collars. The marked difference of patination between the gable-couples and the later ones is supported by entirely contrasting assembly joints. The gable-couples are halved at their apexes and squint-trenched for their collars, the newer couples bridled at their apexes and with chase-tenoned collars; in addition all the later rafters' feet fit accurately into diminished butt-coggings, whilst the gable-couples were truncated to admit the insertion of the plates sidewise in the level plane.

The fabric, as it has survived, presents many unresolved complexities, but overall, provides the most complete evidence yet available for the ridged roofing in timber of stone buildings during the late Saxon period. The similarity of this roofing method to that surviving over the nave of St Martin's church, Canterbury, and to the Rhenish helm at Sompting, Sussex, is probably conclusive evidence for a widespread use of this type of eaves assembly.

CECIL A. HEWETT and H. M. TAYLOR

14 ST PAUL'S STREET, STAMFORD (Figs. 5 and 6)

No. 14 St Paul's Street was investigated in 1973, when it appeared to have been an aisled hall of the 13th century. Sufficient evidence for a satisfactory understanding of the building was not available, and it had been possible in the past to propose other interpretations of the visible features. Extensive alterations in 1976–77 showed that substantial portions of the 13th-century hall survived within the present house.

The 13th-century house, of which only the hall survives, was of two distinct phases. The first, early 13th-century, hall was of stone, parallel to the road, on the N. side of St Paul's Street, and had a two-bay wall-arcade on the E. gable wall. There is nothing to indicate the number or arrangement of other rooms in this or the next phase. Later in the 13th century the hall, and presumably the rest of the house, was remodelled. The insertion of a three-bay arcade created an aisled hall with a single aisle on the N. side. In the 17th and early 18th centuries this hall was again remodelled to form the present house.

Of the first, early 13th century, phase of the hall only the N. end of the E. gable wall is identifiable, having the N. half of a wall arch which can be reconstructed as part of a two-bay wall-arcade occupying the width of a hall roofed in a single span (Fig. 5, where the later 13th-century roof pitch and eaves level of the front wall have been adopted for the reconstruction). The wall arch was semicircular and of a single chamfered order with a hollow-moulded hood-mould enriched with floral paterae. It springs from an abacus (Fig. 5) which rests on a head corbel with tall foliated top. Below this the jamb of the recess is set back slightly, but it is not clear whether this is original or a later alteration. The surviving part of the wall arcade ends abruptly on the line of the later 13th-century arcade, and S. of this point the wall face has been rebuilt a little further E. thus destroying any other evidence of the wall arches. The date of this rebuilding is earlier than the 17th century, when a fireplace was added against the wall, and could be medieval.

Phase 2, the late 13th-century remodelling, accounts for all of the remaining medieval features of the house. At the W. end of the S. wall is a door with two-centred head, 9 ft 4 in. high. Externally there is a hood-mould, now cut back and plastered over, and a keel-moulded arch rising from shafts with undecorated capitals; internally similar shafts, now mutilated, rose to the rear-arch which is now concealed. To the W. is a short length of external string-course, at springing level, possibly reset. Part of the two-centred rear-arch of a window was found, with chamfered arris and roll-moulded internal hood-mould. This was placed so far to the E. end of the S. wall as to suggest that originally there were two windows lighting the hall on this side. The N. wall, which was lower than in phase 1, had no early features save the E. jamb of a large door directly opposite the door in the S. wall.
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NOTES AND NEWS

The arcade was of three bays; the arcade wall and arches were removed perhaps in the 17th century, when the present floor structure was made using the columns as supports and so ensuring their preservation. The W. respond is half-round; it was partly cut back in the 19th century to accommodate a new fireplace. The W. column is intact with moulded capital and chamfered base (Fig. 6); the E. column remains but is badly damaged. There is no trace of a respond against the E. wall, and the width of the E. bay suggests that it may have been no more than a corbel. On the W. wall of the nave, at the level of the arcade capitals, are two moulded brackets (Fig. 6), one in the SW. corner and the other central. They are 13th-century in date, apparently in situ, and have a projection of eleven inches, though what they supported is not clear. The existence of a third bracket against the respond could not be established. On the E. wall of the nave, set centrally at the level of the top of the former arcade wall, is a 13th-century head corbel of a king.

The roof is heavily smoke-blackened, and although it has been removed from above the aisle, it survives almost intact above the nave. There are fifteen trusses of equal scantling (Fig. 6), each pair of rafters having a collar, two struts above the collar and formerly two braces below, but the braces were removed by c.1800 to provide attic space. The junction of the roof with the front wall could not be measured but was identical with the construction above both the arcade and the aisle wall. Above the arcade are ashlar pieces, and sole pieces trenched to fit over a wall plate that has since been removed. The feet of the aisle rafters survive embedded in the N. wall and show the same construction. All joints are notched laps held by pegs with faceted square heads.

In the 17th century the E. fireplace was inserted and the present upper floor structure built, entailing the removal of the arcade wall. About the same time a first-floor room was constructed above the E. part of the aisle, its stone gable built up on top of the original aisle wall. The present central front door was probably in existence by this time. Robert Hames, a mason who lived here in the early 19th century,44 seems to have been responsible for further alterations including building the present first-floor above the W. end of the aisle. This was done by building a jettied timber-framed wall with a lean-to roof formed of whitewashed scaffolding poles each inscribed with his initials, RH. The front wall was raised and given new windows at about the same time.

The remains of several 13th-century houses are known from Stamford, of which this is perhaps the most complete.45 All are of masonry, and with one possible exception all are parallel to the street. A single column at 53 High Street St Martins is the only other fragment that may have been from an aisled hall. A house with an unaisled ground-floor hall, probably in Water Street, was recorded in the early 19th century.46 and a second house with a two-bay wall arcade at the upper end of the hall survives at 16–17 St Paul’s Street. A single-bay wall arcade was discovered in February 1978 at the W. end of the hall of 12 St Paul’s Street; of 13th-century date it consists of a single chamfered order with a chamfered hood-mould. Above, high in the gable, was a window. The roof includes a truss with parallel rafters. No. 17 St George’s Square was built on a sloping site and had an undercroft which raised the principal storey well above street level. Perhaps the remaining part of the building was the hall, with buttress, string course, and originally an eaves-cornice decorated with masks, while on the rear wall was an elaborate two-light window. Two other ground-floor undercrofts, at 9 St Mary’s Street and perhaps at 7 St Paul’s Street, are not easily datable, while that at 10 St Mary’s Hall is of the 12th century. The one 13th-century house apparently built at right-angles to the street is 13 St Mary’s Hill, which has a vaulted undercroft and two storeys above.

None of these houses gives a clear indication of the entire original plan, but in Stamford all later medieval houses built parallel to the street appear to have conformed to the same general arrangement, with a hall at one end and a storeyed section, presumably including a first-floor chamber, at the other. There is little to suggest that the 13th-century houses listed above did not conform to this general arrangement. Some of the houses with ground-floor undercrofts may have been different, for the dimensions of
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10 St Mary's Hill and 9 St Mary's Street suggest that these two houses may have consisted of two parallel ranges with their gables facing the street.

The social standing of 14 St Paul's Street is indicated by the size of the hall, which is amongst the largest in Stamford, and by the high standard of architectural ornamentation in both the early and late 13th-century phases. This compares favourably with contemporary work in churches in the area, and the same judgement applies to 17 St George's Square. That the house probably had few rooms accords with other evidence for 13th-century urban houses. Size rather than number of compartments was the main criterion of social standing, together with elaboration of ornament. Contemporary descriptions of houses before the mid-14th century rarely mention more than a hall, a chamber, a kitchen and service rooms. The multiplication of rooms, especially of chambers, seems to have been a later phenomenon.

Aisled halls do not appear to have been very common in towns, where space was often at a premium. Several examples are known, some with only one aisle at the back, as at 3-4 West Street, New Romney; the increasing evidence for aisled halls suggests that they may have been less uncommon than has hitherto been supposed. The roof of 14 St Paul's Street is of high quality, neatly made with well-squared straight timbers, unlike the rough carpentry of the roof above the hall of 12 St Paul's Street. In design it compares with other contemporary roofs with open notched lap joints and straight braces; the struts above the collars are a less common feature.

D. A. H. RICHMOND and R. F. TAYLOR

NOTES

42 A. Rogers, Medieval Buildings of Stamford (Stamford Survey Group Report no. 1, 1970), 40 and authorities there cited. The writers are indebted to the Stamford Survey Group for drawing attention to the new evidence, and to Mr Richard Bradshaw, the owner, for his willing co-operation.
43 R.C.H.M., op. cit. note 41, Pls. 62, 63.
44 Ibid., lxxxvii.
45 For the following buildings, see ibid.: 53 High Street St Martins, mono. (232); 17 St George's Square, mon. (297); 10 St Mary's Hill, mon. (336); 13 St Mary's Hill, mon. (338); 9 St Mary's Street, mon. (347); 7 St Paul's Street, mon. (372); 12 St Paul's Street, mon. (375); 16-17 St Paul's Street, mon. (379).
46 Ibid., Pl. 61.

MEDIEVAL LOGBOATS

It has been assumed in the past — and possibly still is assumed — that the many logboats (dugout canoes) found in Britain are prehistoric. Phillips, for example, claimed that the extreme simplicity of the North Stoke logboat indicated that it was produced by an 'early or rude condition of man', that is, by 'Ancient Britons'. Phillips also believed that 'it was adverse to reason' to suppose that logboats were built after the introduction of iron tools which could be used to fashion planks. Even as recently as the 1950s, Holmes and Hayward argued that a Saxon scramasax found in the same gravel pit as the Waltham Cross logboat, 'was clearly of later date' than the boat. This attitude may be contrasted with Wilson's conclusion that many logboats must be of post-Roman date.

There is much documentary evidence for the use of logboats in continental Europe until this century. Lucas has summarized the literary evidence for their use in Ireland until the late 17th century, and he believes it probable that they were used well into the 18th century. Joass, quoting a letter dated 22 May 1798, has argued that logboats