NORTHALLERTON BATTLE AND CAMPAIGN

Information from ***The UK Battlefields Resource Centre***
Provided by ***The Battlefields Trust*** http://battlefieldstrust.com/

Report compiled by: Glenn Foard: 24/07/2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE CAMPAIGN

War: **Anglo-Scottish Wars / Medieval: Civil War of Stephen & Matilda**
Campaign: **Northallerton**
Dates: **1138**

Summary

In the 12th century the boundary between England and Scotland was open to great dispute, but in the late 1130s England was also descending into Civil War, between Stephen and Matilda. Through the centuries when the English have been involved in foreign or civil wars the Scots, in normal times the weaker military force, have often exploited this weakness. But in 1138 king David of Scotland was also a relative and close supporter of Matilda, the contender for the English throne. His invasion therefore had support of some of the northern English lords and his intention was conquest and control of the northern counties not simply plunder and destruction.

In several invasions between 1136 and early 1138, he had taken control of the border counties. In August 1138, with King Stephen involved in military action in the south of England, David once again took the offensive. But when he marched into Yorkshire he was countered by a large, well armed English force raised by the Archbishop of York. In this situation early medieval armies and especially Scottish forces, because usually less well armed and equipped than the English, would normally avoid battle. At Northallerton king David, perhaps in confidence of his numerical superiority, took the offensive. In the first battle between the two kingdoms since the Norman Conquest the Scots suffered a dramatic defeat.

Background

After the death of his son, Henry I intended that his daughter Matilda succeed him. But the idea of a woman ruling in England and Normandy did not gain the support of all the nobility. Following Henry's death in 1135, his nephew Stephen of Blois, who held extensive estates in south east England as well as Normandy, travelled from the continent to seize the crown. As Matilda attempted to recover the throne England began to descend into Civil War.

King David I of Scotland, a relation of Matilda, was one of those who rallied to her supported and, throughout the conflict, was one of her most consistent supporters. However he also had other objectives. In 1066 the territory of Carlisle was part of Strathclyde, but it had been taken in to England by 1100 and here David had claims via his brother Edgar and Siward his wife's grandfather. He also had claims in England to the Earldoms of Northumberland and Huntingdonshire, through his wife's father Waltheof.

Over a period of three years the Scots made a number of separate incursions into the north of England, but these were not simply the raids to destroy and plunder that typified later Scottish invasions. David's intention as conquest of the northern counties. Norman control of the north was being achieved by the construction of castles across the Marches and capture of these castles was thus critical to the seizure of territory. But over the centuries, when necessary, the Scottish forces could and did bypass these strongholds for an attack deep into England.

In 1136 King David invaded, taking the towns and castles of Carlisle, Wark, Alnwick, Norham and Newcastle. Stephen marched north with an army to meet the threat but this campaign ended in a negotiated settlement rather than a battle. It was a settlement in which Stephen ceded Cumbria to David. This encouraged him to further action, taking it as a sign of weakness on Stephen's part. He invaded again in 1137 and then again in early 1138. This time Stephen responded with a punitive strike into the Lowlands of Scotland. But in the 12th century armies could not be kept in the field indefinitely and soon he had to withdraw.

Campaign

David's confidence was growing, as Stephen faced rebellion by Matilda's supporters in the south, and in the summer of 1138 he invaded one more. This time there were two forces. One advanced along the west coast route, defeating an English army at Clitheroe (Lancashire, 1138) and the marching south on the east coast to Newcastle.

It was then in July that Eustace fitz John, who held the important castles of Alnwick and Malton, defected to Matilda's cause and joined David in the north. Bolstered by this English support the Scots called up further forces, turning this into a major invasion, and besieged other places in the north, including the castle of Wark. It is claimed that in all he brought together a force of 25,000 men, although medieval sources frequently inflate troop numbers substantially.

As David's army marched south they are said to have conducted systematic looting, including capturing peasants to take into Scotland as slaves. This encouraged a decisive response from the northern English barons. King Stephen was campaigning in the south of England and so the responsibility for organising the defence fell upon his lieutenant in the north, Archbishop Thurstan of York. He was then aged about 70 and, although his skills were as an administrator not as a field commander, he successfully promoted the action as a holy crusade against the Scots.

In the first week of August he began to assemble an army at York, with local levies and other forces instructed to assemble further to the north at Thirsk. On about the 14th August the army marched north from York. Thurstan was too old and infirm to travel north himself and so he sent his deputy, the Bishop of Orkney, to accompany the army. The general rendezvous of all the forces took place at Thirsk.

When moving an army the best roads would be chosen so that the force could be moved as quickly as possible. There is much we do not yet know about the road system of 12th century England, but some Roman roads were certainly still in use and Thirsk lay on one that ran north from York, while the Scottish forces seem to have been using the Great North Road in their advance south. At Northallerton these two route ran close to each other.

There were two major Roman roads running north through Yorkshire. One, later broadly followed by the Great North Road, was in the west, between the Pennines and the marshes of the Vale of York. The other lay further the east, between the marshes on the west and the upland of North York Moors on the east. It is uncertain the degree to which the 12th century road system still followed the Roman, but Thirsk lay on the latter and within striking distance of the northern border of Yorkshire. A little to the north, near Northallerton the two routes approached close to each other and by the 12th century may even have joined before they crossed the Tees. If David marched south then his army would have to take one or other of these roads. Assembling the English army at Thirsk placed them in a position to counter the Scots whichever route they took through this relatively narrow corridor of lowland between Pennines, marsh and Moor, which was the only realistic route into the heart of Yorkshire.

As usual in early medieval warfare attempts were first made to try to settle the question by negotiation. Bernard de Balliol and Robert of Bruce, who both held lands in Scotland and knew David, were dispatched to negotiate with the Scots. They presented terms for a truce that had been sent by Stephen, who offered to recognise David's son Henry as Earl of Huntingdon and Northumbria. But David rejected the terms and on the 21st August the Scottish army crossed the river Tees.

It would appear that the Scots advanced along the Great North Road, already recorded in 1250 as the major route to the north, which ran south through Northallerton, just 10 miles south of the Tees.[1] When this was reported by their scouts, early on the morning of the 22nd August, the English army marched north to counter the Scots. They bypassed Northallerton, perhaps using the route through Brampton village. Although now just a lane, this may have been a significant early medieval route which joins the Great North Road at the northern edge of the battlefield, two miles north of Northallerton.

Map

Consequences

Northallerton was a dramatic defeat for the Scottish army, but it did not destroy King David's army or his challenge for control of Cumbria and Northumberland.

[1] Hindle Brian, *Medieval roads*, Aylesbury, Shire, 1982.

The king soon rallied his forces in Carlisle and he achieved a negotiated settlement which achieved most of his original objectives.

The papal legate, then in Carlisle, arranged for the Scots to release the women and children that they had taken as slaves. He then negotiated a peace treaty in which Stephen renewed the offer that he had made before the battle. Stephen it seems was concerned to negotiate a settlement before having to face an expected invasion from the continent by Matilda. The terms included the granting of the Earldom of Northumberland to David's son Prince Henry, and enabled David in effect to advance his frontier to the rivers Tees and Eden. It is true that Stephen retained a royal garrison at Newcastle and Bamburgh, while Prince Henry was required to administer his lands from England. But in effect the northern counties of England were under the control of a Scottish king.

It would not be until 1157, under Henry II, the ultimate beneficiary of the Civil War, that the northern counties would finally be recovered. By then the English kingdom was no longer divided by internal conflict and could field forces that were more than a match for the Scots.

Further reading

- **Hall, *The Penguin Atlas of British and Irish history*, London, Penguin, 2001, 74-5.**

This provides a very brief summary and simplified plan of the political and military context of the 12th century civil war and its wider context of the Norman transformation of England.

- **Bradbury, *Stephen and Matilda: The Civil War of 1139-53*, Stroud, Sutton Publishing, 1998**

This gives an excellent broad overview of the years of conflict between Stephen and Matilda, of which the Northallerton campaign and the wider troubles on the Scottish border were an integral part.

- **Strickland, *Securing the North: Invasion and the Strategy of Defence in Twelfth-Century Anglo-Scottish Warfare*, Bury St Edmunds, Boydell, 2000**

A short paper which provides an excellent context for the Northallerton campaign.

THE BATTLE

Summary

National location map

Northallerton, better known as the Battle of the Standard, was the first major engagement between English and Scots since the Norman Conquest. It was one of just two major battles during the Civil War of Stephen and Matilda. In most cases in the 12th century the weaker side would avoid pitched battle and concentrate on small scale action and the control of territory through garrisons and their reduction by siege. But at Northallerton, for reasons that are not clear, King David forced a battle and the English met that challenge.

The English army chose the ground, deploying across the Great North Road two miles north of Northallerton, blocking the southward advance of King David I's Scottish army. David probably was confident in his superiority in numbers and may have attempted to advance and strike the English by surprise but, despite the early morning fog, he found the English ready for him. Although outnumbered, the English forces repulsed a series of Scottish attacks. The unarmoured and supposedly 'wild' Galwegian infantry, who insisted on spearheading the Scottish attack in place of the well armoured knights, fell in large numbers to the English arrow storm. When they did reach the English lines they were generally cut down in hand to hand fighting with the local levies and the well armed and armoured English men at arms.

The English first line was at times hard pressed, but they were very effectively seconded and any breach that the enemy forced was rapidly closed. Late in the battle the Scots did mount one successful attack, when Prince Henry's small detachment of cavalry punched a hole right through the English battle formation. However this opportunity could not be exploited by the infantry that seconded the charge who, just like the Galwegians, were forced to retreat. The retreat soon turned into a rout.

After perhaps no more than two hours of fighting, the Scots began to flee, leaving many of their number dead on the field. But the victorious English were unwilling or unable to follow up with an effective pursuit and execution of the broken enemy forces. If they had, then the destruction of the Scottish army would surely have been far more complete.

KEY FACTS

Name	**Northallerton (Battle of The Standard)**
Type	**Pitched Battle**
Campaign	**Northallerton**
War period	**Anglo-Scottish / Medieval: Civil War of Stephen & Matilda**
Outcome	**English victory**
Country	**England**
County	**Yorkshire**
Place	**Brompton / Northallerton**

Location	**accurate (exact deployment position disputed)**
Terrain	**moorland or open field?**
Date	**22nd August 1138**
Start	**early morning**
Duration	**less than 2 hours?**
Armies	**Scottish under King David I**
	English possibly under Walter d'Espec, Sheriff of York
Numbers	**unknown – unlikely suggestions of up to 16,000 Scottish and 10,000 English**
Losses	**uncertain**
Grid Reference	**SE362979 (436200,497990)**
OS Landranger	**map sheet 99**
OS Explorer	**map sheet 302**

The Armies

Medieval chronicles are notorious for their inability to deal effectively with large numbers and so there is no secure information as to the strength of the two armies. It does appear that the Scottish force was the stronger but at Northallerton, as so often in later campaigns, the Scots were unable to match the number of armoured troops that the English could muster. This was to prove their greatest weakness.

Some10,000 – 12,000 troops are claimed for the English army, including substantial numbers off armoured troops as well as many archers. It is said that the Scottish army comprised 25,000 men when it crossed the border but with those deployed in garrisons in the captured towns and castles, and others involved in looting, that there were some 16,000 men on the field at Northallerton. However, as all these calculations are based on the medieval chronicles they must be treated with care.

Losses

The records of 10,000 killed are another example of medieval exaggeration and so there is no good evidence on the numbers killed or wounded. However the losses on the English side may have been relatively limited because only one English noble, de Lacy, is recorded as having been killed.[2]

[2] Leadman, *Battles fought in Yorkshire*, 1891, 23n.

English

Commanders

Thurstan, Archbishop of York, had been too ill to travel with the army. Command was possibly given to Walter Espec, Sherrif of York, or William of Albemarle, though on this the accounts are not clear.

However there were also with them a number of barons from the region and it has been suggested that Sir Robert de Ferrars, who had some experience of warfare in France and would become one of the most able soldiers of his generation, had a significant role in the tactical decisions.[3] Others included Robert de Bruce; Bernard de Baliol; Adam de Bruce; Gilbert de Lacy; Walter de Gaut; Roger de Mowbray; William de Peverill; Robert de Stuteville; Richard de Courcy; William Foassard.[4]

Troops

The barons in the region gathered their followers, while Stephen had also sent Bernard de Balliol with a small body of knights to support the army. In Thirsk the army was joined by Sir Robert de Ferrars, who had raised the nobility of Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire to march north with him. The local militia had also been raised by the parish priests in the region who led all the able bodied men of their parish to Thirsk, where the army was to assemble.

The mounted knights were probably few in number but they were supported by a far larger number of men at arms. These retainers of the feudal lords were well armed and armoured professional soldiers. It has been suggested that together they comprised some 6,000, though all such calculations are based on dubious foundations.[5] In addition there were archers with longbows perhaps not too dissimilar from those with which the English forces were to so dramatically destroy French armies in the 14th and 15th centuries. It has been suggested that there were as many as 1000 archers. The local militia may have been poorly trained and armed largely with makeshift weapons such as axes and scythes, but their numbers may have been substantial, though suggestions of 5-10,000 is undoubtedly an exaggeration.

Scottish

Commanders

David, King of Scotland, was himself in command of the army, standing with the reserve in the centre. Prince Henry his son commanded the vanguard on the right.

[3] Matthews, *England versus Scotland*, Barnsley, Leo Cooper, 2003, 46.
[4] Barrett, *Battles and Battlefields in England*, London, Innes & Co., 1896, 27.
[5] Matthews, *England versus Scotland*, Barnsley, Leo Cooper, 2003, 47-8.

Troops

Although the Scottish army had a small number of Anglo-Norman knights and men at arms, the Scottish kingdom was still in the process of transformation. There was not the high level of central, feudal organisation seen in England that could produce large numbers of armoured troops. The armoured knights and men at arms, wearing chain mail and a helmet, large shields and with an eight foot lance and a sword were relatively few in number. Some of these were Norman or Germanic mercenary forces, the rest Lowland feudal tenants. Although some were dismounted to fight on foot, Henry kept a small detachment of mounted knights on the right wing for what he hoped might be a late but decisive cavalry charge.[6]

The infantry forces from Galloway, described as Galwegians, were are suggested as having numbered as many as 7000, armed with spears about 12ft long and a few with axes, possibly with a helmet and a small round wooden shield of wood or leather. They are said to have considered themselves the best fighters in Scotland but these unarmoured and ill disciplined troops would be no match for the English longbow and heavily armoured men at arms. There were other similarly armed troops from the Highlands.

In addition the Scots infantry included feudal levies from the Lowlands, some of them English speaking from the former territories of Northumbria which was now part of Scotland. These men, suggested as numbering as many as 6000 have been suggested as being protected with mail jackets and large shields and armed with swords, axes and spears and a few with bows. But the Scottish infantry had probably not yet developed the 'schiltron' formation, in which a tight and disciplined formation of pikemen would prove able in later centuries to hold off determined attack even by armoured troops.

The Story of the Battle

Map

Very early in the morning the English advanced to the battlefield first and chose their ground well. Two miles north of Northallerton they deployed to control the Great North Road, along which the Scottish army had to march, and with the natural protection of marshland on their left flank.

They English had marched the 10 miles north from Thirsk to reach the battlefield, probably via what is now Brompton Lane, running north through Brompton village and thus bypassing Northallerton. The ground they chose lay a little to the south of where the Brompton Lane joins the Great North Road. From here to the crossing of the River Tees was just eight miles to the north. The Scots had crossed the Tees, presumably at Neasham three miles south of Darlington, and marched south along the Great North Road until they found their way blocked by the English army.

[6] Matthews, *England versus Scotland*, Barnsley, Leo Cooper, 2003, 47.

This campaign was being treated as a crusade against the Scots and so as a rallying point in the centre of the English battle array a Standard had been erected. It is from this Standard the battle gained its popular name.

This was a continental practice that Thurstan had supposedly seen in Italy, where they were used in battle as the rallying point for the city militia.[7] Not apparently used before on an English battlefield, it is said to have comprised a mast of a ship set upon a wagon upon which were mounted two, possibly four standards: the banners of the northern saint St Peter of York, St John of Beverley and St Wilfred of Ripon and St Cuthbert of Durham.[8]

The traditional location of the battle is between the two slight rises of Standard Hill, today both surmounted by farms of that name. However newly identified field name evidence,[9] suggests that the English deployment, centred on the Standard should be placed some 3-400 metres to the south of the traditional site. This would place the battalia immediately to the south of the area known as Scot Pits, where burials are recorded as having been found in the 19th century. As Burne has noted for various other battlefields, but very specifically and inexplicably rejects at Northallerton, the location of mass graves is one of the best indicators of the centre of the action.[10]

Deployment

Typically the medieval armies both on the march and in battle array were organised in three 'battles'. Apart from Barrett's bizarre interpretation with the English arrayed on the north and the Scots to the south, there are two alternative deployments given by modern authors.

English

English Heritage, following Oman, show a deployment in a single body with just a small reserve protecting the horses, the majority of the baggage apparently have been left in Thirsk. The alternative deployment is shown by Bradbury. He depicts a deployment in three lines, with archers who were protected by dismounted men at arms in the first line, a main battle with the senior figures and the knights centred on the Standard, and a small cavalry reserve which also guarded the horses. Smurthwaite adds a separate line behind the standard and on the flanks comprising local levies and shows the reserve at a considerable distance to the rear.[11]

---

[7] Matthews, *England versus Scotland*, Barnsley, Leo Cooper, 2003, 45.
[8] A woodcut is given by Twysden and a pen and ink sketch is in one of the Archbishop's Registers at York; Leadman, *Battles fought in Yorkshire*, 1891, 18.
[9] See the Battlefield section.
[10] Burne, *The battlefields of England*, London, Greenhill Books, 1996, ii, 99.
[11] English Heritage, *Battlefield Report: Northallerton, 1138*, English Heritage, 1995; Oman, *A history of the art of war in the middle ages*, London, Methuen & co. ltd, 1924, plate 13; Bradbury, *Stephen and*

The English Heritage report shows a battalia some 550 metres wide. However, given the nature of the terrain, as so far reconstructed, it seems likely that the English would have attempted to deploy across the Great North Road, with the marsh of Cinnamire protecting their left flank, and perhaps with the slight valley between the modern Brompton Grange and The Grange, which might perhaps prove to have been another small marshy area, on their right flank. This would give a frontage of up to 1000 metres with Standard Leeze at its centre. However this may be considered too wide for a 12th century deployment with the numbers likely to have been present.

Scottish

The Scottish army was deployed in four battles according to most modern accounts. However they vary between Bradbury's depiction of them aligned one behind the other to Oman's plan, followed by English Heritage, where they are deployed in a diamond formation. The latter has been followed here. All are agreed that David with his reserve was at the rear. Prince Henry was on the right with one infantry wing and a small body of mounted knights, the Lothian troops on the left wing and the Galwegians in the centre.

Initially David's battle plan had been to see his best armed and his armoured men take the fight to the English. But there was no love lost between the native Galwegian troops and these knights and their supporters from the increasingly feudalised lowland areas. Unfortunately, to maintain the support of the wayward Galwegian infantry he had to give them the honour of leading the attack, even though they had no protection from the English arrows and were no match for the well equipped English men at arms. In this lay the seeds of David's dramatic defeat.

Map

The Action

The foggy dawn may initially have made it difficult for the two forces to see their enemy's deployment, but it was not a significant factor. It was the Galwegians who launched the first Scottish attack in what appears to have been a somewhat ill disciplined charge.

Some authors suggest that they had a significant disadvantage because the English held a hill, forcing the Scots to attack up it. However even on the traditional site this cannot be reconciled with the actual battlefield terrain.[12] In reality, especially where the new evidence suggests the English were deployed, it is a wide almost flat area, which matches

---

Matilda: The Civil War of 1139-53, Stroud, Sutton Publishing, 1998, 34. Smurthwaite, *The Complete Guide to the Battlefields of Britain*, London, Michael Joseph, 1993.

[12] Matthews, *England versus Scotland*, Barnsley, Leo Cooper, 2003, 49

the description of a broad field in the contemporary accounts. In reality it was the storm of English arrows which blunted the Galwegian attack, because these Scottish troops were unarmoured. Indeed so effective was the fire of the English archers that these Scottish infantry are described in the accounts as looking like hedgehogs as they retreated. However some Galwegians did reach the English lines, and at least one section, possibly on the left, the front of the English battle array, was temporarily broken. But the English that wavered were seconded by other troops and the Galwegian attack was repulsed. After withdrawing the Galwegians made a second attack but this met the same fate. Even their commander himself was killed by an arrow and his men fell back in disorder. The second Scottish line now attacked but they too failed to break the English.

In what may have been one and somewhat desperate attack, Prince Henry launched a cavalry charge from the Scottish right, possibly with as few as 60 mounted knights.[13] The heavily armoured cavalry with their lances broke through the English lines, but the men at arms again advanced to close the breach and so the Scottish infantry that seconded the cavalry attack were repulsed.

The Scottish cavalry, presumably disorganised and with their horses blown, were unable to capitalise on their success, other than perhaps pillaging any baggage that had been brought with the army, and played no further significant part in the action. Burne has the English horse guard providing a strong resistance and the third English line turning about to attack the Scottish cavalry, in order to explain the position of the Scot Pits behind the traditional position of the English battalia, but there is no documentary support for this and the need for such an explanation is removed by the repositioning of the English lines. The Scottish cavalry would later return as best they could, some removing their insignia so as to be able to mingle with the English troops and thus escape, as many cavalrymen would do in various subsequent battles down the centuries. Prince Henry did not finally rejoin his father until three days later.

The Galwegian forces already in flight, and with their leaders Donald and Ulerich dead the rest of the Scottish infantry began to follow suit, retreat turning into rout. David's rearguard could do no more than provide a rallying point for the routed infantry and to protect their retreat from the field and to limit the execution by the advancing English. After perhaps as little as two hours the battle was over. It is said that the battle was sometimes known as the Battle of Baggamoor on account of the discreditable Scottish retreat.[14]

The Aftermath

The Scottish army suffered a dramatic defeat, but the contemporary claims of 10,000 or more killed have to be dismissed, though it seems fairly certain that the Scots lost far more killed and wounded than did the English. The battlefield was

[13] Young and Adair, *Hastings to Culloden*, London, G. Bell, 1964.
[14] Leadman, *Battles fought in Yorkshire*, 1891, 23

however said to have been thickly covered with bodies which 'were left unburied, and were eaten by the birds of the air and the beasts of the field.'[15] There were also significant numbers captured, with supposedly some 50 Scottish knights taken prisoner and, in usual fashion for the period, held to ransom.[16]

However many Scots were actually killed, the numbers of Scottish losses would have been much greater had the English forces staged a significant pursuit. They apparently did not and it has been suggested that this was primarily because the majority of the English cavalry had dismounted to fight and cavalry was certainly the most important force in any pursuit.[17] Though it should always be borne in mind that the dangers of exploiting what turned out to be a feigned enemy retreat were well known, not least from the fate of the Saxon army at Hastings.

Northallerton was a dramatic defeat for the Scots, but the English failed to capitalise upon it, at least in military terms. Soon after the battle the English levies were disbanded and only a small force was retained to reduce the castle at Malton, which was held by supporters of Matilda. There was no major offensive to drive the Scots out of the northern territories. By early in September David had rallied some 14,000 troops in Carlisle to meet any English counter attack, but none was launched because of the continuing rebellion in the south.

Assessment of the Battle

There can be little doubt that the critical factor in the Scottish defeat was David's decision, in which he may have had little choice, to allow the Galwegians, rather than his armoured troop, to make the initial attack. However there are other issues about the tactics employed at Northallerton that may shed important light on the nature of warfare in the 12th century.

The major factor that has not previously been properly taken into account at Northallerton is the historic terrain. This is something that can be analysed with a little more confidence now that we have new evidence on the probable location of the English battle array. Despite the interpretations of some authors, there was not a significant hill on the battlefield to provide a strong defensive position against an attack from the north, though such places could certainly have been found further north. Why then did the English choose this location to fight? In fact when one begins to reconstruct the historic terrain it can be seen that the English had chosen a strong tactical position. Not only did they control the major road, but they also had a large marsh to provide defence from any outflanking move on the left of their battle array. What lay to their right is at present uncertain, but further research on the historic landscape may yield evidence on this.

[15] Leadman, *Battles fought in Yorkshire*, 1891, 25.
[16] Barrett, *Battles and Battlefields in England*, London, Innes & Co., 1896, 35.
[17] Smurthwaite, *The Complete Guide to the Battlefields of Britain*, London, Michael Joseph, 1993.

The way in which the majority of the English knights and men at arms dismounted and fought on foot has been described by some authors as a curious negation of the greatest strength of the English army, the heavily armoured mounted cavalry charge with couched lances. However, as Bradbury has demonstrated, dismounting many of the cavalry to fight on foot was a typical 12th century Anglo-Norman tactic and one that was probably used widely across the continent.[18]

The events at Northallerton confirm the value of these tactics very well. The dismounted heavily armed troops provided the essential stiffening of the English lines when the local levies were hit first by the Galwegian charge and then later by Prince Henry's mounted cavalry attack. The first they were able to hold when the levies began to break. The second they could not hold, but they were able rapidly to close up the breach, stopping the infantry that seconded Prince Henry from exploiting his initial success. 180 years later at Myton (North Yorkshire, 1319) the lack of dismounted men at arms to strengthen the English lines was surely the key factor in the total collapse of the English army.

The other major reason for dismounting is described in the intended tactics recorded in the account of the battle of Bourtheroulde (Normandy, 1124): *'for one section of our men to dismount for battle and fight on foot, while the rest remain, mounted ready for the fray. Let us also place a force of archers in the first line and compel the enemy troop to slow down by wounding their horses'* .[19] The threat posed by the archers clearly also led the Scots to dismount most of their men at arms and knights. Whereas the horses were very vulnerable to the English arrows, blunting a cavalry charge, the heavily armoured men at arms, when on foot, were not. Why then, one wonders, did the late cavalry charge by Prince Henry succeed in breaking through? The retention of a cavalry reserve for just such an attack was a typical tactic of the period. It may be that launching such attacks became more realistic in the later stages of a battle because the archers' arrows may have been largely spent, especially given the rate of fire which an archer could achieve.

The other important element in the tactics at Northallerton was the prominent role given to the archers. They were almost certainly, as Bradbury says, using the English longbow, and they used it to great effect. Both in the use of the bow and of dismounted heavy cavalry Northallerton seems to show the early stages of the development of tactics which would lead to some of the greatest of English success on the battlefield in future centuries.

Further Reading

Secondary works

[18] Bradbury, *Battles in England and Normandy, 1066-1154*, 1984, 187-8.
[19] Bradbury, *Battles in England and Normandy, 1066-1154*, 1984, reprinted 2000, p.190.

The context of 12th century warfare in England and Normandy, particularly of the battles, was examined by Oman in 1898. The subject has been more recently considered by Bradbury, providing an important if brief review of battlefield tactics of the period.

The most extensive and well referenced discussions of the battle are those by English Heritage and by Leadman. However there is no completely satisfactory account, especially because of the problems of inadequate location of the events and lack of reconstruction of the historic terrain. Almost all the secondary works simply repeat a traditional interpretation that was first developed by Leadman, Barrett and others in the 19th century. Only Bradbury challenges the traditional location of the action, but his brief review of the battle provides no new supporting evidence, simply turning on its head Burne's argument about the site of the mass graves.

The works used in preparing this report are underlined:

- **Barrett, *Battles & Battlefields in England*, London, Innes & Co, 1896, 26-36**

Bizarrely reverses the position of the Scottish and English forces.

- **Bradbury, *Battles in England and Normandy, 1066-1154*, 1984**

Essential reading for its brief but well argued review of military tactics of the period.

- **Bradbury, *Stephen and Matilda: The Civil War of 1139-53*, Stroud, Sutton Publishing, 1998, 32-7.**

A brief account of the battle with an awful battle plan that distorts the little historic terrain that it presents. But it is important as the first well argued, serious revision of the position of the action, as well as providing the best informed assessment of the battle tactics.

- **Burne, *The battlefields of England*, London, Greenhill Books, 1996, 96-99**

Burne only provides a brief description and no plan saying 'So little is known of this battle and its interest is so predominantly ecclesiastical rather than military that is worth no more than a brief and cursory description.', 96. It is however a useful if brief discussion, as usual prompting more thought than most other accounts.

- **Clark, *Battlefield Walks : North*, 1995, 13-24**

One of the more extensive discussions of the context, but a brief account of the battle.

- **Dodds, *Battles in Britain 1066-1746*, 1996, 25-26**

A very brief summary that adds nothing to other accounts.

- **CEI, *Battle of the Standard (Northallerton) 1138: Battlefield Landscape Report*, English Heritage, 1994**

Information on the battlefield landscape and related conservation issues.

- **English Heritage, *Battlefield Report: Northallerton, 1138*, English Heritage, 1995**

The most concise and well informed of assessments of the battle, including various quotes from original sources and fully referenced.

- **English Heritage, *Register of Historic Battlefields*, London, English Heritage, 1995-**

The official Battlefields Register Map with single page of text and listing several of the major references

- **Fairbairn & Cyprien, *A Traveller's Guide to the Battlefields of Britain*, 1983, 28-29**

Poor map. Brief text.

- **Getmapping, *British Battles: Amazing Views*, 2002, 24-25**

Excellent air photo, though as usual the depiction of the deployments obscures important detail. Brief summary of context and action. Deployment plan follows Guest & Guest.

- **Green, *Guide to the battlefields of Britain and Ireland*, London, Constable, 1973, 32-36**

Poor plan showing English forces further forward than most. Brief description.

- **Guest and Guest, *British Battles*, 1996, 22-23**

Poor plan. Deployment follows English Heritage report 1995 except for distinguishing English archers and Henry's cavalry. It usefully does give references to primary sources for its quotes.

- **Kinross, *Walking and Exploring The Battlefields of Britain*, Newton Abbot [etc.], David and Charles, 1988, 48-49**

Poor map. Brief text.

- **Kinross, *Discovering battlefields of England*, Princes Risborough, Shire, 1989, 16**

Brief text. Plan hopelessly inaccurate.

- **Leadman, *Battles fought in Yorkshire*, 1891, 14-25**

No plan. The most detailed published account with extensive list of sources.

- **Matthews, *England versus Scotland*, Barnsley, Leo Cooper, 2003, 43-55**

An accessible popular account of the battle that puts it in a reasonable political context. However for the more serious student it is severely limited by its lack of any referencing or bibliography and its inadequate mapping.

- **Oman, *A history of the art of war in the middle ages*, London, Methuen & co. ltd, 1924, 390-396**

A substantial, if colourful, account which seems to be drawn upon by various later accounts. A very basic plan with no related topography. The deployment is largely followed by the English Heritage report. Oman appears not to have visited the battlefield, because his description of the hills implies substantial topographical features which simply do not exist.

- **Smurthwaite, *The Complete Guide to the Battlefields of Britain*, London, Michael Joseph, 1993, 66-68**

As usual this provides a good concise political & military context for the battle. Incorrectly locates the monument.

- **Strickland, *Securing the North: Invasion and the Strategy of Defence in Twelfth-Century Anglo-Scottish Warfare*, Bury St Edmunds, Boydell, 2000**

Provides a useful if brief discussion of the numbers and types of troops and the equipment and tactics probably used in 12th century Anglo-Scottish warfare..

- **Warner, *British Battlefields: The Definitive Guide to Warfare in England and Scotland*, 2002, 174-181**

Poor map, showing atypical deployment. A short but readable account of the battle, but the discussion of Prince Henry's attack and his explanation of the burials in Scotpits Lane are dubious, running contrary to other discussions and having little to support it in the primary sources.

- **Young and Adair, *Hastings to Culloden*, London, G. Bell, 1964, 22-26**

One of the most coherent short accounts. Lacks a plan.

Other works which contain or may contain significant information but which were not consulted:

- **Bell, *Yorkshire battlefields : a guide to the great conflicts on Yorkshire soil, 937-1461*, Barnsley, Wharncliffe, 2001**
- **Cummins, *Forgotten fights*, Leeds, 1900.**

Contemporary Accounts

The main accounts are listed below. A more complete list of contemporary chronicles which refer to the battle is given by Leadman.[20] The assessment of the contemporary accounts is based largely upon that in the English Heritage report.[21]

Ailred of Rievaulx
Translated in Anderson, *Scottish annals from English chroniclers A.D. 500 to 1286*, London, D.N. Nutt, 1908. A later version, corrupted with various interpolations, especially the reference to Cowton Moor, is in Howlett, *Chronicles of the reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I*, London, Longman & Co., 1886, iii, pp lix, 182, 199.

Richard of Hexham
Translated in Douglas and Greenaway, *English historical documents, 1042-1189*, London; New York, Eyre Methuen : Oxford University Press, 1981, 346.

Hovenden
Printed in Stubbs, *Chronica magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, London, Longman, 1868, i, 193. This too has interpolations adding errors to the account.

The Chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon
Printed in Forester, *The chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon, comprising the history of England, from the invasion of Julius Caesar to the accession of Henry II*, Felinfach, Llanerch, 1991, 269-70.

[20] Leadman, *Battles fought in Yorkshire*, 1891, 14, n.1.
[21] English Heritage, *Battlefield Report: Northallerton, 1138*, English Heritage, 1995.

Extracts

Extract from Richard of Hexham
Douglas and Greenaway, *English historical documents, 1042-1189*, London; New York, Eyre Methuen : Oxford University Press, 1981, 346-7.

'While thus they were awaiting the approach of the Scots, the scouts whom they had sent forward to reconnoitre returned, bringing news that the King with his army had already passed the River Tees and was ravaging their province in his accustomed manner. They hastened to resist them; and, by-passing the village of Northallerton, they arrived early in the morning at a plain distant from it by about two miles. Some of them soon erected in the centre of a frame which they brought, the mast of a ship to which they gave the name of the Standard.'

'On the top of this pole they hung a silver pyx containing the Host and the banners of St Peter the apostle, and John of Beverley and Wilfrid of Ripon, confessors and bishops. In so doing their hope was that our Lord Jesus Christ, through the efficacy of his Body, might be their leader in the struggle. They also provided for their men a sure and conspicuous rallying point, by which they might rejoin their comrades in the event of their being cut off.

Scarcely had they set themselves in battle array when tidings were brought that the King of Scots was close at hand with his whole force, ready and eager for the battle. The greater part of the knights dismounted and fought on foot. A picked force, interspersed with archers, was arranged in the front rank. The others, with the exception of those who were to deploy and reinforce the army, mustered with the barons in the centre, near and around the Standard, and they were guarded by the rest of the host, who closed in on all sides. The troop of cavalry and the horses of the knights were stationed at a little distance, lest thay should take fright at the shouting and uproar of the Scots. In like manner, on the enemy's side, the king and almost all his followers were on foot, their horses being kept at a distance. In the front line were the Picts; in the centre the king with his knights and his English allies, and the rest of the barbarian host poured roaring around them.

As they advanced in this order to battle, the Standard with its banners was visible at no great distance; and at once the hearts of the King of Scots and his followers were dismayed by terror and consternation; yet, persisting in their wickedness, they pressed on to accomplish their evil ends. On the octave of the Assumption of St Mary, being Monday, 22 August, between the first and third hours this battle began and ended. A large number of Picts were slain in the first attack, while the rest, throwing down their arms, disgracefully fled. The plain was strewn with corpses; very many were taken prisoner; the king and all his magnates took to flight; till in the end, of that immense army all were either slain, captured or scattered as sheep without a shepherd ... And the power of God's vengeance was most plainly manifested in this, that the army of the conquered was inestimably greater than that of the conquerors; for, as many affirm, of that army which came out of Scotland alone, more than ten thousand were missing, and in various

localities of the Deirans, Northumbrians and Cumbrians, many more perished after the fight than fell in battle.

Extract from Ailred:
Anderson, *Scottish annals from English chroniclers A.D. 500 to 1286*, London, D.N. Nutt, 1908, 198-206.

...King [David] gathered together his earls and the highest nobles of his realm,and began to discuss with them the array of battle. And it pleased the greater number that all the armed men, knights and archers whom they had should go before the rest of the army, so that armed men should attack armed men, and knights engage with knights, and arrows resist arrows.

The Galwegians [men of Galloway] opposed this, saying that it was their right to fill the front line, to make the first attack upon the enemy, to arouse by their courage the rest of the army. The others said it was dangerous if at the first assault unarmed men met armed men; for if the first rank sustained not the brunt of battle but yielded to flight the courage of even the brave would be readily dispelled.

Nonetheless the Galwegians persisted, demanding that their right be granted to them. 'For why art thou fearful, O King,' said they; 'and why dost thou so greatly dread those iron tunics which thou seest far off? We surely have iron sides, a breast of bronze, a mind void of fear; and our feet have never known flight, nor our backs a wound. What gain were their hauberks to the Gauls at Clitheroe? Did not these men unarmed, as they say, compel them to throw away their hauberks, to forget their helmets, to leave behind their shields? Let then your prudence see, O king, what it is to have confidence in these, which in a strait are more burden than defence. We gained at Clitheroe the victory over mail-clad men: we today shall use as shield the valour of our minds, and vanquish these with spears.'

After this was said, when the King seemed rather to incline to the counsels of his knights, Malisse, earl of Strathearn, was greatly wroth, and said: 'Why is it, O King, that thou reliest rather upon the will of Gauls, since none of them with their arms today will advance before me, unarmed, in the battle?' And Alan de Percy, base-born son of the great Alan - a most vigorous knight, and in military matters highly distinguished - took these words ill; and turning to the earl he said, 'A great word hast thou spoken, and one which for thy life thou canst not make good this day.'

Then the king, restraining both, lest a disturbance should suddenly arise out of this altercation, yielded to the will of the Galwegians.

The second line the King's son [Prince Henry] arranged with great wisdom; with himself the knights and archers, adding to their number the Cumbrians and Teviotdalesmen ... The men of Lothian formed the third rank, with the islanders and the men of Lorne. The

King kept in his own line the Scots and Moravians; several also of the English and French knights he appointed as his bodyguard. And thus was the northern army arrayed.'

'...The southerns, since they were few, very wisely massed into one column. For the most vigorous knights were placed in the first front, and the lancers and archers so distributed through them that they were protected by the arms of the knights, and could with equal vigour and security either attack the enemy or receive his attack. But the nobles who were of a maturer age were arrayed (that they might support the others) around the royal banner, some being placed higher than the rest upon the machine itself.

Shield was joined to shield, side pressed to side: lances were raised with pennons unfurled, hauberks glittered in the brilliance of the sun; priests, white-clad in their sacred robes, went around the army with crosses and relics of the saints, and most becomingly fortified the people with speech as well as prayer.'

'Earth trembled, heaven groaned; the mountains and hills around returned the echo'.

'And the column of Galwegians after their custom gave vent thrice to a yell of horrible sound, and attacked the southerns in such an onslaught that they compelled the first spearmen to forsake their post; but they were driven off again by the strength of the knights, and [the spearmen] recovered their courage and strength against the foe.

And when the frailty of the Scottish lances was mocked by the denseness of iron and wood they drew their swords and attempted to contend at close quarters. But the southern flies swarmed forth from the caves of their quivers, and flew like closest rain; and irksomely attacking the opponents' breasts, faces and eyes, very greatly impeded their attack. Like a hedgehog with its quills, so would you see a Galwegian bristling all round with arrows, and nonetheless brandishing his sword and in blind madness rushing forward now smite a foe, now lash the air with useless strokes.

'Struck with panic all the rear were on the point of melting into flight, when the noble youth, king [David's] son, came up with his line and hurled himself, fierce as a lion, upon the opposing wing; and after scattering that part of the southern army like a spider's web, slaying all who opposed him advanced beyond the royal banner. And thinking that the rest of the army would follow him, to remove from the foe their refuge in flight he attacked those stationed with the horses, routed and dispersed them, and compelled them to flee as far as two furlongs. At this wonderful onslaught therefore the unarmed folk fled in terror.

But by the fiction of a certain prudent man, who raised aloft the head of one of the killed and cried that the King was slain, they were brought back and attacked their opponents more eagerly than ever.

Then the Galwegians could sustain no longer the shower of arrows, the swords of the knights; and took to flight after two of their leaders had been slain, Ulgric and Donald.

Moreover the column of the men of Lothian scarcely awaited the first attack, but immediately dispersed.

Then they who had fled saw the royal banner retiring (for it was blazoned in the likeness of a dragon, and easily recognised) and knew that the king had not fallen but was in retreat. And they returned to him and formed a column terrible to their pursuers.

Meanwhile that pride of youths, glory of knights, joy of old men, King [David's} son, looked back and saw that he was left with a few followers in the midst of the foe; and turning to one of his comrades he smiled and said, 'We have done what we could, and have surely conquered in so far as is in our power. Now there is need of resourcefulness no less than of valour. And nought else is a surer mark of a steadfast mind than not to be downcast in adversity; and when thou hast not strength thou mayest overcome the enemy by stratagem. Therefore throw aside the banners by which we are marked out from the others, and let us mix with the enemy as though we pursued with them, until we outstrip them all and come as soon as may be to my father's column, which I see afar off yielding to necessity, but continuing still in its strength'

THE BATTLEFIELD

Location

Northallerton is one of the most securely located of early medieval English battles. Although there are still some problems they are matters of detailed positioning within the battlefield rather than a choice between several different sites. The contemporary accounts are very specific about the battle having taken place two miles north of Northallerton and the traditional site, with the name Standard Hill, lies just over two miles from the centre of Northallerton.

One late interpolation into a version of Aelred's account refers to the battle having been fought on 'Cottwen more'.[22] This has been identified with Cowton and has led to some a dispute over the site, though this alternative has been dismissed as Cowton lies 4.5 miles to the north west.[23] It should not however be assumed that 'Cottwen more' was actually at Cotwen and it is conceivable that in the medieval period the name was associated with land in the area of the traditional site.[24]

Most authors have accepted a 'traditional' interpretation of the location with the Scottish and English forces centred on the north and the south Standard Hill farms respectively.

[22] Variant C of Aelred. Howlett, Chronicles of the reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I, London, Longman & Co., 1886, iii, 182, footnote.
[23] English Heritage, *Battlefield Report: Northallerton, 1138*, English Heritage, 1995.
[24] See reference to Little Moor, below.

These authors have then attempted various interpretations of the events of the battle to explain the location of the mass burials. Most contorted and implausible was Barrett who reversed the English and Scots positions, which is quite clearly wrong, as Burne pointed out. Other authors, including Burne himself, have tried to explain the location of the Scot Pits as the result of Prince Henry's late charge through the English lines.

Bradbury almost alone has disputed the traditional interpretation and favoured a more southerly position. This can now be supported by newly identified evidence and a revision of the deployments proposed with greater confidence.

This new evidence is the identification of field name evidence for a former area of open field strips known as 'Standard Leeze', immediately south of the eastern half of Scot Pits Lane. Immediately south of Standard Leeze are Short, East and West Leeze, showing that Standard Leeze to be a very tightly constrained area. Field name evidence also may allow the Scot Pits also to be a little more exactly defined, because in 1765 the easternmost of the four Scot Pit Fields, immediately north of Scot Pits Lane, was described as 'properly called Little Moor'.[25]

Historic Terrain

The character of the battlefield at Northallerton has changed dramatically in the more than 950 years that separate us from the action. Much remains to be discovered but some facts are now becoming clear. Today this is a landscape of small hedged fields of pasture or arable with a pattern of dispersed farms and other buildings. In the 12th century it seems to have been a wide area of open field, but possibly in part moorland, on a part of a relatively flat tract of poorly drained clay land with discrete areas of marsh.

The battlefield was traversed north-south by the Great North Road and may also have been crossed by the Brampton Lane along which the English army may have marched to the battlefield. Scot Pits Lane which links the two roads is likely to be a later creation. The land sloped gently down on the west side where Cinnamire, a large are of marsh or open water, covered the English left flank. It is presently unclear whether any significant features lay on the right flank of the English deployment. North to south the battlefield slopes up only very slightly onto the top of Standard Hill, but especially in the area of Scot Pits Lane, where the main action took place, the ground is almost flat, giving no advantage to either side.

One often reads in a battle history or battlefield guide that the landscape today is very much as it was at the time of the battle. Such comments are rarely if ever based on sound evidence and in many cases exactly the opposite is actually known to be true. Northallerton is a good example. Matthews for example writes of Northallerton: *'Not much has changed at the battlefield of the Standard in the nine*

[25] Estate map of part of Brompton of 1765 in NYRO.

centuries since the battle was fought. The main road, now the A167, follows much the same route it did in 1138 and the land remains largely undeveloped.'[26] **Though his comment about the A167 may be correct, in other respects he could not be further from the truth. The failure to understand the historic terrain has led some authors to suggest the impossible, such as Prince Henry charging through what we can clearly see was the middle of the marsh.**[27]

Physical Geography

The landscape to the east of the river Whiske is a gently undulating boulder clay plateau with small basins formerly containing small areas of marsh, represented by surviving names such as Fullicar, Danger Carr, Leascar and Cinnamire, while historic mapping records others. The extent of these marshes is generally identified by the areas of alluvium, silts and peat on the 1:10,000 scale geology mapping. In particular one area to the south west of the battlefield may have been known as Cinnamire, a name preserved in a farm name, immediately to the west of the Great North Road. The extent of the marsh, is still identifiable from the wide flat area, some 300 metres wide at maximum, surrounded by a low but steep scarp. Cinnamire is said to have been converted at some time, probably well after the battle, into a fishpond of the Bishop of Durham, that was drained in the 1740s.[28] It was certainly still open water as late as the late 16th century, for a small oval area of open water is depicted by Saxton (and repeated by Speed) half way between Brompton and Hutton Conyers, on his map of Yorkshire of 1577.[29] The date of drainage of the mire and carrs is not known but it is likely to post date the battle by a considerable time and so these features are likely to have played a significant role in the tactical decisions taken by commanders on the day, especially in the English choice of the field on which to fight.

This marsh will almost certainly have given flanking protection to the left flank of the English deployment. On the east there was Leascarr, similarly identifiable in the modern landscape surrounding Leascarr Farm, but this lay much too far to the north east of the battlefield to be relevant to the action. Other small marshy areas also lay immediately north and north west of the battlefield. On the battlefield itself the ground, all except the west side of and the far north east, is an almost flat plateau, the slopes of the north and south Standard Hills being so gentle that there is likely to have been little tactical advantage to be gained from the physical terrain in an north-south engagement. On the right flank of the suggested English line there is no clear feature easily identifiable, but it is perhaps likely that other elements of the historic terrain that were significant in the English choice of ground, other than the Cinnamire, still await identification, such as any hedgerow or area of woodland. At present we have no knowledge of the nature of those

[26] Matthews, *England versus Scotland,* Barnsley, Leo Cooper, 2003, 55.
[27] Warner, *British Battlefields: The Definitive Guide to Warfare in England and Scotland,* 2002.
[28] Information from Jim Sedgewick, Northallerton Local History Society, re documentary sources in the NYRO.
[29] Ravenhill, *Christopher Saxton's 16th Century maps : the counties of England and Wales,* Shrewsbury, Chatsworth Library, 1992. Nicholson, *The Counties of Britain: A Tudor Atlas by John Speed,* 1988.

historic features, although the modern drains along the field boundaries immediately south east of Brompton Grange and Red Hill might reflect the former presence of a marshy area that has not been identified in the fairly coarse scale of mapping by the British Geological Survey.

The battlefield comprises a very low north-south ridge with land falling away gently on the west side and hardly at all on the east side, except at the northern end, where a small valley cuts back from the north. It may be significant that, despite it being just a slight fall of the land, that troops on east side of the battalia would probably not have been be able to see the action on the other side unless a narrow frontage was maintained.

Settlements & townships

The battlefield as currently defined lies mainly within the historic township of Brompton with a the western part lying in Northallerton township. The pattern is however a complex one, for there is a detached portion of Brompton township to the west divided from the main township by a narrow tongue of Northallerton township.

Given the relatively highly nucleated settlement pattern of this part of Yorkshire, it is unlikely that any dispersed farms existed in the battlefield area in the 12th century. The dispersed pattern of farms across this landscape at present is likely to have been a post medieval dispersal of settlement, with no buildings being identified on Ogilby's map of 1676 along the main road, though this is not a definitive guide.[30]

Land Use

The only significant original reference to the terrain within which the battle was fought is the mention of what is usually translated as 'in a very wide plain'. The English Heritage report attempts to identify this with the plain associated with woodland that was mentioned in the Domesday (1086) entry for Northallerton, suggesting a large tract of uncultivated land. This interpretation in itself is open to considerable question, but more fundamental is the question of the translation of Aelred's original Latin: 'in campo lattissimo juxta Alvertonam', which is probably more correctly 'in broad open field', meaning the arable strip fields associated with one or more of the adjacent medieval settlements, probably mainly that of Brompton within whose township most of the traditional battlefield lies.

Later interpolation in one version of Aelred gives 'in campo lattissimo, scilicet super Cottwen more juxta Northaldertonam', meaning in the broad open field, namely upon Cottwen Moor next to Northallerton.[31] The latter identification as moor is supported by

[30] Ogilby, *Britannia, vol.I : or, An illustration of ye kingdom of England and dominion of Wales, by a geographical & historical description of the principal roads,* (London, A. Duckham, 1939, plate 8. Dickinson, *Britiain's First Road Maps: The Strip Maps of John Ogilby's Britannia 1675,* Bollington, Macclesfield, Cheshire, UK, Windgather Press, 2003.

[31] Assistance in this interpretation has been given by Matthew Bennett and David Hall. Variant C of Aelred, in Howlett, Chronicles of the reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I, London, Longman & Co., 1886, iii, 182, footnote. Latham, *Revised Medieval Latin Wordlist,* 1965.

the 1765 reference to Little Moor.[32] At some time this had probably been quite extensive area of moorland because the 1st edition Ordnance Survey mapping shows the area to the north east as Brompton Moor, to the west as Wiske Moor and to the north west there is Moor Barn in Lazenby. The exact extent of any moor is not known. That at least part of the area was open field in the medieval period is confirmed by both the presence of some ridge and furrow on the battlefield,[33] and the reference to Leeze in various field names, while the 1st edition Ordnance Survey maps show a pattern of long, narrow parallel hedged enclosures which are indicative of early inclosure of open field strips. It is therefore likely that a large part of this area had been encompassed by the open fields of the adjacent townships by the high medieval period. But, given that the battle was fought in 1136 these open fields may not have reached their maximum extent by that time and some of the area later under ridge and furrow may not yet have been taken, although some land may have fallen down to moorland in the recession which followed the Black Death.

This may have been an area where a number of townships shared moorland. Brompton has a detached portion of its township to the west of Cinnamire. It may even be that Cowton in the medieval period had detached rights in this area and that the battlefield area was indeed Cowton Moor, although this is pure speculation at present. The presence immediately north west of the battle field of the names Crowford Farm and Crowfoot Lane might also be significant in this context.

The character of the landscape has of course been completely transformed by inclosure into hedged fields. None of the townships have any enclosure by Act of Parliament, indicating it was enclosure by agreement, all probably largely completed before the mid 18th century.[34] Although a small fragment of open field o the east of Northallerton was still open field in the 18th century, the battlefield area was probably late medieval or early post medieval enclosure, and almost certainly completed by 1675 when Ogilby shows the road to be already enclosed all the way from Northallerton to Lowsey Hill and beyond.[35]

Communications

For a battle of such an early date there are usually fundamental questions about the nature of the road system, particularly the degree to which particular Roman roads were still in use and the degree to which the major road network first recorded in detail in the later 17th and 18th centuries had already come into existence. In the case of the present A167, the former Great North Road where is runs between Northallerton and Darlington is first mapped in circa 1250 and was regularly used by King John and other kings of the 13th century. It was already one of the most important roads in the whole kingdom and the

[32] See above.
[33] English Heritage, *Battlefield Report: Northallerton, 1138*, English Heritage, 1995.
[34] Tate and Turner, *A Domesday of English enclosure acts and awards*, Reading, The Library University of Reading, 1978.
[35] Ogilby, *Britannia, vol.I : or, An illustration of ye kingdom of England and dominion of Wales, by a geographical & historical description of the principal roads*, (London, A. Duckham, 1939, plate 8.

main route on the east side of the country leading to Scotland.[36] It is therefore extremely likely that the road ran on or very close to its present course in 1138. Detail of the exact alignment and character of the route is not however recorded until 1676, when it is seen to run almost exactly on the current course, with the exception of a dogleg, onto the line of the Northallerton Rigg past Brick House, a little to the south west of the battlefield. The route was not significantly altered by turnpiking in the 18th century. The dogleg, now just a lane, was not abandoned until later in the 18th century took it onto the course of the.[37]

Diverging from the A167 southward and running on through Brompton is the Brompton Lane. Although no evidence has yet been identified for this, it may be that this was a significant route in the 12th century, leading to the Roman road south to Thirsk and thus York.

Joining these two roads to the south of the junction, along what we have interpreted as the approximate location of the English lines, is a small lane called Scotpit Lane. Despite showing the English deployment some distance to the north, Warner suggests Scot Pits Lane was probably a deeply hollowed way and thus used as a defensive position by the English. The evidence on the ground does not support this, for it is not hollowed at all, indeed it now has a central cambered surface. Though this may be a 19th century modification it will not have removed deep hollowing. It is possible that the lane did not exist until after inclosure but this cannot be determined without archaeological investigation. In 1891 the Scotpits Lane was grass grown but still open but a cottage had been built at the dog leg at some time since the 1st edition 6 inch Ordnance Survey mapping. The cottage is now no longer extant and the lane severely overgrown.[38]

Archaeology of the Battle

A number of archaeological finds have been made on the battlefield, but all appear to have been chance discoveries. No record has yet been identified to suggest that there has been any more recent metal detecting or other archaeological investigation of the site.

Silver coin of King Stephen of 1137 was found in a field adjoining Standard Hill grounds in about 1851. A similar coin had also been found nearby in 1839 and close to it the silver hilt of a sword.[39] In about 1894-5 ‘on the Standard Hill itself a beautiful little bronze cross, about four inches in length and ornamented on its face with a knot decoration, was discovered.’ This was believed to have been taken to Edinburgh for

[36] Hindle Brian, *Medieval roads*, Aylesbury, Shire, 1982.
[37] Ogilby, *Britannia, vol.I : or, An illustration of ye kingdom of England and dominion of Wales, by a geographical & historical description of the principal roads*, (London, A. Duckham, 1939; 1797 map of Northallerton NYRO ZEK1/3.
[38] Leadman, *Battles fought in Yorkshire*, 1891, 24
[39] Leadman, *Battles fought in Yorkshire*, 1891, 24, quoting Illustrated London News, May 3rd, 1851.

identification.[40] Finds continued to be made in the 20th century because Burne mentions 'relics' having been occasionally ploughed up, referring to the then (1952) owner's father who is said to have discovered 'relics', items which might have been donated to York museum.

The most significant discovery is the evidence of burials, apparently of both horses and men, found in the 19th century found in the vicinity of the Scot Pits, the fields immediately to the north of Scot Pits Lane.

This location has long been known as the site mass graves. In the later 17th century Dugdale reported 'the Ground whereon it was fought, lying about two miles distant from North Alverton (on the right hand the Road, leading thence towards Durham) is to this day called Standard Hill, having in it divers hollow places still known by the name of the Scots Pits.'[41] In the mid 18th century Roger Gale[42] reported a few trenches still to be seen in his day called The Scots Pits, said by tradition to be the burial pits of the slain. However early in the 19th century ploughing apparently destroyed all the earthwork evidence.[43] However Leadman in 1891 reports that within living memory at Scotpits Lane "bones of men and horses have been found…'.[44] It is uncertain whether Barrett's comments are at least in part independent from Leadman and others, but of Scot Pits Lane he records that 'hedgers and ditchers have frequently found fragments of weapons and bones there.'[45]

In any future archaeological study of the area for earthwork or crop and soilmark evidence it will be necessary to take account of the presence of a Brick Kiln Field in close proximity to the eastern end of Scotpit Lane which may have generated quarry pits in the area which might need to be identified to avoid confusion with mass graves.[46]

The presence of these burials behind the traditional location of the English lines has caused considerable problems for most earlier authors. The re-interpretation presented here resolves this difficulty, placing the mass graves in the centre of the action.

The most bizarre interpretation was that by Barrett, who reversed the location of Scots and English deployments, something that Burne has pointed out is impossible. Others have attempted to explain the location of the graves by attributing them to the small numbers killed Prince Henry's cavalry charge through the English lines and his attack on

[40] Barrett, *Battles & Battlefields in England*, London, Innes & Co, 1896, p.35-6.
[41] Dugdale, *The baronage of England, or, An historical account of the lives and most memorable actions of our English nobility*, London, Printed by Tho. Newcomb, 1675, 1, 62; quoted by English Heritage, *Battlefield Report: Northallerton, 1138*, English Heritage, 1995.
[42] Hist of Northallerton, 1739????
[43] Leadman, *Battles fought in Yorkshire*, 1891, 24.
[44] Leadman, *Battles fought in Yorkshire*, 1891, 25
[45] Barrett, *Battles & Battlefields in England*, London, Innes & Co, 1896, p.35-6.
[46] Brompton Tithe Map, NYRO microfilm 2237.

the cavalry and horses in the rear of the English battalia.[47] Indeed, in an uncharacteristic lapse of judgement, even Burne specifically avoids his normal interpretation regarding the significance of mass graves: 'I usually attach great significance to the position of the battle grave-pits, as probably indicating the approximate centre of the battle, but this must not be taken as an absolute rule, especially where it conflicts with other evidence.'[48] However the new evidence discussed above would appear to resolve this problem and associate the Scot Pits directly with the dead from the main Scottish attack.

Though it is perhaps most likely that the tradition is a later rationalisation of an existing name, in the 19th century Red Hill was reported as traditionally associated with the battle, the Red name supposedly relating to the hillside streaming with blood. [49] Though perhaps spurious, it is interesting to note that the location lies even further south east than Scot Pits.

Research information

Historic administrative areas

County: Yorkshire: North Riding
Township (Parish): Northallerton (Northallerton); Brampton (Northallerton)

Map?

Sites and Monuments Record

North Yorkshire County Council

Portable Antiquities Officer

York Museum.

Record Offices

North Yorkshire Record Office, Northallerton.

Local Studies Collections

None consulted.

Further reading

[47] For example, Smurthwaite, *The Complete Guide to the Battlefields of Britain*, London, Michael Joseph, 1993; and Burne, *The battlefields of England*, London, Greenhill Books, 1996.
[48] Burne, *The battlefields of England*, London, Greenhill Books, 1996, ii, 98.
[49] Barrett, *Battles & Battlefields in England*, London, Innes & Co, 1896, p.35-6.

Secondary works

Sources not consulted which may contain significant information:

Britnell, et al., *The economic and social history of Northallerton, 1470-1540,* ;Langdale, *The History and antiquities of Northallerton, in the county of York*, Northallerton, Printed and sold by J. Langdale ... 1813;Meek, *A Sketch of the Roads and Villages within five Miles of Northallerton. ... M. Meek delin,* 1810;Newman Christine, *Late medieval Northallerton : a small market town and its hinterland, c. 1470-1540,* Stamford, Shaun Tyas, 1999;Riordan, *The history of Northallerton : from the earliest times to the year 2000*, Pickering, Blackthorn Press, 2002;Saywell Joseph, *The history and annals of Northallerton, Yorkshire : with notes and voluminous appendix*, Northallerton ; London, Printed at the office J. Vasey : Simpkin Marshall & co., 1885

Toulmin Smith, *The itinerary of John Leland in or about the years 1535-1543,* London, Centaur Press, 1964.

Primary sources

The maps index, tithe and enclosure indexes of the North Yorkshire County Record Office were searched for map sources in preparing this report. Given the ownership of land on the battlefield by the Bishop of Durham there may be a high potential for the reconstruction of the historic landscape in the medieval period. However no search was made in any archive for written documentary sources on the historic landscape.

British Geological Survey maps

The 1:10,000 scale BGS mapping provides important information on the location and approximate extent of former marshland.

Soil maps

None consulted:
Allison, et al., *Soils in North Yorkshire VI : sheet SE 39, Northallerton*, Harpenden, Soil Survey of Great Britain, 1981

Historic Maps

Historic Ordnance Survey Maps

Ordnance Survey 1st edition 1:10,560 scale maps of 1857, Yorkshire sheets 55 & 56.

Other Historic Maps

The Northallerton battlefield appears to be very poorly served by historic maps.

Brompton

- Tithe map – NYRO microfilm 2237

Important map, shows Standard Leese to the SE of Scot Pits Lane.

- Enclosure - none
- Estate map of 1765

Showing hedged fields and field names of land around Firtree Farm to the south fo the battlefield and the strip of fields immediately to the north of Scotpit Lane.

The owner of Crawford Lodge is said by the local historians to have a Sale Catalogue of circa 1840 showing the land around the farm which includes reference to the graves.

Lazenby

- Estate map of pre 1828, ref: M1497

Shows hedged fields just beyond the north west edge of the battlefield. It identifies several Carr fieldnames on the edge of the battlefield.

- Tithe – none
- Enclosure - none

Northallerton

Large number of maps between 1765 and 1850s in NYRO. Only clearly significant maps listed here.

- Tithe map – NYRO microfilm 1789 – not seen.
- Enclosure – none
- Map of 1765 – NYRO ZEK 1/10: Old plan of Mr Crosfield;s Estates. Shows the Scot Pits Lane and adjacent fields on the north side. All three fields at this time called Scot Pit Field, though the easternmost described as ‘properly called Little Moor’.
- Township of Northallerton in 1797, NYRO ZEK1/3.

Shows the area to the west of the A167. All fields named. Township boundaries as now. Includes schedule. NYRO: microfilm 199, m.202 is battlefield area.

- Map of 1842 – turnpike now diverted across the dogleg. Fields named in battlefield area. Small area of open field shown on the east side of the town.

Historic Documents

Sources not consulted:

Standard Hill was freehold tenure, subject to a small fee farm rent to the Bishop of Durham. Hutchinson, Durham, vol.3, 245, quoted by Leadman, 18.

Management Assessment and Strategy

Assessment

Northallerton is probably the best preserved of 12th century battlefields in England and as such has a very high potential for the study of its historic terrain and its battle archaeology to contribute to the understanding of the development of military practice that ultimately led to the armies and tactics that defeated the Scots and especially the French in major 14th and 15th century battles.

Military History

For such an early battle Northallerton is remarkably well documented, in part because this was treated as a holy crusade and thus was particularly noteworthy for the ecclesiastical chroniclers who provide almost the only source of significant information on such early battles.

Military Archaeology

Landowners have not encouraged fieldwork, but this may have protected the battlefield from metal detecting activity. The apparent lack of metal detecting on the site and the relatively large area under pasture may mean that there is a good potential for the recovery of arrowheads. This would be particularly important as Northallerton is the likely to be the best preserved of English 12th century battlefield and may contribute substantially to the understanding of the development of the use of the longbow in a battlefield context.

This is an ideal site for geophysical survey for mass graves, particularly in the area of Scot Pits where the site is reasonably tightly constrained and previous discoveries of burials have been reported.

Historic Landscape

There has been fundamental change in the historic landscape but the lack of modern development may mean that there is some preservation of evidence of headlands from the medieval field system. The extent and potential of the documentary record has yet to be adequately explored. It is unclear whether the drainage of the carrs and mores has destroyed all waterlogged deposits which might contain pollen or other waterlogged deposits which might elucidate the character of the landscape in the early medieval period.

Access

Rights of Way

There are no rights of way across the battlefield recorded in the definitive map or the Ordnance Survey Explorer map. However the Scot Pits Lane has been used for the last 100 years for public access to the battlefield and there is already a request for its addition to the Definitive Map.

Registered Common Land and Open Country
None identified.

Other public access
None identified.

Interpretation

The footpath system in the area is very poor, with no paths crossing the battlefield other than the now heavily overgrown Scot Pit Lane which has not, as yet, been added to the definitive map. The road network does however give good access to the battlefield and the A167 although a fast and relatively busy road does have wide verges. Most parts of the battlefield are visible from the public highway or from Scot Pits Lane. Although the views from the site of the battlefield monument are not particularly good, there are good views within a short distance to north and south of the monument. The most important element of access to the battlefield is however the Scot Pits Lane as it runs approximately along the line of the English deployment and gives excellent views across the presumed Scottish positions.

Research Agenda

Establish the character of the landscape including, which carrs and mires were still existing in 1138 and their exact extent; medieval land use of the battlefield and its immediate context and the degree to which this had evolved by 1138, including the extent of open field, any woodland and moorland.

Until the major road system of the region is better understood and mapped, including issues such as the degree to which particular Roman roads were still in use in the 12th century, the strategic context of the campaign cannot be fully understood.
And the immediate tactical decisions leading up to the battle will not be fully grasped.

The study of the historic terrain and the archaeology of the battle may, by reference to the archaeology of other battlefields, allow some calculation as to the likely numbers involved in the action by calculation of the frontages of the battalia.

Conservation Strategy

Some of the battlefield is under arable, but a substantial part is currently under pasture. All but a small area of this pasture appears to have been cultivated at some point in recent times, judging from the very small area of surviving ridge and furrow, although it is possible that some parts of the battlefield were never cultivated as part of the open field systems of the two townships. The main survival of ridge and furrow is a small area in the northern half of the field to the north east of the northern Standard Hill Farm.

Existing Designations

Threats

The large scale of the Crawford Grange Farm may mean there is the potential for yet further expansion which could impact on the archaeology within and visual character of the battlefield.

The potential impact of cultivation and agricultural chemicals on the survival of any iron arrowheads and other ferrous artefacts within the ploughsoil should be viewed as a potentially major threat to the archaeology of all medieval battlefields.

The loss of access along Scot Pits Lane is a major threat to public access to and interpretation of the battlefield, it having formed a key component of battlefield walks in the past. It was already too overgrown for easy access when Kinross visited in the 1980s.

Management priorities

Addition of Scot Pit Lane to the Definitive Map of Rights of Way on the basis of previous usage, from Barrett in the 1890s to Clark in the 1990s, and the removal of barbed wire and its clearance of invasive trees and shrubs to enable public access.

Conservation Information

Conservation status

Registered Battlefield

Modern administrative areas

North Yorkshire County Council.
Hambleton District Council.
Northallerton & Brompton parishes.

Local Archaeological curator

County Archaeologist, North Yorkshire County Council, Northallerton.

VISITING THE BATTLEFIELD

The value of a site visit

The understanding of the deployments, the historic terrain and the action is better for Northallerton than for many early battles and therefore a visit can be very rewarding. This is the more so given the way in which this battle seems to presage

major tactical developments of succeeding centuries, including the probable use of the longbow as well as dismounted knights.

Despite the lack of footpaths over the site it is possible, if great care is taken, to walk along the verge of the main road and along the Brompton Lane. Most of the battlefield, including both the traditional site and the re-interpreted site as presented here, can be viewed from these roads. However, until and unless the Scot Pits Lane is made accessible once more the value of visiting the battlefield will be substantially curtailed.

Monuments

The Battlefield Monument

At the time of writing (June 2003) the monument has recently been restored. The plaque which was on the monument has been removed and the shield showing an image of a standard has been replaced. The plaque, present in 1999, read:

'THIS MONUMENT
PLACED ON THIS SITE IN 1913 WAS RESTORED BY
HAMBLETON DISTRICT COUNCIL IN 1977
IT COMMEMORATES THE
BATTLE OF THE STANDARD
FOUGHT IN 1138 WHEN AN INVADING FORCE LED
BY KING DAVID OF SCOTLAND
WAS DEFEATED BY AN ARMY RAISED BY
THURSTON ARCHBISHOP OF YORK'

In 1983 Fairbairn noted that the monument 'appears to be much favoured as a roosting place for local birds.'[50] Sadly, judging by the condition of the monument, the same appears to be true today.

Interpretation on site

An interpretation panel has recently been erected immediately adjacent to the monument. This however relates to the traditional siting of the battle arrays and so must be treated with care.

[50] Fairbairn & Cyprien, *A Traveller's Guide to the Battlefields of Britain*, 1983.

Other locations to visit

Museums

None identified with relevant interpretation or finds.

Tourist Offices

Northallerton.

Nearby battlefields

Myton and Boroughbridge: 20 miles.
Byland Abbey: 16 miles.

Other nearby sites of historic military interest

Battlefield visit

Tour map

The battlefield lies on farmland to the north of the town of Northallerton (North Yorkshire). It is normally approach along the A167 Northallerton to Darlington road. There is a lay-by on the east (southbound) side of the road about 2.5 miles from the centre of Northallerton. At the layby there is the battle monument and an information board. This is positioned on the English lines according to the traditional interpretation but near the centre of the battlefield according the re-interpretation presented here.

Walk

3 miles. Along the verge of a major road, so requiring great care. The nearest shops, pubs and other facilities, including toilets, will be founding Northallerton, 2 miles to the south. The walk described here is meant to be used in conjunction with the Battlefield Explorer map, which can be downloaded from the Media Store.

The views presented here are mainly taken from the A167 and the Brompton Lane, with a few from the Scot Pits Lane. The best views of the battlefield and the ones which the commanders on both sides would have enjoyed, are those form the top of the slight north-south ridge that is Standard Hill but are not currently accessible, the Scottish position being on private land and the English position being difficult of access along Scot Pits Lane, though it can just be traversed with great difficulty from the western end.

On the west side of the road opposite the lay-by, no more than 30m into the field is the low scarp dropping down to the wide flat area, extending into several adjacent fields, that represents the site of Cinnamire, which is believed to have been an area of open water or marshland at the time of the battle. This, together with the Great North Road, is likely to have been a key factor in the decisions as to where the English army should deploy.

Although there is an excellent view of the site of Cinnamire from the other side of the road to the lay-by, crossing to the west side of the road is not recommended due to the speed of traffic on the A167.

The only walk, and that recommended by Kinross and by Clarke, is to go north along the verge from the layby through the Scottish lines and turn right into the Brompton Lane, following the Lane southward down to and just beyond the eastern end of the Scot Pits Lane, to the English lines and the area of the main action. The lane is no longer passable from this side and so one has to retrace ones footsteps to the lay-by. Although the A167 road verge is said to be regularly used by walkers it is not a pleasant walk and could be dangerous if not treated with great care, due to the volume and especially the speed of the traffic, while the Brompton Lane, although having far less and slower traffic, is narrow and generally lacks a significant verge. Incidentally, Wainwright's Coast to Coast walk skirts the northern edge of the battlefield.

From the lay-by the southern Standard Hill Farm can be seen on the rise to the east. This is traditionally the site of the English battalia, but in the re-interpretation it is just forward of the Scottish lines.

150 m to the north of the lay-by there is a clear view of the northern Standard Hill Farm, the traditional site of the Scottish battalia.

Immediately north west of the junction of the Brompton Lane with the A167 on the west side of the road the slight scarp is clearly visible close to the edge of the field dropping down into the small basin which was another small carr encompassing the whole of the field at some time in the past.

Take the right hand turn into Brompton Lane which then soon turns right again. About 150m to the east of the Brompton Lane is the former area of marsh known as Leascarr which may have been a significant feature at the time of the battle. It is not however very easily seen fro the Lane due to high hedgerows. Once to the south of Leascarr the ground becomes a wide almost flat plain, the slopes of Standard Hill being very gentle.

When the hedges are well maintained it is possible from various locations along the Brompton Lane to see the dark silhouette of the Pennines to the west, some 15 miles away, and on the east just 5 miles away the North York Moors. From here one can really appreciate what a relatively narrow corridor it was for armies striking south into the heart of England, especially when one then takes into account the vast tracts of land that were marshland or at least very poorly drained in the Vale of York. It is easy to see why so many battles were fought in the narrow strip of Land running south towards York and just beyond.

950 m south of the corner a road joins from the left. The end of Scot Pits Lane is 200m further south on the left, but it is currently impenetrable from this side. Just before the Lane there are views of the Scot Pits fields and just to the south of the Lane is the area of

Standard Leeze, which we have interpreted as the probable position of the centre of the English deployment. From here it is necessary to retrace ones steps.

450 yards (400 m) to the south of the lay-by is the western end of Scot Pits Lane, leading east to the Brampton Lane. It is now somewhat overgrown, especially at the eastern end, and fenced off at both ends with barbed wire. However it is just possible, with great difficulty to penetrate along half its length to gain an excellent view from the centre of the English lines. This lane without doubt provides the best vantage points on the whole battlefield. Clarke found it a cheerless place but on a warm summer afternoon it can be a very pleasant spot, despite its proximity to the busy A167 which is soon left behind. The lane is not currently on the Definitive Map, but a request to add it is pending and the lane appears to have been used for at least the last 100 years by members of the public to visit and view the battlefield.

Drive

Finally, for a broad but distant overview of the landscape the only good option is the brow of the hill (about 2 miles from the battlefield) on the south east side of Brompton. Take the Brompton Lane, possibly the English approach route to the battlefield, south to Brompton (just under 2 miles from the A167 junction). Go through the village and straight on along Banks Road which runs south east from the village, crossing the A684 bypass (about 1.5 miles north east of Northallerton). It rapidly climbs a steep hill from which there are excellent distant views back across the broad plain where the battlefield lies. This lane however is narrow and parking is difficult.

Access Information

Finding The Battlefield

For modern road mapping online follow this link:
http://demo.battlefieldstrust.com/resource-centre/battlefieldsuk/periodpageview.asp?pageid=218&parentid=104

Rights Of Way & Other Access By Foot

There are no rights of way across the battlefield marked on the Ordnance Survey Explorer map or on the Definitive Map of Rights of Way maintained by the County Council. However the Scot Pits Lane has been submitted for inclusion on that map and has long been used by visitors to the battlefield, though today it is heavily overgrown and needs to be cleared.

For further information on Rights of Way or access to land through the Countryside Stewardship scheme follow this link:

http://demo.battlefieldstrust.com/resource-centre/battlefieldsuk/periodpageview.asp?pageid=211&parentid=104

Further Reading – Battlefield Guides

Most battlefield guides devote some space to the Northallerton battle, but the problems with their location of the Scottish and English battle arrays render them of limited value to the visitor other than for the comparison of the two alternatives.

- Burne, *The battlefields of England*, London, Greenhill Books, 1996

A brief discussion only, with no plan.

- Clark, *Battlefield Walks : North*, 1995

Recommends a circular walk, going south past Cinnamire farm and turning left along tn Scotpits Lane then around via Brompton Lane and back along the A167. Whereas in 1995 it was just heavy going, Scot Pits Lane is now impassable.

- Fairbairn & Cyprien, *A Traveller's Guide to the Battlefields of Britain*, 1983

Very poor map. Suggests a circular walk but notes the unsuitability of Scot Pits Lane for the return leg.

- getmapping, 2002, British Battles: Amazing Views

As usual an important resource to complement a visit, which does extend far enough south to encompass the revised interpretation presented here.

- Burne, *The battlefields of England*, London, Greenhill Books, 1996

No walk suggested.

- Kinross, *Walking & Exploring the Battefields of Britain*, 1988

Poor map. Brief text and no walk suggested.

- Kinross, *Discovering Battlefields of England*, 1989

Totally inadequate, distorted plan.

- Matthews, *England versus Scotland*, Barnsley, Leo Cooper, 2003

Brief but useful suggestions for investigating the field.

- Smurthwaite, *The Complete Guide to the Battlefields of Britain*, London, Michael Joseph, 1993

No significant guide information.

- Warner, *British Battlefields: The Definitive Guide to Warfare in England and Scotland*, 2002

Poor plan and no significant guide information.

Acknowledgements

Information was obtained in discussion with Jim Sedgewick and Jennifer Allison of the Northallerton Local History Society. Assistance was also provided by Matthew Bennett and David Hall, regarding the interpretation of the Latin in Ailred's chronicle where he refers to open field.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allison, J. W., R. Hartnup, England Soil Survey of, and Wales. *Soils in North Yorkshire VI : sheet SE 39, Northallerton, Record of the Soil Survey of Great Britain ; no. 68*. Harpenden: Soil Survey of Great Britain, 1981.

Anderson, Alan Orr. *Scottish annals from English chroniclers A.D. 500 to 1286*. London: D.N. Nutt, 1908.

Barrett, C R B. *Battles & Battlefields in England*. London: Innes & Co, 1896.

Barrett, Charles Raymond Booth. *Battles and Battlefields in England*. London: Innes & Co., 1896.

Bell, Graham. *Yorkshire battlefields : a guide to the great conflicts on Yorkshire soil, 937-1461*. Barnsley: Wharncliffe, 2001.

Bradbury, Jim. "Battles in England and Normandy, 1066-1154." *Anglo-Norman Studies* 6 (1984): 1-12.

———. *Stephen and Matilda: The Civil War of 1139-53*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 1998.

Britnell, R. H., A. J. Pollard, Economic, and Council Social Research. *The economic and social history of Northallerton, 1470-1540, End of award report ; no R000233084*.

Burne, Alfred H. *The battlefields of England*. London: Greenhill Books, 1996.

CEI. "Battle of the Standard (Northallerton) 1138: Battlefield Landscape Report." English Heritage, 1994.

Clark, David. *Battlefield Walks : North*, 1995.

Cummins, J. Ildephonsus. *Forgotten fights*. Leeds, 1900.

Dickinson, Gordon. "Britiain's First Road Maps: The Strip Maps of John Ogilby's Britannia 1675." 4, no. 1 (2003): 79-98.

Dodds, Glen Lyndon. *Battles in Britain 1066-1746*, 1996.

Douglas, David Charles, and George William Greenaway. *English historical documents, 1042-1189, English historical documents 2*. London; New York: Eyre Methuen : Oxford University Press, 1981.

Dugdale, William. *The baronage of England, or, An historical account of the lives and most memorable actions of our English nobility*. London: Printed by Tho. Newcomb, 1675.

English Heritage. "Battlefield Report: Northallerton, 1138." English Heritage, 1995.

———. "Register of Historic Battlefields." London: English Heritage, 1995-.

Fairbairn & Cyprien, Niel & Michael. *A Traveller's Guide to the Battlefields of Britain*, 1983.

Forester, Thomas. *The chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon, comprising the history of England, from the invasion of Julius Caesar to the accession of Henry II*. Felinfach: Llanerch, 1991.

Getmapping. *British Battles: Amazing Views*, 2002.

Green, Howard. *Guide to the battlefields of Britain and Ireland*. London: Constable, 1973.

Guest, Ken, and Denise Guest. *British Battles*, 1996.

Hall, Simon. *The Penguin Atlas of British and Irish history*. London: Penguin, 2001.

Hindle Brian, Paul. *Medieval roads, Shire archaeology ; 26*. Aylesbury: Shire, 1982.
Howlett, Richard. *Chronicles of the reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I, Chronicles and memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the Middle Ages*. London: Longman & Co., 1886.
Kinross, John. *Discovering battlefields of England, Discovering series ; no.176*. Princes Risborough: Shire, 1989.
———. *Discovering Battlefields of England*, 1989.
———. *Walking & Exploring the Battefields of Britain*, 1988.
———. *Walking and Exploring The Battlefields of Britain*. Newton Abbot [etc.]: David and Charles, 1988.
Langdale, James. *The History and antiquities of Northallerton, in the county of York*. Northallerton: Printed and sold by J. Langdale ... 1813.
Latham, R E. *Revised Medieval Latin Wordlist*, 1965.
Leadman, Alex. *Battles fought in Yorkshire*, 1891.
Matthews, Rupert. *England versus Scotland*. Barnsley: Leo Cooper, 2003.
Meek, Michael. *A Sketch of the Roads and Villages within five Miles of Northallerton. ... M. Meek delin*, 1810.
Newman Christine, M. *Late medieval Northallerton : a small market town and its hinterland, c. 1470-1540, Studies in North-Eastern history ; no.3*. Stamford: Shaun Tyas, 1999.
Nicholson, Nigel. *The Counties of Britain: A Tudor Atlas by John Speed*, 1988.
Ogilby, John. *Britannia, vol.I : or, An illustration of ye kingdom of England and dominion of Wales, by a geographical & historical description of the principal roads*. (London: A. Duckham, 1939.
Oman, Charles William Chadwick. *A history of the art of war in the middle ages*. London: Methuen & co. ltd, 1924.
Ravenhill, William. *Christopher Saxton's 16th Century maps : the counties of England and Wales*. Shrewsbury: Chatsworth Library, 1992.
Riordan, Michael. *The history of Northallerton : from the earliest times to the year 2000*. Pickering: Blackthorn Press, 2002.
Saywell Joseph, Lemuel. *The history and annals of Northallerton, Yorkshire : with notes and voluminous appendix*. Northallerton ; London: Printed at the office J. Vasey : Simpkin Marshall & co., 1885.
Smurthwaite, David. *The Complete Guide to the Battlefields of Britain*. London: Michael Joseph, 1993.
Strickland, Matthew. "Securing the North: Invasion and the Strategy of Defence in Twelfth-Century Anglo-Scottish Warfare." In *Anglo-Norman Warfare*, edited by Matthew Strickland, 208-229. Bury St Edmunds: Boydell, 2000.
Stubbs, William. *Chronica magistri Rogeri de Houedene, Chronicles and memorials of Great Britain and Ireland during the middle ages ; 51*. London: Longman, 1868.
Tate, William Edward, and Michael Edward Turner. *A Domesday of English enclosure acts and awards, University of Reading, Library, 3*. Reading: The Library University of Reading, 1978.
Toulmin Smith, Lucy. *The itinerary of John Leland in or about the years 1535-1543*. London: Centaur Press, 1964.

Warner, Philip. *British Battlefields: The Definitive Guide to Warfare in England and Scotland*, 2002.
Young, Peter, and John Eric Adair. *Hastings to Culloden*. London: G. Bell, 1964.

