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ODIHAM LODGE, in NE. Hampshire, was built by Edward III during the decade before his death in 1377. It is a rare example of a park lodge built for a medieval English monarch which has survived to the present day. As such, it contributes to our knowledge of the appearance and function of such lodges. Its interest is enhanced by secure tree-ring dates and by the survival of the original building accounts.

The first two volumes of The History of the King’s Works1 embody the standard survey of the buildings of the English monarchy in the Middle Ages. In this survey, and in modern usage generally, the term ‘hunting lodge’ is applied to two classes of building: on the one hand lesser manor houses suitable for aristocratic hunting parties, and on the other much smaller houses for parkers and other servants situated at some distance from an aristocratic residence.2 While the meanings of the modern term ‘hunting lodge’ are fairly clear, what was meant by ‘a lodge’ (loge, loggia) in the Middle Ages is more obscure, and it would certainly be wrong to assume that the ‘loge’ of medieval documents is equivalent to the modern ‘lodge’.3 Indeed, some would go so far as to say, ‘What lodges were, and how they were used, we do not really know. Contemporary records do not tell us, for they assume that everyone knew, and the archaeological evidence is meagre’.4

This paper, which attempts to lift some of this obscurity, arises from the recent identification of a lodge built by Edward III in the royal park at Odiham, Hampshire. Odiham lodge (which was actually called a loggia or loge in contemporary documents) is composed of a fragmentary hall and a well-preserved solar cross-wing. Both are timber-framed, and dendrochronology has provided felling dates for the timbers of the cross-wing (1368–69) and the hall (1375), dates matched by the original building accounts held at the Public Record Office in London.5

This discovery adds to our knowledge of the appearance of medieval park lodges and offers some clues as to how they were used and by whom. Indeed, in the present state of knowledge, the lodge at Odiham may be the only medieval, royal park loge still standing in England. Its recognition is thus a small addition to ‘the history of the king’s works’.
Odiham castle stands c. 1.6 km (1 mile) NW. of the town of Odiham and c. 0.8 km (½ mile) from the western boundary of its park (Fig. 1). There had been a royal residence at Odiham early in the 12th century but the castle, of which the ruins still remain, was built by King John in the early 13th century. By the 14th century, accommodation at the castle included the ledene chamber (presumably with a lead roof), the king's chamber, a chamber for the queen, a chapel, a hall, and the usual service buildings. In the late 15th century, the castle was said to be in a ruinous state. Little seems to have been spent on repairs thereafter, and it had probably fallen into irremediable decay by the mid 16th century.

Odiham park was apparently in existence long before King John came there to enjoy the pleasures of the hunt, for Hugh the Parker was living at Odiham in 1130-31, and land for the castle was appropriated from Robert the Parker by King John. The park lodge was already standing in 1291-92 when it was in need of repair. It was situated beside a bridge over the river Whitewater in 1332-33 and was rebuilt between 1368 and 1375, apparently on the same site. Medieval records imply that it was then the only dwelling within the park, and it is shown as such on Godson’s map of Odiham drawn in 1739.

DESCRIPTION OF ODIHAM LODGE

Odiham lodge, or Lodge Farm as it is now called, is a building of several periods. Edward III’s cross-wing is little altered, but his hall has been substantially rebuilt and only its roof-timbers, apparently raised on later brick walls, survive (Fig. 2). Several, post-medieval additions serve to create the present, rambling farmhouse.

The cross-wing is a two-bay structure approximately 5.2 m (17 ft) wide and 8.2 m (27 ft) long externally. The roof was hipped at both ends, the northern hip surviving intact. The existence of a former southern hip is shown by a spare tenon at the tip of the collar purlin, but the hip rafters were removed in the 17th century when the S. end of the cross-wing was rebuilt in brick with a Dutch gable.

Apart from the rebuilt S. wall, enough of the external framing survives for it to be possible to suggest a reconstruction of the original appearance of the cross-wing (Fig. 3). The building is framed in large panels and with a mixture of head (arch) and foot (tension) bracing. The one surviving window (at the N. end) is small and undecorated, and has no rebate for window glass.

Internally, a solar, which occupies the entire first floor, was apparently the principal private chamber in the house. It has few decorative features. Two unchamfered braces spring from a simple crown post. The arch-braced tie beam which spans the centre of the room has a bold but plain chamfer, as do the wall plates. The timbers are of good quality and impressive section (as is not unusual in 14th-century houses) but there is a complete absence of moulding or carving, and no evidence of paintwork. The only indication of luxury is the framed space in the rafters of the W. side of the roof (Fig. 4). Although the surrounding timbers are unsoted, this curious feature is perhaps best explained as a relic of some kind of
smoke-hood or small chimney for a brazier. It is certainly an original feature, for the horizontal member is not attached to the adjacent rafters by slip tenons, or other evidence of secondary work.

The ground floor of the cross-wing was occupied by a divided service area. Stave holes and mortices for large, curved braces in the soffit of the cross-beam

FIG. 1
Places in the vicinity of Odiham mentioned in the text. Inset: Odiham lodge, castle and town.
FIG. 2
Odiham lodge: plan, cross sections, and long section.
FIG. 3
Odiham lodge: Edward III's hall and cross-wing. (A reconstruction).
show where the partition was made. Large, flat mortices in both faces of this crossbeam indicate the original housing for floor joists.

The hall of 1375 has been destroyed apart from the smoke-blackened rafters in a block at right angles to the cross-wing. The number and size of these rafters suggest that the dimensions of the medieval hall roughly corresponded with the dimensions of the present block below. This block is constructed of brick and appears to date from the 18th century. A chimney with early, two-inch thick, bricks has been built in the E. end of this block and abutting the cross-wing. A shadow on the W. face of this chimney indicates the apex of an earlier roof of a similar height to that of the cross-wing.
Such evidence is too slight to allow firm conclusions as to the original position or dimensions of the hall. However, it could be plausibly suggested that the chimney was inserted in the low end of the hall at a time which may be indicated by the felling date-range of its mantel-beam (1544–49), although the tree-ring matches were not nearly so strong as in the 14th-century samples, and that the hall was rebuilt in brick in the 18th century when its roof was raised but the medieval rafters retained. Unfortunately, these rafters have been re-assembled in such a way as to render any view on the original roof-construction of the hall somewhat speculative.

**THE BUILDING OF THE LODGE**

In 1993, the construction date of Lodge Farm was unknown and a dendrochronological survey of the hall and cross-wing was commissioned. Fortunately, several timbers retained complete sapwood and had a long sequence of tree-rings whose profile correlated closely with master chronologies. Consequently it was possible to obtain precise felling dates for the cross-wing (1368–69) and for the smoke-blackened rafters of the hall (1375). Corresponding references to the construction of the lodge in Odiham park (la loge infra parcum) were found in building accounts covering the years 1366–70 and 1373–77 (see below). Thus it was revealed that Lodge Farm was Edward III’s loge.

Although dendrochronology can provide a felling date, it cannot determine a building date. However, it is believed that oak was almost always used freshly-felled (or ‘green’), an assumption confirmed in this case by the building account covering the period ending in 1370. Thus dendrochronology provides a terminus post quem of 1368–69 for the construction of the cross-wing, while documentation gives a terminus ad quem of 1370. As for the hall, the felling date of 1375 for the rafters can be linked with the building account of 1373–77 which refers to payment of William Tiler for roofing the lodge within the park. This cannot possibly mean the roofing of the cross-wing which had been tiled by 1370.

The only detailed building account for Odiham lodge deals with the cross-wing, fortunately the best-preserved part of the building. The account also covers work on Odiham castle and records the repair of the castle with timber felled in Odiham park. It is probable that timber for the lodge came from the same source.

To begin with, the old lodge had to be demolished. Twenty pence was paid for stripping the tiles from its roof, a sum that implies a decision to save the undamaged ones for reuse. When work started on the new lodge, eleven carters took one whole day to transport timber and four sawyers were occupied for a total of 122 working-days. Once the timber had been prepared, nine carpenters constructed the frame, a task that took at least the 77 days that the master carpenter was on site. To complete the cross-wing, payment was made in daubacione, that is for plastering or whitewashing the walls, and a tiler fixed 2500 newly-bought, plain tiles (and some re-used ones) as well as hip (heppetille) and ridge tiles.
MEDIEVAL LODGES

In modern usage, the term 'hunting lodge' embraces not only the relatively lowly lodges built for foresters and parkers, but also the larger and more sumptuous dwellings of those who owned the forests and parks. Thus, a royal hunting lodge may now denote a king's rural residence, no matter how spacious. Even the magnificent royal house at Clarendon (Wilts.), which has reasonably been called 'a palace', has also been dubbed 'a royal lodge'.

The precise meaning of the medieval term 'loge' or 'loggia' is less clear. It seems rarely, if ever, to have been applied to principal residences, such as Clarendon palace, which were generally called 'the king's houses', domus regis. Instead, a loge seems to have been a subsidiary or satellite dwelling situated at some distance from a principal residence. Thus, Odiham lodge was almost a mile away from its principal dwelling, Odiham castle; and Edward III built similar park lodges at a distance from Clarendon palace, from Leeds castle (Kent), and from his manor house at Isleworth (Middlesex).

For whom were these satellite buildings intended? Some may have been constructed as subsidiary dwellings, to be briefly occupied by royalty and aristocrats; the kind of luxurious and often fanciful buildings with a recreational function that became popular in the 16th century, and which were certainly then called 'lodges'. Perhaps Edward III's Ha1teburgh lodge in the New Forest may just fall into this category. It had a great chamber and chapel for the king but it cost only £140. This was a trifling amount beside Edward's more ambitious building projects although considerably more than the £19 spent on the cross-wing at Odiham lodge.

Most loges, however, were satellite buildings of a humbler nature, situated in a park and designed mainly for the use of the keeper of a park or warren. For example, in 1446-47, Henry VI granted the keepership of Byfleet park (Surrey) to John Penycock, who was to have the 'loge for keping of the conynes (rabbit warren) ther'. Certainly, in the magnificently detailed medieval records of the bishopric of Winchester, the bishop's residences are distinguished from the much smaller lodges which were always satellite dwellings, and apparently never occupied by the bishop. In these records, the word 'loge' was reserved exclusively for park lodges of this latter sort.

Documentary evidence suggests that royal lodges, too, were relatively small, with few chambers and ancilliary buildings. Thus, the principal, royal residence at King's Langley (Herts.) in the 14th century had chambers for the queen, the prince, and for various distinguished members of the household, a hall, chapel, cellar, and numerous service rooms. Against this, apart from outbuildings, the lodge in the great park there had but a hall and chamber.

The limited accommodation at such lodges is reflected in the modest expense of building them. Towards the end of Edward III's reign a royal lodge was built at Flitteris (Rutland) for little more than £13 and another at Isleworth (Middlesex) for a similar sum. These figures are comparable with the £12 16s. expended in 1356 on building a timber-framed lodge in the bishop of Winchester's park at Bishop's Sutton (Hants.). This lodge seems to have contained only two rooms,
divided by a partition and was specifically called a parker’s house, *domus parcarii*.

Nevertheless, regardless of intended use, even small lodges could be valuable shelters for the king and his private household when they found themselves unexpectedly at a distance from larger and more luxurious accommodation. They might also serve as staging posts during the king’s travels. For example, Edward III and his *privata familia* stayed at the lodge near Wodeforde (perhaps Woodford in Essex) when travelling between Westminster and Rotherhithe in May 1361.

The structural, or archaeological, evidence for the nature of medieval park lodges is of equivocal value without parallel documentation. Thus, an excavation report on ‘King John’s Hunting Lodge, Writtle, Essex’ is an important account of a medieval building which, however, appears only to have been called ‘the king’s house at Writtle’ in contemporary documents. Similarly, without clear documentary evidence, it has been debated whether Thetford Priory’s lodge in Thetford Warren (Norfolk) was ‘almost certainly a dwelling of the prior’s gamekeeper’, or a recreational home occupied for short periods by the lord with a reduced household.

In two instances at least (apart from Odiham lodge) documentary evidence seems sufficient to support the claim that standing structures are the surviving remains of buildings that were called lodges in the Middle Ages. The first to be identified was a 15th-century lodge in Hatfield Forest (Essex) which Rackham believed was ‘a unique survival; as far as I know, it is the only medieval Forest Lodge of which any particle remains above ground’. Although built for the Duke of Buckingham, this small, timber-framed lodge was intended for the forester’s occupation. More recently, a 15th-century park lodge at Kingston Lacy (Dorset) has been recognized. Although stone-built, with some refined features, it is relatively small (11.1 m by 6.2 m), intended for a park-keeper, and a satellite dwelling c. 500 m distant from a principal, aristocratic residence. Thus the limited archaeological evidence so far available tends to support the documentary evidence on the nature of medieval lodges.

Finally, an aristocratic building which should not be confused with a medieval *loge* is the standing. This was an open-sided grandstand from which distinguished visitors could watch ceremonial hunts (a notable example being Henry VIII’s Great Standing in Epping Forest (Essex)). A standing was effectively an observation tower, whereas a lodge was a domestic building. Furthermore, the buildings which accommodated large numbers of an aristocratic household, and which are now conveniently called ‘lodging ranges’, do not seem to have been referred to as *loges* in medieval documents. For example, at Bishop’s Waltham (Hants) the lodging range within the *curia* was called ‘the long building’ (*domus longa*) when it was erected in 1438–42, whereas the term ‘loge’ was reserved for the lodge in the adjacent park.

**Odiham Lodge**

How then should we interpret the lodge at Odiham? Was it a recreational building for Edward III, a residence for a park keeper, or did it serve both purposes?
If the king himself intended to visit Odiham lodge, he would have been well aware that more spacious and regal accommodation was at his disposal at Odiham castle, less than a mile away — a trivial distance on horseback. However, he may have wished for an obscure retreat where he could escape from the formality of the Court with a few intimate friends. As he grew older, Edward increasingly favoured such retreats, and maintained a ring of satellite houses around Windsor castle, so that in whatever part of the Forest he chose to hunt there was a house at which he could eat and sleep. Odiham lodge may have served a similar purpose. In spite of its meagre size and lack of royal decoration it was, after all, the king’s house. Edward had paid for it and could use it as he chose.

Moreover, it may be significant that there was a herbarium, a pleasure garden for royalty, in the park and thus at some distance from the castle. This garden was newly made against Edward I’s arrival in 1291–92, and in 1332–33, early in Edward III’s reign, it was enclosed within a boarded fence in which were doors, and furnished with a garderobe screened by a hedge, and had turf-covered benches. The existence of this royal, pleasure ground in the park may perhaps indicate that the park lodge, too, was used for kingly recreation.

On balance, however, the documentary evidence suggests that the lodge was a working residence for the parker. It was called the park keeper’s house in the park, domus parcarii in parco, in 1291–92 and was still called ‘the keeper’s lodge’ in 1630. Furthermore, Edward III could hardly have had much personal use for the lodge, for his visits to Odiham were infrequent and he seems not to have visited at all in the 1370s, after the rebuilding of the lodge. Furthermore, the naming of Edward III’s private chamber in Odiham castle (camera regis in castro) cannot be matched by a similar reference to a room at the lodge.

The relative status of Odiham lodge is reflected in the records of Edward III’s expenditure on his building projects. He spent over £50,000 on his favoured residence at Windsor, whereas at Odiham castle, which was not a major residence, he spent only in the region of £450 on repairs in the ten years after 1366. Yet refurbishing the king’s chamber at the castle cost over £59 in 1366–70, three times the £19 14s. 9½d. spent on entirely rebuilding the cross-wing at the lodge. Such considerations do not belittle the significance of Odiham lodge, but serve to place it in context.

Turning to the structural evidence, the lodge is (in comparison with other royal buildings) notable for its modest size, its lack of ornamentation, and its timber-framed construction. In Hampshire, where good building-stone was scarce, timber-framing was almost universal for the houses of ordinary people in the late Middle Ages. Thus stone buildings were a mark of wealth and status, while timber-framing was rarely used for the principal rooms in aristocratic houses.

The minimal ornamentation at Odiham lodge is also somewhat less than regal, and its general plainness at odds with Edward III’s ‘fastidious taste’ and demand for a high standard of accommodation. The size of the lodge, too, is small indeed when set beside other solar cross-wings built for a king or an aristocrat in late 14th-century Hampshire; for example those at Portchester castle and East Meon (Fig. 5). And not only did Odiham castle dwarf the park lodge nearby, but
Comparative plans and sections of Odiham lodge and (a) the cross-wings of two aristocratic houses in Hampshire: those at Portchester castle built by Richard II in 1396–99, and at East Meon built by William of Wykeham in 1395–97. Odiham lodge is much smaller, is timber-framed, and lacks an inner room en suite; (b) two late-medieval houses in High Street, Odiham. Both are town houses with a two-bay solar similar in size to the lodge, but the George Inn is superior in having an inner room like the aristocratic houses above.
the number and quality of its chambers greatly outshone the humble hall and cross-wing of the lodge. In fact, Odiham lodge is closely similar to the medieval cross-wings which still stand in Odiham town, buildings which could be readily associated with prosperous merchants or minor gentry (Fig. 5). A similar point is made by Rackham with regard to Hatfield Forest lodge (Essex) which is also a timber-framed building comprising a two-bay solar over services, originally linked to an open hall. 'It was a plain, workaday building with little ornament. Its size . . . suggests a middle-class dwelling'.

Thus on both documentary and structural evidence, it would seem that Odiham lodge was built primarily to house the keeper of the king’s park, an official who was far from being a humble menial. William Prest, the parker at the time when the lodge was rebuilt, had been granted the keepership of the park and an annuity for life of 100L by Queen Philippa in 1366, a sum sufficient to support the estate of a gentleman. His position was confirmed in 1370, at which time he was yeoman of the king’s buttery, and confirmed again by Richard II in 1378. Prest probably retained the office until 1394 when a new appointment was made.

As a gentleman, Prest would have been expected to oversee the park, although not to engage in the menial tasks involved in its upkeep. He had been hiring men to work on the royal park at King’s Langley (Herts.) as early as 1363 and was involved with payment for the cross-wing at Odiham about six years later.

Such administrative work, however, is unlikely to have been unduly onerous and the office of keeper was generally granted as a reward for good service. Prest had been Queen Philippa’s yeoman of the buttery when first granted the keepership in 1366 and was serving the king in the same capacity when his office was confirmed in 1370. His successor was made parker at Odiham specifically for good service to Richard II and his late queen. Such patronage was common on other large estates. The 15th-century records of the bishopric of Winchester show how frequently the bishops’ valets were rewarded with the keeperships to his parks for good and faithful service.

Apart from the salary and perquisites of the keepership, William Prest would have enjoyed the right to occupy the lodge when the king had no need of it. This would have been a suitable base from which to oversee the management of the park. It would also have been a more personal asset, ensuring accommodation on the occasions when the royal household was at Odiham with the consequent intense pressure for lodgings.

CONCLUSION

Odiham lodge is, in the present state of knowledge, a rare example of a surviving medieval park lodge which was actually called a lodge by contemporaries. Its interest is enhanced both by firm tree-ring dates which shows it to have been built by Edward III, and by supporting documentation. The weight of evidence points towards its principal use as a park keeper’s lodge, but it may occasionally have been a building associated with the king’s private recreation. It is to be hoped
that its publication will encourage others to identify further examples of these buildings so that they can be more fully understood.

APPENDIX: THE BUILDING ACCOUNT OF THE SOLAR CROSS-WING

An account rendered by Richard Bernard, clerk of works at Odiham Castle, of building expenses incurred between May 1366 and September 1370. The account deals with work on several chambers within the castle for which timber was cut in Odiham Park. It also deals with various outbuildings and the park lodge. Only this last section has been translated. The word 'repair' in the first entry of the account presents an apparent difficulty, for a careful examination of the timbers of the lodge cross-wing shows that they were assembled in one building campaign and without reused timbers. The solution lies in the fact that the word 'repair' (reparacw) in medieval documents often denotes a complete rebuilding. For example, the remodelling of Westminster Hall and the entire renewal of its roof in 1393–99 was recorded as a reparacio.

Cost of the building called the Lodge (la loge) within the Park

The same (i.e. Richard Bernard) accounts for 300 plank-nails (planchenaill) bought to repair the same building, 5s. 3d.

And in 200 board-nails (bordnail) bought wholesale (in grosso), 11d.

And for 2000 latch-nails (lathnail) bought, 2s. 8d.

And for three iron bands bought for the said works, 16d.

And for 2500 flat tiles (pleyntill) bought for the said works, 10s.

And for 100 hip tiles (heppetille) and ridge tiles (crestes) bought for the said works, 3s. 8d.

And for seven quarters, six bushels of lime bought wholesale (in grosso), 6s. 3d.

And for four pairs of twists and hooks (twistes & hokes) bought, 3s. 8d.

And for the tiler of the said building paid according to an agreement, 8s. 8d.

And for plastering/whitewashing (in daubacione) the said building according to an agreement, 15s. 2d.

And for taking down the old tiles there according to an agreement, 20d.

And for the wages of one carpenter working there for 77 days at 8d. a day, 51s. 4d.

And for the wages of five carpenters working there on the said work for 275 days between them all, each taking 6d. a day, £6 17s. 6d.

And for the wages of three carpenters working there on the said works for 133 days between them all, each taking 5½d. a day, 6os. 11½d.

And for the wages of four sawyers sawing timber there on the said works for 122 days between them all, each taking 5d. a day, 5os. 10d.

And for the wages of three lath-makers working and making laths there for nine days between them all, each taking 5d. a day, 3s. 9d.

And for the wages of eleven carters carrying timber there for one day, each taking 12d. a day, 1ls.

And for the wages of thirteen carters carrying tiles, lime, and various other items there for one day each, each taking 8d. a day, 8s. 8d.

And for the wages of 46 labourers working there for one day each, each taking 3d. a day, 11s. 6d.

Sum total, £19 14s. 9½d.

THE BUILDING ACCOUNTS AND THE EXISTING BUILDING By D. H. MILES

While many medieval building accounts have survived, it is rare indeed to be able to match accounts against existing buildings — especially small, timber-framed buildings such as Odiham lodge. This presents an important opportunity to discuss medieval building practice.
The accounts list materials (giving quantities and values) and labour (recording trades and daily wages, except for the tiler and plasterer who had agreed fixed prices for their tasks).

**Tiles**

The present cross-wing roof has an area of 850 sq. ft. The roof of the previous cross-wing was probably of a similar area. Stripping such a roof is not wholly skilled work and could be accomplished by a tiler and two labourers in about two days (six man-days in all). At Woodstock (Oxon), in 1365, tilers were earning 4d. per day and labourers 3d. If the Odiham team were paid the same rates, this would accord exactly with the 20d. recorded in the Odiham accounts for taking down the old tiles.

The accounts record 2500 flat tiles bought for 10s. As the present roof requires approximately 4500 tiles, 2000 tiles must have been salvaged from the previous cross-wing. Medieval tiles were of relatively poor quality and a salvage rate of 50% might be expected. To roof the cross-wing, about 180 bonnet hips (heppetille) and 15 ridge tiles (crestes) would be required. As these quantities are about double what was purchased, a similar salvage rate is implied.

The cost of the tiles closely corresponds with prices recorded elsewhere at the same period, but the payment to the tiler of 8s. 8d. is more problematic. In order to earn this sum, a tiler (at 4d. a day) and two labourers (at 3d. a day) would need to work for ten days — twice as long as a similar team today. Perhaps this discrepancy may be explained by the need for the medieval tiler to make and supply his own tile-pegs, and to bed the tiles on a mortar or straw torching.

**Laths**

The quantity and price of laths is not given, presumably because all timber came from the king's own park or woodland and was thus not purchased. However, the labour cost of producing the laths was 3s. 9d. What quantity of laths could be made for this sum? In 1366, lath-makers at Windsor were paid 5s. per 1000 for laths made of heartwood but only 2s. 6d. for those made of sapwood. As the cost of making laths is the same for heartwood and sapwood, the difference in price (2s. 6d.) was the labour cost of 1000 laths. At Sheppey (Kent) in the same year, the labour cost per 1000 laths was 1s. 8d. Therefore the Odiham lath-makers (who were paid 3s. 9d.) would have made 1500 laths at Windsor rate, or 2500 laths at the Sheppey rate. Assuming that the medieval lath was generally five feet long, the Odiham lath-makers would have produced between 7500 and 11250 feet of laths.

An apparent discrepancy now arises. The roof area of the lodge cross-wing would require approximately 2500 ft of laths, or 500 individual laths, leaving between 1000 and 1750 laths (or 5000 and 8750 ft) unaccounted for. This discrepancy is paralleled by the 2000 lath-nails purchased for the lodge. Each lath would lie across four rafters and would be fixed by four nails (allowing one nail per rafter). Four nails multiplied by 500 laths gives precisely the 2000 nails purchased, but still leaves 1000 to 1750 laths with no means of fixing them.

The building itself may provide the solution to this apparent difficulty. A corner post (marked C in Fig. 2) has an exposed vertical groove 1⁄8 in. deep by 1⁄4 in. wide and set back 3 inches from the outside face of the post, behind the wall-braces. It is likely that this groove was intended to receive infill panels made of riven laths, woven around staves, and tucked into lath-grooves in the vertical members. The total wall area of the cross-wing, including the partition for the divided service, is approximately 1023 sq. ft. (not deducting for window or door openings). Allowing for laths to be 1 3⁄4 in. thick, about 1600 laths (or 8000 ft.) would be required, comfortably within the 1000–1750 laths (5000–8750 ft.) surplus already calculated.
**Nails and ironwork**

Apart from the lath-nails, 300 plank-nails were bought, probably to fix the floor boards in the solar floor. Each board would lie over eleven joists, including the side-girts and, if nailed with one nail per joist (with side-to-side fixing), would require eleven nails. Assuming each board was about 12 in. wide, and given the solar length of about 27 ft., 297 plank-nails would be required, leaving three surplus.

The 200 board-nails bought would probably have been used for making doors and window-shutters. The three iron bands were probably strap hinges, implying a heavy door.

**Plastering/whitewashing**

Earning 4d. a day, a team of four plasterers would earn the cost of plastering and whitewashing the building (15s. 2d.) in about four weeks; a not unreasonable time for the job in modern terms.

**Lime**

The seven quarters of lime bought would only have been sufficient for making lime mortar to bed the tiles and to build a foundation plinth (probably with flints which are locally abundant). Therefore it is unlikely that lime would have been used in the daub for the infill panels of the walls, a clay-based daub being more suitable.

**Masonry**

Apart from plastering, no wet trades are mentioned. No mason was engaged to build a plinth wall or to make a hearth for the solar fire (evidenced by the trimmed rafters — see Fig. 2). This presents an unsolved problem.
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