

ST PETER'S CHURCH,  
WINTRINGHAM, NORTH YORKSHIRE

ARCHITECTURAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
RECORDING OF THE TOWER PARAPET



Ed Dennison Archaeological Services Ltd  
18 Springdale Way  
Beverley  
East Yorkshire  
HU17 8NU

ST PETER'S CHURCH,  
WINTRINGHAM, NORTH YORKSHIRE

ARCHITECTURAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
RECORDING OF THE TOWER PARAPET

Report no: 2006/286.R01  
Version: Final  
Date: May 2008  
Author: Ed Dennison & Shaun Richardson

Ed Dennison Archaeological Services Ltd  
18 Springdale Way  
Beverley  
East Yorkshire HU17 8NU

On behalf of

The Churches Conservation Trust  
1 West Smithfield  
London  
EC1A 9EE

# ARCHITECTURAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORDING OF THE TOWER PARAPET, ST PETER'S CHURCH, WINTRINGHAM, NORTH YORKSHIRE

## CONTENTS

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	SITE LOCATION.....	1
3	SURVEY METHODOLOGY .....	1
4	ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND .....	2
5	STRUCTURAL DESCRIPTION OF THE TOWER PARAPET.....	4
6	GRAFITTI ON THE SPIRE.....	6
7	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	7
8	BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	9
9	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	10

### Appendices

- 1 Gazetteer of Recorded Features
- 2 The Conyers Family and their Connections in Relation to Wintringham Church
- 3 Listed Building Description

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In April 2006, Ed Dennison Archaeological Services Ltd (EDAS) were commissioned by The Churches Conservation Trust, through their architect Mr Peter Gaze Pace, to undertake a programme of architectural and archaeological recording during works associated with the repairs to the tower parapet of St Peter's Church, Wintringham, North Yorkshire (NGR SE88727317).

The church tower and recessed spire have both previously been described as Perpendicular and the current work has uncovered no information which would contradict this assessment. Comparison with Perpendicular towers elsewhere within Yorkshire suggests that the tower at Wintringham is a larger and more affluent example of the type erected towards the middle of the 15th century and afterwards. Some of the decorative details on the parapet may indicate the tower was actually built in the late 15th century, or that the parapet was rebuilt at this date. This date fits in well with the heraldic shields which decorate the parapet, which appear to commemorate the family connections of William Conyers (d.1490) and his wife Anne Bigod. William Conyers succeeded to the Conyer's estate at Wintringham in 1487, and so the shields suggests that the parapet was probably built between 1487 and 1490, or shortly afterwards.

It is probable that most of the apparent discrepancies between features within the parapet result from successive rebuilding and repairs. One of the shields (W14) on the west face of the parapet, which is dated 1715, commemorates either the repair or rebuilding of the parapet almost certainly after storm damage on 1st February 1715. It is highly likely that the existing appearance of the parapet owes much to this early 18th century work, and it is difficult to estimate to what extent the decorative features were re-ordered then. The spire appears to have been repaired again in 1818, and it seems probable that further work was undertaken on the parapet at this date. Graffiti recorded around the base of the spire provides additional evidence for maintenance work into the 20th century, such as the replacement of lead roofing.

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 In April 2006, Ed Dennison Archaeological Services Ltd (EDAS) were commissioned by The Churches Conservation Trust, through their architect Mr Peter Gaze Pace, to undertake a programme of architectural and archaeological recording during works associated with the repairs to the tower parapet of St Peter's Church, Wintringham, North Yorkshire (NGR SE88727317).

## **2 SITE LOCATION**

- 2.1 St Peter's Church lies at the eastern end of Wintringham village, on the north side of an unclassified road which runs west to West Knapton and east to East and West Lutton (see figure 1). The village itself is located at the head of a dry valley close to the north edge of the Yorkshire Wolds, some 4km to the east-north-east of Malton.
- 2.2 The church is a Grade I Listed Building (see Appendix 3). This high listing reflects its importance as a piece of ecclesiastical architecture, and it has been described as "the most rewarding village church in the [former] East Riding with an exceptional collection of furnishing" (Pevsner & Neave 1995, 759).

## **3 SURVEY METHODOLOGY**

- 3.1 The aim of the archaeological and architectural recording was to monitor the works associated with the repairs to the tower parapet. These works were part of a larger project designed to conserve, stabilise and repair the whole of the tower and spire (see figures 2 to 5). To facilitate the project, the tower and spire were fully scaffolded, affording an opportunity to inspect and record the richly decorated masonry around the parapet. The scope and scale of the recording work, which was defined as a result of discussions between EDAS and Peter Pace, the church architect, comprised a combination of photographic and drawn elements, with an accompanying description.
- 3.2 An initial site visit was made on the 22nd May 2006 and a sketch elevation was made of the four external faces of the parapet at a scale of 1:50. These were then enlarged and reproduced at a scale of 1:25. Each architectural feature, such as a corbel or shield, was assigned a unique reference letter / number code e.g. N1 or E3, according to which face it was on, in order to aid identification. The features were numbered in a logical order from left to right across each parapet, starting with the corner gargoyle, running across the corbels to the gargoyle at the opposite end and then running across the shields above from left to right. It should be noted that the central spouts on the east and south faces of the parapet were not numbered as both have been almost completely removed or replaced, and there is no surviving structural evidence as to their original form; in addition, the corner gargoyles obviously occur on two faces, and so have two sets of letter / number codes.
- 3.3 The initial architectural sketches were used to inform the photographic recording, which took place on the 9th June 2006. A total of 103 35mm black and white photographs were taken, supplemented by a number of colour digital photographs and 35mm colour slides, together with sufficient site notes to prepare a written gazetteer (see Appendix 1). The presence of the scaffolding

and other equipment meant that it was not always easy to obtain a square-on photograph of the various architectural features, but this was done wherever possible. A further visit took place on 27th March 2007 to record features which were replaced or renewed as part of the conservation work; these items are also identified in Appendix 1.

- 3.4 In terms of the identification of the heraldic devices on the shields, this report has used the details provided by Collier and Lawrance (1916), who in turn appear to have drawn on previous unreferenced work undertaken by the local 19th century antiquarian, Revd C B Norcliffe. Collier and Lawrance's work has then been supplemented by further specialist research by Dr David Neave (2008), who also provide details on the medieval landownership in the parish.
- 3.5 With the agreement of the Churches Conservation Trust, the project archive, comprising written, drawn and photographic elements, has been deposited with Malton Museum (EDAS site code SPW 06).

## **4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

### **Archaeological Background**

- 4.1 Wintringham village lies within a rich archaeological landscape, the main elements of which have been summarised in a desk-top survey report (Hunter-Mann 2003). The area was being exploited from at least the early Bronze Age (c.1500-1000 BC), and there is a probable late Iron Age-Romano-British "ladder settlement", now evident as cropmarks, in the dry valley floor to the south-east of the church. This settlement appears to be centred on a linear routeway running up the valley, which was probably a precursor to the present unclassified road, linking the lower Vale of Pickering with the higher Wolds to the east. A scatter of pits adjacent to this ladder settlement may also potentially indicate later Anglo-Saxon occupation.
- 4.2 Wintringham is first mentioned in the 11th century Domesday Book, along with its secondary settlements of Linton (now Linton Wold Farm) and Newton. Wintringham's name, thought to mean "homestead of the Wintringas", is derived from the Old English personal name *Wintra* which may signify an Anglo-Saxon settlement (Smith 1937, 136). The village has some characteristics of a planned village, with a back lane running parallel to but set back on the north side from the main street; the Ordnance Survey 1854 1st edition 6" map (sheet 125) shows garden plots extending from the main street frontage to this back lane. This plan form could have been laid out during, or prior to, the 11th century.
- 4.3 The church is not mentioned in the Domesday Book, the earliest part, the chancel, dating from the 12th century (see below). By the mid 12th century, Wintringham was held by Eustace Fitz John, who granted the church and other land in the parish to Malton Priory which he had founded in 1150. It is possible that the present church originated at this time and a John de Wintringham was Prior of Malton around 1350. Eustace Fitz John was succeeded by his son William (d.1184-85) who assumed the name Vesci (or Vescy). The manor of Wintringham then descended through the Vesci family until the death of William Vesci "of Kildare", the illegitimate son of William Vesci, 1st Lord Vesci of Alnwick and Malton (d.1297) at the Battle of Bannockburn in 1314.

- 4.4 The Vesci estates then passed to his distant cousin Sir Gilbert de Aton (c.1275-1350), 1st Lord Aton of West Ayton (near Scarborough), who made his will at Wintringham. By this time, the de Aton family was probably at its height, and a document of 1327 notes that they held the manors of Malton, Ayton, Hutton Buscel, Brompton, Wintringham and Barlby; Sir Gilbert also had property and considerable commercial interests in Hull (Rimington & Rutter 1967, 12-13). His son, Sir William 2nd Lord Aton, was like his father an important and powerful regional landowner, and he was a Member of Parliament, Sheriff of Yorkshire in 1348, 1349 and 1352 and Governor of York Castle, and he married Isabel, daughter of Henry, 2nd Lord Percy and then Idonea, daughter of Robert 1st Lord Clifford. However, he died without a male heir in 1389, and his estates passed to his three daughters: Anastasia married Sir Edward St. John; Katherine married Sir Ralph Eure; and Elizabeth (d.1402) married firstly Sir William Place (d.1387) and then Sir John Conyers of Sockburn (d.1395). Initially the manor of Wintringham, like that of New Malton, appears to have been shared between the three heirs, each holding a third, although the Conyers family seem to have the dominant interest there by the later 15th century. Henry, Lord Clifford (d.1524), great grandson of Edward St. John, also held land at Wintringham (David Neave, *pers. comm.*).
- 4.5 William Strickland purchased Place Newton in 1543 and Wintringham in 1594. The Strickland family rebuilt the hall at Place Newton but their main residence was Boynton Hall near Bridlington. In 1874 on the death of Sir George Cholmley, who had changed his name from Strickland in 1865, the estate at Wintringham and Place Newton passed to his son Arthur John Cholmley (d.1932) from whom it descended to the present owners.

### **The Church**

- 4.6 St Peter's is a large structure, lying at the east end of the village in an equally large churchyard. It is built of dressed sandstone with a slate roof. Its plan form comprises a four stage western tower surmounted by an embattled parapet and octagonal spire, a four bay aisled nave and three bay chancel. There are chapels in the eastern bays of both aisles. The earliest surviving part of the building is the 12th century Norman chancel, which has small round-headed windows in the north and south walls, pilaster buttresses and a corbel table; the east end of the chancel was rebuilt in the 15th century. The arcades to the north and south aisles have continuous double-chamfering and are, together with the chancel arch, early 14th century in date while the aisle windows are 15th century. The four stage tower is late 14th century, and was repaired in 1818 (Elders 2002). The Torre Manuscript, currently being catalogued by the Yorkshire Archaeological Society, also notes that burials within the church include John Oustyn (d.1452) and Matilda Boynton of Newton (d.1539), and Thomas Lutton (d.1546) Ralph Lutton (d.1557) and Phillip Lutton (d.1620) of Knapton, just to the north of Wintringham.
- 4.7 The church was repaired and re-roofed in 1887 by J Oldrid Scott, and oak fittings were added to the chancel as part of other restoration work in 1889-91 by Temple Moore. The lowering of the nave floor as part of the latter uncovered numerous unrecorded burials, as well as a lead coffin in the north chapel, thought to be that of Ralph Lutton of Knapton. Some of the external stonework was replaced using stone salvaged from the ruins of Linton chapel, while the graveyard was lowered by some three feet. These excavations also



uncovered chalk foundations extending north and west from the former door on the north side of the chancel, suggesting a former chapel or other building. Details of these restoration works are contained in contemporary document held by the Churches Conservation Trust. It is not known whether the south porch was also pulled down at this time. More recent descriptions note the quality of the internal furnishings and also the abundance of carved heads externally, for example, to the aisle parapets (Pevsner & Neave 1995, 759-760; Pace 2003).

- 4.8 The embattled parapet is extravagantly carved with wavy trails, shields, gargoyles and decorative quatrefoils, which were all recoded as part of the current project. These carvings were previously described in some detail in 1916 by Collier and Lawrance (1916, 383-395), who make reference to an earlier description by the Revd C B Norcliffe, although they provide no further details. Norcliffe was a leading 19th century East Yorkshire antiquarian who lived at nearby Langton Hall (Bulmer 1892) and who produced transcriptions of many documentary sources (David Neave, *pers. comm.*).
- 4.9 Joseph Elders produced a detailed Pastoral Measure Report in 2002 (Elders 2002), and a condition survey of the carved stonework over the whole of the church was undertaken in April 2003 (Copsey 2003). The latter document refers to the various gargoyles as "hunkypunks". However, as the term appears to be a Somerset (West Country) dialect term for either a grotesque carving or more specifically a carving of an animal squatting on short haunches with a non-spout function (Tisdall 1998, 96), the word "gargoyle" is preferred here.

## 5 STRUCTURAL DESCRIPTION OF THE TOWER PARAPET

- 5.1 A general description of the surviving form, detailing and construction of the tower parapet is given below, and a numbered gazetteer describing each surviving decorative feature is given as Appendix 1. This gazetteer commences with the north face and progresses around the parapet in a clockwise direction. All the features described below and in the gazetteer appear to be carved from local sandstones, although Copsey noted carved heads in local limestone elsewhere on the church (Copsey 2003).
- 5.2 The tower parapet is virtually square in plan, measuring between 6.20m and 6.25m on either side, and each side is approximately the same form, with a corbel table at the base, a row of heraldic shields above, a panel of wavy trail decoration above this, and an embattled top (see figure 6, plates 1 and 2).
- 5.3 In terms of their distribution, the corbels are generally placed symmetrically about a central spout; on the east and south faces there are eight corbels (four to either side of where the spout once was) while on the north face there are ten corbels (five to either side of a badly weathered owl-like spout). This regular distribution is different on the west face however, where there are five corbels to the north of the central owl spout and four to the south.
- 5.4 The corbels on the south face of the parapet are extremely badly worn, especially those to the east of the central spout position, making the identification of their original subjects difficult. However, across all four faces of the parapet, there appear to be only seven different designs used. Of these,



the most common are a woman's head with a box-like headdress, which appears a total of seven times (N2, N9, N12, E2, E7, W2 and W4) (see plate 3), although it is to be assumed that there were others, now eroded, on the south face (possibly S7). Other common and frequently occurring types are a Tudor type-rose (E6, S5, W3 and W8) and a grotesque with cat-like features (N4, E3, S3 and W9) (see plates 4 and 5). Also present are two variations on a vine or leaf design split into four quarters (N6, N8, E5, E9, S6?, W6 and W11?), a man possibly wearing a helmet (N10, E8, S7? and W5), a daffodil-like flower (N3, N11, S2 and S9), and a daisy-like flower (N5, E4, S4, S8? and W10) (see plates 6 to 10). On the north face, there is a rough symmetry about the way the subjects are arranged to either side of the central spout, and the same might once have been true of the south face, although as with all the parapet features, it is not certain to what extent this reflects the original arrangement or has resulted from later rebuilding or replacement (see Discussions and Conclusions below). The corbel table on each face terminates in a gargoyle; for the purposes of this description, they are named as the gurning man (NE corner - N1/E10), the hooded man (NW corner - N13/W1), the owl (SE corner - E1/S10) and the dog (SW corner - S1/W12) (see plates 11 to 14).

- 5.5 Above the corbel table, each face of the parapet exhibits a line of shields. As with the corbels, in terms of their position, they are arranged approximately symmetrically, with six shields to the north and south faces, and five to the west face. The exception is the east face, where there are two larger shields (one now partly broken off) (E12 and E14) with one smaller central shield between them, one smaller shield to the south and two to the north (i.e. six shields in all). The wave moulding to the rear of the intact larger shield (E14) has been cut back, implying that it is a later addition, perhaps replacing an earlier version (Collier & Lawrance 1916, 394), although this is not totally clear from the structural evidence (see plate 23). All the other shields are of the common "heater" or classic shape, often used to depict a single coat or device and characteristic of the period of the 14th and 15th centuries ([www.baronage.co.uk/1999/herart01.html](http://www.baronage.co.uk/1999/herart01.html)). It is noticeable that one shield on the west face, bearing the date "1715" (W14) (see plate 17), has a slightly squatter shape, perhaps indicating a later design, and it is likely that this shield was inserted when the parapet and upper part of the tower was repaired or rebuilt after a storm; the juxtaposition of this shield relative to the others on this face suggests that the 1715 shield replaced two other earlier examples. The storm was probably that which occurred on 1st February 1715, which also damaged the churches at Bainton, Huggate and Rillington, all of which lost the tops of their spires (Neave 1990).
- 5.6 The arms on 15 of the original 20 can be identified with some certainty and all relate to the Conyers family of Sockburn (south-east of Darlington), who held a third share in the manor of Wintringham, and their connections; details of their family tree and the original forms of their arms appear in Appendix 2. Two of the other shields can be attributed to families related to the Conyers. As the shields lack tinctures or hatching, which has either eroded away or was never present in the first place, it is impossible to identify the arms for which no family connection has been found, but some suggestions have been made.
- 5.7 The arms of the Conyers family appear four times on the parapet (N17, E13, S14 and W15), once on each side and centrally or as near to centrally as can be achieved; their arms are represented by a "maunch", a lady's sleeve with

long hanging ends (Parker 1894) (see plate 15). No other family is represented more than once except the Vescis, which exhibit two sets of arms, namely crosses of different designs (N16 and E11) (see plate 16). The other shields around the parapet represent the Greystock family (S12), the Ros family (Lords of Helmsley) (E15), the Eure family of Malton (S16), the Clervaux family of Croft (S15), the Clifford family (W13), possibly the Scope or Mauley families (W16), either the Fitzwalter, Peche or Lisle family (W17), the Place family of Place Newton (N15) and possibly the Grey family of Rotherfield (Oxfordshire) (N14) and the Fitzwilliam family (E16) (see plates 18 to 22); details of their connections with the Conyers appear in Appendix 2, although there are a few where no obvious connection either with the Conyers or the parish has been established. Two of the heraldic devices (N18 and S11) are currently unidentified and another, displaying a double-headed eagle (N19), may be associated with the Sigston or Lutton families; as noted above, several of the Lutton family were buried in the church. The eagle, both single and double-headed, frequently has a connection with German Emperors or princes, and there are shields of both types executed in stained glass in York Minster which were considered by Boutell to have been made before 1310 (Boutell 1889, 92-93). Only one of the shields (E14), now fairly badly weathered, shows any quartering of arms, for the Percy and Lucy families, resulting from the marriage of Henry Percy, 1st earl of Northumberland, and the heiress Lady Maud Lucy in 1386. In addition to the 1715 dated shield, one other shield displays no heraldic device - this is a Passion Shield (E12), with now only the scourge visible. This shield may also have been a later insertion to the parapet. Further details of all the shields appear in Appendices 1 and 2.

- 5.8 Above the line of shields, each face of the parapet exhibits a panel of wavy trail decoration (see plate 1). Each panel is approximately the same size with a similar number of pieces, but again there are variations between faces. On the north and west faces, the outer ends of the decoration face down (although the southernmost panel of the west face has been reset the wrong-way up), whilst on the south and east faces the ends face upwards. This allows the wavy trail to run smoothly around the whole parapet. Finally, all four faces of the parapet are surmounted by battlements, with cruciform loops on the merlons; there originally appear to have been four loops to each side, but only the north and east faces now retain this number with three on the west and south faces. The only surviving pinnacle is located in the south-east corner which Copsey suggests is a 19th century replacement (Copsey 2003).
- 5.9 In terms of the stonework repairs to the parapet, all of the cruciform loops on the north and west faces were replaced, as well as two on the south face and one part of one on the east face. Only the corbels on the south and west faces were renewed, namely S2, S5, S6, S7, S8, W6 and W11, as well as shield W16 on the west face (see plates 25 and 26). The majority of the wavy trails on the north face were replaced with new carvings, as well as several panels on the south and west faces (see plate 27). The fallen or incomplete pinnacles at each of the four corners of the parapet were also renewed, replaced or refurbished as required.

## 6 GRAFITTI ON THE SPIRE

- 6.1 Whilst carrying out the recording work on the parapet, it was noted that there was a large amount of graffiti around the bottom c.2m of the octagonal base of

the recessed spire, either on the stonework itself or on the lead flashing around its base. The earliest graffiti dates to the mid 19th century, whilst the latest is from the 1960s. It is assumed that that most was made by people climbing the staircase at the tower's south-west corner, and the majority is located close to the staircase doorway. The earliest dates suggest that either the parapet area was not readily accessible to visitors before the mid 19th century, or that any earlier graffiti was removed during the repairs to the spire undertaken in 1818 (Copsey 2003). The fact that no graffiti is placed any higher than c.2m shows that it was all made from the parapet, rather during repairs for example, although some clearly does relate to renewal of the lead roofing here.

- 6.2 For ease of description, the eight sides of the octagonal spire base have been labelled "A" to "H", starting on the north side and running round in a clockwise direction (see figure 7). The inscriptions are as follows:

Side A: Blank

Side B: THIS LEAD LADD BY W CLARKSON G COOK J WEATHERILL & W MILLER TT TT 1910, MARY GARYSON, 19 F.ALAM 05. On the lead: D Ethel 11 55, T H Dawson, AE AC IO 1853, IC 1864, HaE A M, JC HE, JW AL, W R MILLER, 1917 FEM, N F CALAMOS, R ELINGT (see plate 24)

Side C: I H H Yale, T PeaLLR, CRT, CHF, WL

Side D: MH AJH TEP 1885, J W Foster, G H Skelton, G Thompson 1889 Dec 1st, KP WBH +

Side E: VM MEA AA MY SEB HW JA EAB

Side F: FH BLE, J Kirby 1888

Side G : S Sewell 1969, B Irish League 1969, ALF STOY 1889

Side H: J Dobson, July H. 1889, RT HO

## 7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 The church tower and recessed spire have both previously been described as being Perpendicular in date (i.e. mid 14th to early 16th century) (Pevsner & Neave 1995, 759-760), and the current work has uncovered no information which would contradict this assessment. It is likely that the tower and spire were provided with a parapet of some sort originally, although due to at least one reconstruction (see below), its early form is not entirely clear.
- 7.2 Copsey (2003) rightly points out that some of the decorations to the corbels, such as the Tudor roses, are suggestive of a post-medieval date, or at least one after 1485. It might also be argued that the style of the woman's headdresses on the corbels is also of the late 15th or early 16th centuries, and not later, again as suggested by Copsey. Similarly, although Copsey suggests that the wavy trail panels to the parapet "do not read as medieval", there are comparable late medieval examples and the work is reminiscent of carvings sometimes seen on late medieval screens or indeed the decorated stonework of some very late medieval churches (see, for example, the c.1500 nave of St

Peter and St Paul in Lavenham, Suffolk; Williamson 2003, 378). Ornamental traceried parapets are generally held to have developed as a means of finishing off a wall during the 14th century (Friar 1996, 212). Very similar, if not identical, parapet decoration survives at St Peter and St Paul church in Pickering, North Yorkshire, where it is suggested that the recessed spire and battlements might be later than the mid 14th century (Pevsner 1966, 282), and at All Saints church in Settrington (Pevsner & Neave 1995, 675). Indeed, the idea for displaying the family arms on the parapet of the church tower at Wintringham may have been introduced from Settrington Church where the quartered arms of Bigod and Mauley occur as well as the Bigod arms on their own; Sir John Bigod (d.1427) married the heiress Constance Mauley in c.1410 (David Neave, *pers. comm.*).

- 7.3 There is therefore some reason to believe that much of the parapet at Wintringham dates from either the late 15th or perhaps early 16th century. This date range is supported by the shape of the heraldic shields and the arms depicted. Almost all of the shields have the common “heater” or classic shape, often characteristic of the 14th and 15th century before quartering became more common ([www.baronage.co.uk/1999/herart01.html](http://www.baronage.co.uk/1999/herart01.html)); the only definitively quartered shield on the parapet, depicting the Percy family (E14) is larger to accommodate the more complex design. It is also noticeable that the only definitely later shield, i.e. that bearing the date “1715” (W14), has a slightly squatter shape, indicating a later design. It is also likely that the larger shield depicting the instruments of the Passion (E12) was also a later addition. The heraldic shields were almost certainly incorporated into the church’s fabric as commemorations to prominent benefactors (Friar 1996, 48-49). Whilst it is possible, as suggested by Copsey (2003), that some of the shields may have been brought from elsewhere on the church, it seems unlikely that all of them would have been. Perhaps the benefactors recorded by the shields were previously commemorated in some other way within the church, and when the tower and spire were built, the opportunity was taken to record their benefactions in the form of the shields around the parapet?
- 7.4 As has already been noted, the arms of the Conyers family appear four times, i.e. once and centrally on each side of the parapet (N17, E13, S14 and W15), which clearly demonstrates that it was this family that paid for the work. Chronologically, the latest Conyers family link shown on the arms was to the Bigod family of Settrington (with links to the Greystoke and Mauley families) (S13); William Conyers married Anne Bigod by 1469. William Conyers inherited the estate in 1487 and died in 1490, and so it is likely that the parapet was built at this time or soon afterwards. If the parapet had been erected by the son Christopher Conyers (1469-1513), then one would expect it to have included the arms of his wife Anne Markenfield (David Neave, *pers. comm.*).
- 7.5 The parapet gargoyles and the surviving spouts might also be taken to be earlier than some of the other features such as the corbels. In so far as they take away water from the parapet, the gargoyles and spouts perform a function, but as in all other churches, they also serve decorative and allegorical functions. Gargoyles exist both physically and metaphorically “outside” of the Church, and are used to both personify the devils driven out and to illustrate the sin/fate likely to befall those who also find themselves outside of the Church (Tisdall 1998, 95); they pour, vomit or even urinate water onto those passing by to remind them of the latter. The dog gargoyle at the south-west

corner (S1/W12) is a good example; the dog can represent those who fall into sin again after they have confessed: “as the dog returns to his vomit, so a fool returneth to his folly” (Tisdall 1998, 63). Similarly, the gurning man at the north-east corner (N1/E10) may refer to a gesture of derision, sometimes explicitly linked to fools, made during the Mocking of Christ, examples of which survive in English church architecture from the very early 14th century to at least the mid 15th century (Jones 2002, 115).

- 7.6 It is probable that most of the apparent discrepancies between features within the parapet result from successive rebuilding and repairs. Comparison with Perpendicular towers elsewhere within Yorkshire suggests that the tower at Wintringham is a larger and more affluent example of the type erected towards the middle of the 15th century and afterwards, such as those noted by Ryder in West Yorkshire (Ryder 1993, 60-61). Were this to be the case, the corner gargoyles and shields may be remnants of the original parapet, with other parts being rebuilt at the end of the 15th century or early 16th century; alternatively, the whole tower (including the parapet) may be of this later date. Shield W14 on the west face of the parapet, dated 1715, commemorates the repair or rebuilding of the parapet after storm damage on 1st February that year.
- 7.7 It is highly likely that the existing appearance of the parapet owes much to this early 18th century work, and it is difficult to estimate to what extent the decorative features were re-ordered; for example, was the wavy trail decoration originally all set the same way up, and incorrectly replaced in 1715? Copsey notes that the spire was repaired in 1818 (Copsey 2003) and it is probable that work was also undertaken on the parapet at this date; for example, some of the loops are far less weathered than others, and so may have been replaced during the 19th century, and Copsey suggests that the only surviving pinnacle is also a 19th century replacement.

## 8 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boutell, C 1889 *English Heraldry*

Bulmer 1892 *History and Directory of East Yorkshire*  
([www.genuki.org.uk/big/eng/YKS/ERY/Langton/Langton92.html](http://www.genuki.org.uk/big/eng/YKS/ERY/Langton/Langton92.html) - accessed 19th May 2008)

Collier, C & Lawrance, H 1916 “Ancient Heraldry in the Deanery of Buckrose”. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* vol 24, 383-395

Copsey, N 2003 *Condition Report, Carved Stonework, St Peters Church, Wintringham, Malton, North Yorkshire* (unpublished report provided by Peter Gaze Pace)

Elders, J 2002 *Pastoral Measure Report: Wintringham, St Peter* (unpublished mss held by CCT)

Friar, S 1996 *A Companion to the English Parish Church*

Hunter-Mann, K 2003 *St Peter's Church, Wintringham, North Yorkshire: A Report on an Archaeological Desk Top Study* (unpublished York Archaeological Trust report 2003/12)



- Jones, M 2002 *The Secret Middle Ages: Discovering the Real Medieval World*
- Neave, D 1990 "Great Storms in East Yorkshire". *East Yorkshire Local History Society Bulletin* 42, 19-21
- Neave, D 2008 "Shields of Arms on the Parapet of the Tower at Wintringham Church, North Yorkshire" (unpublished mss for EDAS)
- Pace, P G 2003 *St Peter's Church, Wintringham, East Yorkshire: Condition Survey Report* (unpublished mss)
- Parker, J 1894 *A Glossary of Terms Used in Heraldry*  
([www.heraldsnet.org/saitou/parker/Jpglossm.htm](http://www.heraldsnet.org/saitou/parker/Jpglossm.htm) - accessed 9th May 2008)
- Pevsner, N 1966 *The Buildings of England: Yorkshire: The North Riding*
- Pevsner, N & Neave, D 1995 *The Buildings of England: Yorkshire: York and the East Riding*
- Rimington, F C & Rutter, J G 1967 *Ayton Castle: its History and Excavation*. Scarborough and District Archaeological Society Research Report No 5
- Ryder, P 1993 *Medieval Churches of West Yorkshire*
- Smith, A H 1937 *The Place-Names of the East Riding of Yorkshire and York* (English Place-Name Society vol 14)
- Tisdall, M 1998 *God's Beasts: Identify and Understand Animals in Church Carvings*
- Williamson, P 2003 "The Parish Church". In Marks, R & Williamson, P (eds) *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, 375-423

## 9 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 9.1 The architectural and archaeological recording of the tower parapet at St Peter's Church was commissioned and funded by the owners of the site, the Churches Conservation Trust, through their architect, Mr Peter Gaze Pace. EDAS wish to thank Dawn Whitton of the CCT, Peter Pace and the contractors, Ebor Stone Limited, for their assistance and co-operation during the work.
- 9.2 The on-site recording work was undertaken by Shaun Richardson and Richard Lamb, with assistance from Ed Dennison, and Shaun Richardson produced the drawings. The majority of the photographs were taken by BM Photographic Services of Hull, with the rest taken by Ed Dennison. Dr David Neave provided details of the heraldic devices, and further information on the medieval manorial history of the parish. Tony Wright also provided some background details on the site, and "as-built" photographs.
- 9.3 The final report, illustrations and archive were completed by Ed Dennison, with whom any errors or inconsistencies remain. The copyright of this report has been transferred to the Churches Conservation Trust, although Ed Dennison and Shaun Richardson retain the right to be accredited as authors.