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While archaeological techniques are now commonly applied to the study of houses of medieval and Tudor date, less attention is generally being paid to the methodical investigation of those of the 17th and later centuries. Alongside the essentially single-period houses, which comprise the text-book examples and command the lion’s share of attention, there is a far greater number of buildings where important evidence of 17th- and 18th-century structure survives, but is enmeshed amongst work of other eras. Houses that have suffered extensive alteration, or mutilation, are too often set aside by scholars as being unworthy of detailed scrutiny.

Over the past thirty-five years I have carried out archaeologically-based studies on a variety of post-Tudor houses, ranging from humble rectory to episcopal palace, and from farmhouse to castle. Upon close scrutiny, the majority turned out to be hybrid structures, even if this was not initially apparent. Unexpected, and in some cases quite remarkable, discoveries came to light, enabling the often-complex structural histories of these houses to be appreciated. The volume of fresh information resulting from in-depth studies of larger buildings such as Fulham Palace, Combe Abbey (Warwickshire) and Herstmonceux Castle (Sussex) has been overwhelming. Smaller houses have yielded fascinating evidence too. In this paper I shall discuss the structural histories of two modest-sized Gloucestershire houses where recent restoration projects have been coupled with archaeological investigation. Both are important for their 17th-century fabric. What follows is no more than a brief summary: full reports will be published in due course.

DANEWAY HOUSE, BISLEY

The minor medieval manor of Daneway, lying in a remote corner of the historic parish of Bisley adjacent to Sapperton, is documented from the early 14th century. The first reference to buildings dates from 1340, when Daneway's tenants, Henry and Maud Clifford, obtained a licence for an oratory.¹

Although the oratory is no longer identifiable, the medieval great hall still survives: its date has long been uncertain, but there has been a general presumption in favour of the 15th century. In an attempt to refine the chronology of Daneway, a series of timber cores was taken from the roof structure of the great hall in 1994, and dated by dendrochronology to 1315.² It is thus now clear that the surviving great hall and solar were constructed in the second decade of the 14th century, and they form the nucleus of a complex house that has been enlarged and modified on
many subsequent occasions, culminating in the addition of a tower-like structure of 17th-century date (Fig. 1).

The building has not been substantially altered since the tower was erected. Remarkably, no Georgian or Victorian reception rooms were created, and the house has never been provided with a main stair. By the end of the 19th century Daneway was semi-ruinous, and in 1908 it was leased to Ernest Gimson and the Barnsley brothers, who established their noted Arts and Crafts furniture workshop in the outbuildings there, while the house itself served as a showroom. Later, it was the home of the architect Oliver Hill. In 1993 Daneway was sold by the Bathurst Estate to Mr. Nicholas Spencer, who has carried out a painstaking restoration, and who commissioned an archaeological study in order to inform the work. Over the course of nearly a century, Daneway House has been visited by scores, if not hundreds, of architectural historians, and opinions have been expressed on matters of detail. Although the subject of various articles, neither the structure as a whole, nor any of its components, has hitherto been comprehensively studied. The principal account of the house, published by Country Life in 1929, is seriously erroneous.

During refurbishment works, it was possible to see behind modern decorative finishes, to examine walls stripped of plaster, to investigate beneath floors, and to ascertain structural sequences between all the component parts of the house. A complete reappraisal of the architectural history of Daneway has thereby been facilitated.

On the accompanying plans, rooms are numbered according to the 1994 survey. Reconstructed floor plans have been created to illustrate the principal periods.
DANEWAY HOUSE  Period 1

Fig. 2. Daneway House: reconstructed plans of the medieval hall.

Period 1: The Great Hall and Solar (Fig. 2)
The core of the house is a rectangular structure of three bays, with gables to east and west and a continuous, steeply pitched roof between. The house was built on ground that falls gently from east to west. Thus the eastern gable end was dug into the hillside, while the western was externally strengthened by three buttresses.

Internally, the house was divided into two parts by a stone cross-wall. The eastern two thirds comprised the great hall, which was internally open for its full height (10). At the east or ‘high’ end of the hall would have been a dais upon which the table stood. Light was provided by windows to north and south. Close to one of these stood a stone lectern from which readings were made while the family was dining. In origin, this was an ecclesiastical practice, but it became popular in secular households in the 14th century. Vestigial evidence for an opening through the wall has been noted at the south-east corner of the hall: a latrine projection is a possibility.

At the west or ‘low’ end of the hall was a timber screen which defined the screens passage, between the north and south doors. Apart from a single recycled timber, the screen has been lost. Just east of the screen lay an open hearth, the smoke from which rose to a vent in the roof above. The roof timbers over the middle bay of the house are heavily encrusted with soot.

The western one third of the house was vertically divided into a ground floor space and an upper chamber. The lower room, which was entered from a central doorway in the screens passage, was an undercroft for storage, is likely to have been referred to as the celarium (6). It was probably lit by a slit window in the west gable, and possibly another in the south wall. The upper room, which was provided with a canopied fireplace and a substantial window in the gable end, was clearly the private apartment, which doubled as both a sitting room and a bed chamber (i.e. the solar: 25). The room was entered from a gallery (20) running above the screens passage, and there must have been a timber stair giving access, from either the passage or the hall.

The survival of two thirds of the original oak roof structure is an especially fine feature of Daneway. It has also allowed the building to be closely dated, to 1315, by dendrochronology. The stone arched doorway on the south is original, and was the principal entrance. Its present counterpart on the north is a little later in date, probably replacing a narrower doorway. None
of the original windows survives intact, owing to enlargement in later centuries, but their positions have been established.

The medieval plan of Daneway is unusual in that the private apartments were normally adjacent to the high end of the hall, and not at the service end, as seen here. Natural topography was in part responsible for the unconventional arrangement. However, the quality of the workmanship, in both masonry and carpentry, shows that the house was by no means a humble dwelling, yet at the same time it was not in the premier league of manor houses. All this makes detailed interpretation difficult. Domestic cooking is likely to have taken place in the hall, over the hearth, since Daneway was probably not grand enough to have had a detached kitchen. But that cannot be ruled out.

**DANEWAY HOUSE**  Period 2

Fig. 3. Daneway House: reconstructed plans showing late medieval additions.

**Period 2: Medieval Enlargement** (Fig. 3)
The house was enlarged in three directions, by the addition of small wings to the east and north-west, and a porch on the south. There was possibly also a south-west wing added alongside the porch, making the plan 'T'-shaped. While the building became progressively more complex in the 14th and early 15th centuries, the relative order in which the wings were added cannot be determined with certainty because they are separate structures with no stratigraphic links. However, it seems likely that the southern and western adjuncts antedated the eastern.

The north-west wing was single storied and comprised a small room (7) that presumably had an outside door on the east (where the bake-oven now is). It also connected with the undercroft (6), via a doorway that was later blocked by a fireplace. From its position, room 7 ought to have had a service function, a dairy being the most likely choice. Curiously, the room had two tiny but ornate 14th-century windows high up in its walls: one is of trefoil form, the other a slit with an ogee head (both are now just above an inserted floor, in room 26). Assuming these features are *in situ*—and there is no specific evidence either way—they are not readily compatible with a service function. They are exactly the kind of windows that might have been in the oratory.
However, neither the plan nor the location of room 7 is indicative of such a use. Nevertheless, the possibility of a later conversion is worth bearing in mind (see below).

A porch (3) was added on the south, enclosing the main entrance to the house. Of the medieval structure only part of the west wall remains, and in this is a 14th-century ogee-headed doorway. The position and modest size of the doorway suggest that it was not the entrance into a new south-west wing, but that it led into a restricted space which was closely integrated with the porch. The circumstances are suggestive of a stair-turret giving access to a room above the porch. Two-storied porches began to appear on superior houses in the 14th century.

The upper room (22) would have been suitable for a domestic oratory, the provision of which (but not the location) is recorded in 1340. Moreover, the two tiny windows noted above would have been ideal in the east and south walls, respectively. The existing stone doorway giving access to the upper room (from the main landing) is probably a 15th-century modification, and the original entry is likely to have been from the stair on the west.

If there was a stair-turret integral with the porch, as suggested, it could also have provided a new access to the solar, and incorporated a latrine shaft. The solar became the 'great chamber', and private access and latrine facilities might be expected.

The possibility that there was a service wing on the south-west (including a kitchen) deserves serious consideration. The undated (but seemingly medieval) foundations discovered in 1995 during trenching for services, immediately south-west of the house, could well be relevant.

The third addition to the house comprised a square, single-storied room adjacent to the east end of the hall, with an interconnecting doorway behind the high table (room 11). This was clearly a parlour, and was probably created in the earlier 15th century. It was dug into the hillside, had windows on the north and south, and would almost certainly have had a fireplace in the east wall (where there is now a much later one).

**Period 3: Tudor Improvements** (Fig. 4)

Open halls with central hearths were falling out of fashion in the later 15th century, and at Daneway the usual conversion took place. A massive, free-standing stone fireplace and chimney were erected inside the west end of the hall, against the screens passage. The height of the hall was reduced by inserting a heavy oak-beamed ceiling at eaves level. At the same time the lighting was improved by widening the two side windows. The stone reading desk was broken up, and its fragments incorporated in the stack.

The entrance to the hall, from the screens passage, lay between the fireplace and the south wall. The corresponding space on the north side (where the stair to the gallery previously was) was made into a tiny room (9) with a slit window. The commonest use for the space beside the fireplace was to house a newel stair leading to chambers above the hall. However, there are problems with this interpretation: Daneway is unusual in that the considerable space in the roof directly above the hall was never adapted for domestic accommodation. Hence, any stair in this position led only to an attic, not to chambers. Alternatively, the tiny room could have housed a latrine although, owing to the rising ground outside, no effective drain or soakaway could be constructed here.

The service rooms at the west end of the house were re-arranged and extended in the 16th century, and the former undercroft (6) assumed a new function. It became a staircase hall, and in it was constructed a new dog-leg stair leading to the first and second floors. On the first floor a landing was created out of the southern part of the great chamber to accommodate the new stair (24). The arrangement can be reconstructed with confidence from vestigial evidence. The great chamber and the room above the porch (oratory?) were now entered from the new landing.
Fig. 4. Daneway House: reconstructed plans showing Tudor modifications.
A doorway was broken through the north wall of the great chamber, to connect with the upper part of the earlier north-west wing (room 26). This formerly single-storied space must now have had a floor inserted. The use of the new room 26 was thus intimately related to that of the great chamber: it might have been a bedroom for children. Another possibility is that room 26 became the oratory, in succession to one above the porch, and that the two ecclesiastical-style 14th-century windows were moved here as part of a general rearrangement of the domestic offices. Private oratories were often found adjacent to the great chamber.

The great chamber was ceiled, and the formerly open roof adapted to provide a single room at second-floor level (30). It was accessed by the new stair. The room, which could only have been lit by dormer windows, was doubtless servants' accommodation.

**Period 4: Early Jacobean Alterations**

The parlour (11) had been built as a single-storied addition to the hall. However, at about the beginning of the 17th century an upper floor was inserted, but with no apparent means of access. There was certainly no internal stair, which means that the new room (16) must have been reached either by an external stairway or from an adjoining wing that has since been lost. Circumstantial evidence points to the loss of a structure of unknown dimensions on the south side, where the tower now stands. There may thus have been an earlier south-east wing, or at least a projection.

**Period 5: The Carolean Remodelling** (Fig. 5)

Next, the interior of the house was rearranged, so that the private apartments were entirely separate from the service areas and servants' quarters. A new addition was made in the form of a tower-like structure—usually known as the 'high building'—at the south-east corner. It is five stories high, set slightly askew to the remainder of the house, has only one room at each level, and is connected to the great hall by a stone stairway cut obliquely through the south-east corner of the latter. Any earlier south-east wing on this site was entirely destroyed.

The high building was an anachronism in the 17th century, a remote descendant of the medieval solar tower, complete with projecting stair-turret on the east. The building is an impressive structure, both externally and internally, and is particularly notable for its fine plaster ceilings and friezes.6

At and partly below ground level is an undercroft (1), entered only from the outside, as in the medieval tradition. The undercroft probably served as the wine cellar. Above this is the main reception room of the house, or the withdrawing room (12). The principal entrance is external and is in the west wall, where it is approached by a flight of stone steps (Fig. 6). Internally, the necessary connection with the dining room (10, formerly the great hall) is via the obliquely sited steps to the left of the fireplace, while to the right a door leads into the stair-turret.

In the high building the stone newel stair rises to first-floor level, giving access to the principal chamber (15) and to the room above the parlour. This was probably a guest chamber (16), but it could equally have been used as a study or office. The newel stair then rises—this time in timber—to the second floor, where there is a third well appointed room (28). This however lacks a fireplace, but has windows in three walls whereas the rooms below are lit only on two sides. It was almost certainly designed as a summer sitting room, taking advantage of the fine views to the east, west and south.

A hatch and ladder gave access to the attic (29), which also has gable windows on three sides, demonstrating that this space was intended for occasional use. The internal detailing was never completed, but there can be little doubt that the attic was conceived as a prospect room.
Fig. 5. Daneway House: reconstructed plans of the building in the late 17th century.
Following the completion of the high building, the south-west wing and porch were reconstructed as a twin-gabled unit. At the same time a small court was formed by walling in the space between the new wing and the high building. The court is entered from the south via steps and a doorway identical to that leading into the main reception room. The court was thus envisaged *ab initio* as part of the formal entry to the high building.

The tower, and in particular its ornate plasterwork, has long attracted scholarly attention, and diverse dates for its construction have been proposed, ranging from c. 1620 to c. 1675. One of the priority subjects for archaeological scrutiny was the relationship between the structure of
the tower and its decorative elements. Only when this had been resolved could dating be properly considered. The general appearance of the rubble-built tower, with its heavy stone-mullioned windows and cross-gabled roof, is suggestive of a date around the end of the 16th century. However, the round-headed external doorway, which is elaborate and exhibits a mixture of Classical and latent Gothic detail, cannot be earlier than the mid 17th century. The living room (12) to which it gives access has a fireplace of similar date and a decorative plaster ceiling and frieze.

The chamber above (15) is equally fine, being provided with a fireplace and decorative plaster ceiling. It is entered via an internally protruding oak-panelled porch, there being no effective landing at the head of the newel stair (Fig. 7). The general form of the panelling indicates a 17th-century date, and the mouldings exhibit an interesting amalgam of two traditions, plainly belonging to a transitional period: scratch mouldings and bolection mouldings are used here in combination. The Classical elements of the joinery suggest a date no earlier than the 1670s or '80s.

Archaeological examination readily established that the masonry shell of the tower is of one build and that the detailing of the attic was never completed. Attention was next directed towards the structural carpentry, including the several oak-panelled doors and the internal porch. All were clearly contemporary, and there was nothing to suggest that they were not structurally integral. Examination of the archaeological relationship between the decorative plasterwork, the fireplaces and panelling led to the conclusion that the plaster was also original (sometimes hitherto questioned). Dr. Claire Gapper was invited to undertake a fresh study of the plaster decoration, and she opined that it was later than had generally been supposed, suggesting a date in the second half of the 17th century.

At the conclusion of these studies, it seemed to me that the Daneway tower was a perfectly preserved set-piece of c. 1680, and if so it was plainly an architectural anachronism. Examination of the designedly non-visible structural carpentry—floor and roof framing—showed that oak of modest scantling had been employed. Nothing was wasted, and waney edges abounded: the material seemed ideal for tree-ring dating. Cores were taken from both principal and subsidiary timbers of the roof and the floor frames. The result was impressive and unambiguous: the oaks were all from a common source and were felled early in the spring of 1674.7

Although the date of construction was settled, the questions remained: how did the tower function in a domestic context, and who built it? Daneway House does not have an integrated plan, making circulation impossible, and servicing difficult. The tower has a physical link with the old hall, but there has never been an effective connection with the remainder of the house, which was not modernized in the 17th century. Since the living room in the tower had its own external entrance, it seems that the structure was designed as an essentially self-contained unit, while the remainder of the old house was relegated to servicing it. Plainly, this house could never have functioned as a normal family residence of the period.

Now that we know the date of the tower, the key to its social and historical context manifests itself. William Hancox, high constable of Bisley hundred, died in 1673, bequeathing Daneway to his son, also William. The tower was therefore constructed by the younger William immediately following his succession. He was a bachelor, and thus had no need for a large or conventionally-planned family house. We shall never know what inspired William to build his 'bachelor's pent-house' in such an anachronistic style, and it must surely have been viewed as a mild eccentricity in its day. The turniform construction seems to hark back to the solar tower of the Middle Ages.8

Upon the death of William Hancox in 1709, Daneway passed to a collateral descendant, Nathaniel. He lived there until his death in 1729, and was probably responsible for some modest
internal alterations to the old parts, executed in the prevailing Georgian style. Nathaniel Hancox evidently died without an heir, and Daneway passed to his brother Walter. Walter too seems to have been heirless when he died in 1743, and thus for more than a century Daneway was occupied by men without families. This explains why the house was never seriously Georgianized, or a formal progression of rooms created within it. Finally, decline in the 19th century ensured the survival of Daneway House essentially in its late 17th-century form. That has been carefully preserved today.
Daneway House is a masterpiece inspired by art so unerring that it is undatable by external signs and the centuries succeed one another in a structure to which there is nothing to add and from which there is nothing to take away.

I. J. Massingham

LODGE PARK, SHERBORNE

In 1986 the National Trust acquired the extensive Sherborne Estate, the westernmost part of which includes former parkland having Lodge Park on its east side. Built by John Dutton, the Lodge itself has long been recognized as a 17th-century structure of considerable pretension, which was erected for the once-fashionable sport of decr coursing. A date close to the middle of the century has sometimes been advanced for its construction, but when Lieutenant Hammond, a traveller, passed by in 1634 he described the Lodge as 'lately built'. He mentioned the great cost of the work, and the lavish furnishings. He noted also a passing resemblance to Inigo Jones’s Banqueting House in Whitehall, London.

The five-bay east front of the Lodge is intact (Fig. 8), complete with the balustraded parapet that surrounded a former flat lead roof, now gone. The arcaded loggia on the east elevation retains its lead roof and parapet. There were thus viewing platforms at two levels, with access to the higher one being provided by a substantial staircase tower on the back of the building. The tower has also gone, but is recorded in a finely detailed painting by Lambert, c. 1740.

Fig. 8. Lodge Park: the east front in 1991.
Internally, the Lodge was thought to have been only one room deep, comprising an entrance hall and service room at ground level, a great banqueting room on the first floor, and the projecting stair tower at the north-west corner. On the site of the tower is a rear range, built at the turn of the 20th century, making the Lodge into a double-pile house (Fig. 9).

It is now appreciated that the structure was considerably larger and more sophisticated, but much has been lost: the attractive and seemingly unaltered facade belies a saga of massive change internally. Apart from the hall chimney-piece and the adjacent arched opening that once led into the staircase tower, nothing of 17th-century date appeared to survive inside the building (Fig. 10). This was potentially explicable on the grounds that in the 1720s William Kent completely refurbished the Lodge, seemingly as a house. But, curiously, nothing of his interior survived either: extant finishes all appeared to be 20th century.

In order to determine a strategy for the restoration, use and presentation of Lodge Park, the National Trust needed to ascertain whether anything of substance could be discovered about the original and the Kentian interiors. Hence, between 1991 and 1996 the interior of the house was systematically 'unpicked' as an archaeological operation. This revealed that the building had been totally gutted in the early 19th century (1830s?), and again in 1899–1902 when the present rear range was added. Moreover, there had been further substantial refurbishments in 1938 and 1964. Despite the near-total destruction of the 17th-century interior, sufficient evidence remained in the fabric to enable the original internal spaces to be resurrected and detailed with reasonable confidence. The refurbishment was completed in 1999 and Lodge Park opened to the public in 2000.

The major archaeological revelation was that the Lodge had been designed as a double-pile structure, and that the Edwardian rear range occupies exactly the site of an original block which included the staircase tower (i.e. the latter was not a projection); the demolition of these components had taken place in the early 19th century. Examination of a boiler-house under the Edwardian range, and a 1960sstrongroom beneath the front range, revealed that these incorporated parts of an extensive cellaring system that once occupied three quarters of the ground plan of the Lodge. Excavation of the infilled cellars has now revealed a substantial service basement, the main access to which was via a broad flight of stone steps that descended from the ground floor of the staircase tower (Fig. 11). The steps have been robbed out, but the ramp upon which they were bedded remains (Fig. 12). There was also external access to the kitchen via a light-well on the south side.

The extent of the accommodation at Lodge Park was thus much greater than had hitherto been supposed, occupying three floors, not two. The provision of a large kitchen and wine cellars implies entertainment on a lavish scale. The kitchen was fitted with two major fireplaces, a bread oven and two pastry ovens. The presence of several rooms additional to the reception rooms suggests that staff resided on the premises; possibly there was also some overnight guest accommodation.

Although the tower and original rear range have been lost, scars resulting from their attachment to the spine wall remain, as do fragments of two primary fireplaces at ground and first-floor level. Wall-scarfs, together with excavated evidence from the basement, allow the plan and basic details of the great staircase to be reconstructed. It was a well-stair, built of timber, with treads six feet in width. The rising position of each flight, the quarter-landings and the dimensions of the steps can all be ascertained.

In the surviving front block, only the three external walls, and the spine wall, are primary: not only have partitions been lost, but so too has the roof and all floor structures. Nevertheless, careful stripping and recording of the inner faces of the walls revealed not only the disposition of rooms (Fig. 13), but also the positions and dimensions of the major timbers associated with
Fig. 9. Ground plan of Lodge Park in 1991. The surviving 17th-century walls are shown in solid black. The Edwardian rear range exactly follows the outline of the lost original.
the roof and floor framing. The only surviving structural carpentry of the 17th century comprised two beams and fragments of the wall-plates of the loggia roof. Embedded in the masonry was a series of wrought-iron cramps and baulks of timber that acted as anchors, in conjunction with the ties.

The banqueting room—nominally of double-cube form—occupied the whole of the east range (Fig. 14) and had a great fireplace at the centre of the west wall. The original stone chimney-piece was removed to Sherborne House in the early 19th century, where it was installed in modified form. A new chimney-piece, based on the original design, has now been made for the Lodge. The banqueting room had a flat ceiling with a large cove, a cornice and a frieze. The basic dimensions of these components could be recovered from a host of small holes and scars in the walls faces, some of which retained oak plugs and fixing-grounds (Fig. 15). Even a few crumbs of cornice bracket were still clinging to the occasional bent nail. The evidence survived only in those areas of the north and south walls that lay within the attic after the building was reroofed in the early 19th century. Then, curiously, a pitched roof, set c. 2.5 m below the level of the original lead flat, was constructed inside the former banqueting room; this required the blocking of all first-floor windows above transom level (Fig. 16). The inserted roof has now been removed and the lead flat reinstated.

Lower down on the walls of the banqueting and other rooms, wooden fixing plugs and setting-out lines crudely scored on the masonry revealed the positions of lost architraves, skirtings and chair rails. The archaeology of the 17th-century fixings had to be disentangled from that of
their 18th- and 19th-century successors, since some parts of the building had been panelled three times over.

Removal of the modern windows throughout the building, and study of the reveals and the masonry frames, yielded a complex history of fenestration, shutters and panelling. In some openings, there had been as many as five successive sets of frames and casements. The positions of iron stanchions and tying bars were marked by infilled sockets, while plugs, scars and rust-marks provided information about fixed and opening lights. The arrangement of horizontal tying-bars demonstrated that the leaded quarries must have been of reticulated form, and not rectangular: an 8-inch glazing module was indicated.

An unexpected discovery occurred in the two windows at the extreme ends of the main east front: although glazed externally to provide a unified appearance, they were originally blind on the interior. Inside the banqueting room, there would have been no indication of windows in these positions, simply blank walling. The reveals were only cut through in the early 19th century.
The centrally placed east window on the first floor took the form of a pair of tall casements, which provided access from the banqueting room to the roof of the loggia. Study of the external masonry around the windows revealed a carefully filled series of fixing holes relating to original hinged shutters. These were only fitted at first-floor level, and were not present on the two false windows. Doubtless the Lodge was closed up and made secure during the winter.

There were some unexpected revelations concerning the windows at ground level too. While the assumption that the central arched doorway—the main entrance—has always been symmetrically flanked by two pairs of windows is reasonable enough, investigation showed that this was not so. The window to the left of the door was initially blind, owing to the presence of an internal room division behind it (between the hall and parlour); but it was opened up as part of a series of minor changes which seem to have taken place in the later 17th century. The second window to the right of the main door began life as another doorway, and was fitted with two tall casements in a frame (similar to those giving access to the loggia roof). Again, it was probably in the later 17th century that the doors were removed and a raised sill inserted to make the window appear uniform with its neighbours.

Other features which superficially appeared to be original and unaltered were found, on closer inspection, to have been subtly tampered with. The main doorway, with the somewhat Jacobean-looking decoration around the head, appears untouched, and the fact that some of the ashlars used over the arch are slightly yellower in colour and have a tighter grain than the vast majority of the external masonry may seem insignificant. However, it is discernible that the aberrant
Fig. 13. Reconstructed plan of the 17th-century ground floor of Lodge Park.
Fig. 14. Reconstructed plan of the 17th-century first floor of Lodge Park.
stones are not randomly placed, but seem to be disposed in a crudely symmetrical pattern over the doorway. Their jointing is also curiously stepped, and is suggestive of careful piecing in; the decorative carving too is slightly crisper on the yellowish blocks. Weighing all the evidence, a convincing case may be made for about half of the decorative masonry being a 19th-century replacement. The need for this could have been occasioned by the removal of a pedimented timber doorcase that had been fixed to the facade (presumably by Kent).

Internally, the surviving hall fireplace and chimney-piece are not quite all that they seem. Lady Sherborne’s monogram (ETS) was carefully inserted into the arched panel over the fireplace in c. 1900, and much new stonework was pieced-in elsewhere. It is, however, the proportions of the fireplace aperture that are most unsettling: it is uncomfortably tall in relation to its width (Fig. 10). An explanation for this was forthcoming when it was found that the level of the ground floor had been lowered throughout the house by c. 20 cm, and the reveals of both the fireplace and the archway to the tower had been carefully underbuilt, thus unbalancing the true proportions of the apertures.

Finally, it was decided to address the question of dating the building through dendrochronology. Although the 17th-century structural timbers had all been removed, various sawn-off ends of beams, spreaders and lintels remained embedded in the walls (Fig. 15). These were nearly all sampled, but unfortunately nowhere did the full extent of the sapwood and bark survive. The reason for this lay, ironically, in the very high quality of the carpentry used at the Lodge: timbers
had all been meticulously squared so that no waney edges remained, even where they would have been concealed within walls. This stands in marked contrast to the extensive use of waney-edged timber at Daneway. However, the consensus of evidence pointed to a felling date for the trees between c. 1625 and 1632.\textsuperscript{15} The Lodge was, therefore, newly built when Hammond saw it in 1634.

In conclusion, the careful unpicking of the fabric of Lodge Park, with the application of archaeological techniques throughout, has enabled the National Trust to carry out an unusually wide-ranging restoration of the property, based on authentic evidence.\textsuperscript{16} It is to be hoped that this example will be followed by others.

Notes

1. For brief notes on the history of the property, with source references, see *Victoria History of the County of Gloucester* 11 (1976), 10, 17, 24.
2. The dendrochronology programme was carried out by the University of Nottingham. For details, see *Vernacular Archit.* 26 (1995), 47.
4. I am deeply indebted to Mr. and Mrs. Spencer for the opportunity to carry out an extended study of Daneway between 1993 and 1996. The house is a private residence and is not open to the public.
7. See note 2.
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