicating that Track 9 is almost certainly of post-medieval date. Historic Ordnance Survey maps (1854; 1890) indicate that the route passed northwards obliquely across the southern half of West Row (south) and joined Track 21 close to Area 6, where excavation revealed cart ruts (Milne 1979b, fig 17).

Track 10 can be dated with some precision, for it was clearly constructed to give access from Road 2B to the gateway into the courtyard of the Improvement farm, which was built between 1775 and 1779. Although most of the farmstead was demolished at some point between 1846 and 1851, the track evidently continued in use, for it is shown on both the First Edition 6-inch scale map surveyed in 1851 and the First Edition 25-inch scale map surveyed in 1888 (Ordnance Survey 1854; 1890). The track cannot strictly be termed a hollow way, although it is similar in form, for it must have been deliberately cut through the higher ground on the south side of Road 2B, rather than gradually eroded through use. The earlier plan erroneously shows a toft boundary continuing across the track; the only earthwork in this vicinity that demonstrably post-dates the track is a pipe trench, apparently leading to the water pumping station built in 1935.

Track 11, at least in its latest form, provided access from the north to the church and post-medieval parsonages. Yet, as described above, it also follows the most direct and topographically straightforward continuation of Road 3C into the village, and may represent an antecedent of the awkward Road 3D, which climbs the valley side to the west. The existence of such a route, which cannot be proven from the earthwork evidence, might go some way to explaining the siting of the church (see Section 5.3).

Track 12 gave access from Road 3B to the western end of Field 6. It does not appear to have been used intensively; what has previously been identified as a hollow way is a field boundary ditch, probably of post-medieval origin (Boundary 8 in section 5.8).

Track 13, which has not been explicitly identified before, can only intermittently be distinguished as an earthwork in its own right, but seems in essence to have followed the headland running along the top of the lynchet bank, effectively forming a back lane along the rear of West Row (north). Those sections that can be identified as slight hollow ways and

ramps seem to have provided access into the individual tofts and perhaps represent piecemeal use at a relatively late date. The existence of the route at an earlier date in a more planned form can be inferred from the fact that the headland provides the only means of access to the crofts (Wrathmell 1989). On plan evidence, it seems likely that the northern end of the route originally continued as far as Road 1B. Following the construction of Building 18 on the projected line of the track, it is possible that access to it was gained through Toft 19.

Track 14 has previously been recorded as earthworks but not interpreted as a track, although its embanked form is essentially similar to that of Track 1 and Road 1B. The route is the clearest example at Wharram Percy of a 'back lane', running between the rear of the tofts of North Row and the adjacent crofts. The western end of the route abruptly becomes indistinct, possibly due to later dumping or disturbance, but may at some stage have continued as far as the open area at the south-eastern corner of the North Manor. The eastern end is equally difficult to trace, but may have intersected with Track 3, or turned northwards along the edge of the escarpment.

Track 15 is a short hollow way that evidently allowed access into the crofts of West Row (north), possibly at a relatively late date when the village had been reduced to a small number of courtyard farms. The hollow way cuts through the lynchet bank and the ditch of the northern boundary of the *curia* enclosure surrounding the South Manor. The separation between the ditch that forms part of the northern boundary of the *curia* enclosure and the buildings in Toft 14 would suggest that they were sited to allow the track to pass through, which would imply that the track was already in existence.

Track 16 is a deeply worn hollow way that utilises a natural indentation in the crest of the southern side of Drue Dale to ascend the steep slope, thus providing access to Field 5. The lower section of the track has been rendered difficult to trace by the severe soil creep in this part of the valley. The Ordnance Survey First Edition 25-inch scale map surveyed in 1888 shows it heading almost straight down the slope to the point where Track 8b/9 begins to ascend the northern side of Drue Dale, but this is no longer clear from the surface traces (Ordnance Survey 1890). Rather, the earthworks seem to suggest that it may have continued obliquely across the contours to join Track 18b. It is of course possible that the course of the track changed over time or that both routes were in concurrent use at some time prior to 1888.

Track 17 has previously been recorded in part as an earthwork, but not interpreted as a track. It loops eastwards from Track 8b, giving access to two previously unidentified medieval buildings on the slope and intersecting with Track 18, and then continues northwards obliquely down the slope towards the church. At this point, its course has been erased or masked by a landslip.

Track 18a branches off from Track 17 and descends the slope to the main spring. Although a connection between the village and the water source has previously been assumed, this track is the only clear-cut physical manifestation of that link. This section is not depicted on historic maps, but the Ordnance Survey First Edition 25-inch scale map surveyed in 1888

depicts a continuation of the route to the south of the Wharram stream, Track 18b, which is no longer identifiable as an earthwork (Ordnance Survey 1890). Although it must have been in use at that date, it is not unreasonable to suppose the existence of a medieval antecedent.

Track 19, previously described as an element of Track 4, is demonstrably of later date than that route or continued in use for longer: as the earlier survey actually shows, it cuts through Track 4, through Toft 15 and so gives access to the crofts to the west. It seems likely that Track 19 is either broadly contemporary with the small number of later medieval courtyard farms or that it is of 18th-century origin. On balance, the evidence that Toft 15 did not develop to the extent as the other tofts in the row seems to point to its abandonment, and the subsequent use of Track 19, towards the end of the life of the village.

Track 20 climbs the western side of the valley, running approximately parallel to Road 1C. It is not heavily eroded, indicating that it was not intensively used. Its northern end seems to have provided access to the scatter of buildings that encroach onto the village green, but there are hints that one of the buildings may overlie the trackway.

Track 21 was depicted on historic maps, as a 'footpath' which continued the line of Track 8c south-westwards (Ordnance Survey 1854; 1890). Excavation on the line of the route in Area 6 revealed cart ruts (Milne 1979b, fig 17). The only section of this that can now be traced as an earthwork obliquely descends the northern side of Drue Dale, descending the steep slope from east to west. The route cuts obliquely across Field 4, suggesting that, like Track 5b, it post-dates the end of arable cultivation, presumably around the early 16th century. Since the footpath follows the most direct route from the site of Wharram Percy Cottages to Wharram Percy Farm, it is reasonably safe to infer that this stretch originated in the late 18th century or later.

5.3 St Martin's Church

As a standing structure, Wharram Percy's church is fairly typical of small village parish churches in the Yorkshire Wolds, consisting of a nave and chancel with a tower at the west end. The building was at its largest and most elaborate between the early 13th and early 15th centuries, reflecting the fortunes of the parish and the village itself. The walls are built of well-coursed stonework, mostly using sandstone, and incorporate many segments of high-status medieval grave slabs. Twelve phases of construction have been detected, initially through analysis of the standing fabric and subsequently by total excavation between 1962 and 1974 (Bell and Beresford 1987). Following the consolidation of the tower, whose western half collapsed in December 1959, the fabric has remained in good repair and the interior of the building is open to public access. The nave has not had a roof since the early 1970s, while the chancel was re-roofed in slate in the mid-1980s. No further examination of the building was carried out by English Heritage in 2002 and the survey has contributed nothing further to the existing understanding of the sequence of parsonages that lie nearby. The visible extent of the churchyard lies immediately to the south of the church; it contains thirty-one headstones dating from the late 18th century onwards and was not subjected to excavation. Limited excavation to the north, where burial ceased when the village was

deserted, suggested that the ground had been used for at least four cycles of burial. In all, around 600 burials comprising about 1,000 individuals were removed for study. The new investigation suggests that the expansion of the churchyard would have blocked the earliest route of Road 3, forcing its diversion up the slope of the western side of the valley (referred to as Road 3D). This development may have occurred when Haltemprice Priory acquired the advowson in the 1320s, but radiocarbon dating of skeletons seems to indicate that the graveyard reached its maximum extent before the Norman Conquest (information from Stuart Wrathmell).

Excavation has revealed that the earliest structure, built in timber, was a small, single-cell chapel, possibly constructed in the mid-10th century; this building evidently influenced the siting of its stone-built successors. In his study of medieval villages, BK Roberts (1987, 100) has commented that the location of St Martin's, well below the highest ground and at a considerable distance from what seems to have been the heart of the village, is 'a most curious siting, which raises many unanswerable questions!' While several theories have been proposed, it is true that no entirely convincing answer to this fundamental question has yet been found (Hurst 1985, 90). The earliest church has been interpreted as a proprietary chapel, that is one attached to a manor house, an origin common amongst rural churches in England (Rodwell 1981, 140-5). However, though the presence of a third Anglo-Saxon manor on the terrace occupied by the church has been suggested, no support for this theory has been forthcoming. The suggestion that the churchyard may have effectively defined the southern end of East Row (Beresford and Hurst 1990, fig 60), which would mean that the site of the church was not entirely excluded from the village plan, is questionable, as discussed in Section 5.6. In any case, it has not yet been proven that the foundation of the church does not predate the planning of a nucleated village by as much as two centuries. On the north side of the church the excavations found an Iron Age burial of the 1st century BC, leading to suggestions that the church might occupy a site of prehistoric ritual importance, perhaps associated with a water cult, given the proximity of the stream (Wrathmell 1996, 15). The putative water cult might arguably be expected to arise in closer proximity to one of the springs and to be reflected in a more apposite dedication than St Martin. Furthermore, the single burial does not constitute strong evidence for the existence of a cult, especially in the context of the apparent string of graves of similar date along the crest of the western plateau. Given this and the passage of more than a thousand years, the idea of any direct continuity of ritual significance can probably be dismissed. However, it is not inconceivable that the Iron Age burial was originally marked by a square barrow, which would have been detectable as an earthwork a millennium later, and might have prompted the construction of a church in an attempt to sanctify the pagan monument. Comparison has been made with the treatment of the late Neolithic standing stone in the churchyard at Rudston, though this monument is arguably in a different league from an Iron Age square barrow. Yet this again begs the question as to why this particular burial might have been singled out, of the string of square barrows recorded by aerial photography along the edge of the western plateau. One explanation might be the siting of the other barrows in relation to later ploughing, which was probably intensive during the late Iron Age and Romano-British periods, for these

earthworks might have been erased long before the mid-10th century. By contrast, a barrow lying within the uncultivated public space around the church might well survive intact.

Another possibility arising directly from the English Heritage investigation is that the siting of the church related to the pattern of principal through routes in the late Saxon period. As described in Section 5.2, it is possible that Road 2B, which formed one of the most obvious principal axes of the medieval village, may have replaced an earlier route, referred to as Road 2C, which climbed the valley side at a more gentle angle. If so, at some point prior to the laying out of East Row the intersection of Roads 1, 2 and 3 may have lain at least as far south as Wharram Percy Cottages and perhaps closer still to the location of the church. If the church was originally located next to a road junction, its siting might be regarded as much less unusual, if not typical. In any event, it seems very likely that the main north to south route passed immediately to the west of the site of the late Saxon chapel. The site of a church with pre-Conquest origins at North Burcombe in Wiltshire seems to owe much to the early road pattern and it too lies at a considerable remove from the main village earthworks (Aston 1989, 121). Given that radiocarbon dating suggests that the churchyard reached its greatest extent before the Conquest, it is possible that the route was diverted in the same period. The evidence presented in Section 5.2 suggests that the north to south route increased in importance at some point between the Romano-British and early medieval periods.

At a more fundamental level, it is worth observing that BK Roberts' view of the siting of the church as entirely inexplicable is based on the conventional model of the church standing cheek-by-jowl with the manor. Analysis of village plans in Lincolnshire has revealed that a significant proportion of churches there were founded by the free peasantry on sokeland and that this origin is regularly reflected in a separation between church and manor (Everson, P and Stocker, D in perparation). The single carucate of sokeland referred to in Domesday Book has traditionally been equated with land towards the south of the village, but it may be necessary to reconsider the evidence.

5.4 The South Manor

In 1955, excavation of Area 10 (centred on Building 10) revealed a sequence of peasant houses, beneath which lay the top of a major stone wall, which a trial trench proved to be sunk 3m into the ground. Further excavation in 1956 and 1957 showed that the wall was part of an elaborate rectangular stone-built undercroft, built *c* 1180 on an east – west alignment. This was interpreted as part of the solar block, or *camera*, of a manor house and its outline was eventually laid out for display to visitors. Apart from various dressed stone blocks in the demolition rubble used to backfill the undercroft early in the second half of the 13th century, there was scant evidence for the form of the upper storey and none at all for the remainder of the building, perhaps due to later disturbance. It has been speculated that the hall may have extended at right angles to the south, and was perhaps built primarily in timber (Beresford and Hurst 1990, plate 9). Documentary evidence indicates that the Percy family acquired the rights of both manors in 1254 and since the *camera* had been demolished at about this date, the South Manor was initially linked to the Chamberlain family (Hurst 1979, 138-9). However, it was concluded that without better understanding of the dating of the North