Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report 133/88

TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TWO TIMBERS FROM CAWOOD, YORK, 1987.

Cathy Groves

AML reports are interim reports which make available the results of specialist investigations in advance of full publication They are not subject to external refereeing and their conclusions to be modified may sometimes have in the light of archaeological information that was not available at the time of the investigation. Readers are therefore asked to consult the author before citing the report in any publication and to consult the final excavation report when available.

Opinions expressed in AML reports are those of the author and are not necessarily those of the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England.

Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report 133/88

TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TWO TIMBERS FROM CAWOOD, YORK, 1987.

Cathy Groves

Summary

.

Two oak timbers from the residence of the Archbishops of York at Cawood, near York, were examined with a view to confirming the construction date indicated by the heraldic device on the gatehouse. It was not possible to date either timber.

Author's address :-

Dendrochronology Laboratory Department of Archaeology & Prehistory University of Sheffield Sheffield S10 2TN

0742 768555 x6082



Tree-ring analysis of two timbers from Cawood, York, 1987

Introduction

Two oak timbers (<u>Quercus</u> spp) from the residence of the Archbishops of York at Cawood, near York, were sampled during restoration. One (<u>CAW1</u>) was from a major floor joist in the Castle Gatehouse, whilst the other (<u>CAW2</u>) was from a purlin in the attached, and presumed contemporary, brick residential range. Heraldry on the gatehouse dates its construction to the period of Archbishop Kempe (AD1426-51) and possibly as closely as AD1439-51, due to the presence of a Cardinal's hat on one of the shields. It was hoped that tree-ring analysis would corroborate the dating and confirm that both buildings are contemporary.

Method

The samples were prepared and measured following the method given by Hillam (1985). Two radii were measured on each sample and these measurements were averaged together to give a single ring sequence for both timbers. It is usual to measure only one radius on oak samples, but an exception was made in this case since only two timbers were available for tree-ring analysis. By taking an average of the two radii, it was hoped that the common climatic signal would be accentuated and the "background noise" resulting from the local growth conditions would be reduced, thereby increasing the chances of obtaining a reliable date.

The ring widths of each timber were plotted as graphs, which were compared visually by superimposing the two curves and sliding one past the other searching for similarities in the ring pattern. This process of crossmatching is aided by the use of a computer. The computer program for this crossmatching process (Baillie & Pilcher 1973) measures the amount of correlation between two ring sequences at each position of overlap. The Student's <u>t</u>-test is then used as a significance test on the correlation coefficient, and generally a <u>t</u>-value of 3.5 or over represents a match, provided that the visual match is acceptable (Baillie 1982: 82-5).

1

The results only date the rings present in the timber and therefore do not necessarily represent the felling date. If the sapwood on an oak sample is complete, indicated by the presence of bark or bark edge, the exact felling year can be determined. A recent study of oak sapwood data showed that 19 out of 20 samples from British trees over 30 years old had 10-55 sapwood rings (Hillam <u>et al</u> 1987). These 95% confidence limits are used to estimate felling dates in the absence of complete sapwood. In the total absence of sapwood the addition of 10 rings to the date of the last measured heartwood ring produces a probable <u>terminus post quem</u> for felling. As the number of missing heartwood rings is unknown the actual felling date could be much later.

Results

<u>CAW1</u> and <u>CAW2</u> had 79 and 45 annual growth rings respectively. The bark edge was present on <u>CAW1</u> and the appearance of the <u>CAW2</u> timber suggests that only the sapwood is missing from the sample. The cross-section of <u>CAW1</u> indicates that the timber must have come from a trunk of approximately 0.5 metres diameter and 79 years old when felled (Table 1). <u>CAW2</u> probably came from a trunk of similar or slightly younger age with a diameter of circa 0.3 metres.

The average ring width of both timbers is greater than 3.0mm. Generally trees with very narrow rings are from dense woodland where competition was severe (Bartholin 1978). This suggests that the Cawood timbers probably came from a more open context where competition was less severe. However a narrow band of growth rings, years 46-56, indicate that <u>CAW1</u> suffered severe stress, and hence a reduction in growth, during this period (Figure 1). This could be due to harsh local environmental growth conditions or factors such as defoliation by insects. An annual growth ring of an oak tree shows a distinct change in character between the springwood and summerwood of a total season's growth (Figure 2). Defoliation has little effect on the springwood which is formed during leaf expansion and relies on food stores laid down the previous year. However a defoliated tree produces substantially less summerwood as this is dependent on the immediate food supplies of that particular year (Varley 1978). Experimental work by

2

Varley (1978) has demonstrated that a tree may take several years to recover from defoliation, during which little growth occurs.

There was no similarity between the ring patterns of the two timbers but this does not necessarily indicate that they are not contempory. The ring sequences (Table 2; 3) are both short and the effect of the stress suffered by <u>CAW1</u> would tend to obscure similarities in the ring sequences.

Single ring sequences of less than 50 rings are unlikely to provide reliable absolute tree-ring dates as the ring pattern may not be unique (Hillam <u>et al</u> 1987). Consequently no further work was carried out on <u>CAW2</u>. <u>CAW1</u> was tested against reference chronologies from Britain and Europe. No consistent dating was obtained from these comparisons and therefore this sequence remains undated.

Conclusions

Sample <u>CAW2</u> is probably undateable because of insufficient rings but it may be possible to obtain a tree-ring date for <u>CAW1</u> as more reference material becomes available from the York area. The importance of obtaining a tree-ring date for <u>CAW1</u> is enhanced by the presence of the bark edge. This would produce a precise felling date and hence an accurate indication of construction date which would refine or refute the AD1426-51 indicated by the heraldry.

Acknowledgements

The Sheffield Dendrochronology Laboratory is financed by the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England. I am also grateful to the Belfast Tree-ring Laboratory and the Nottingham Tree-ring group for making available unpublished data.

References

Baillie MGL 1982 <u>Tree-ring dating and archaeology</u>. London: Croom Helm. Baillie MGL & Pilcher JR 1973 A simple crossdating program for tree-ring research, <u>Tree-Ring Bulletin</u> 33, 7-14. Hillam J 1985 Theoretical and applied dendrochronology - how to make a date with a tree. In P Phillips (ed), <u>The Archaeologist and the Laboratory</u>, CBA Research Report number 58, 17-23.

Hillam J, Morgan RA & Tyers I 1987 Sapwood estimates and the dating of short ring sequences. In RGW Ward (ed), <u>Applications of tree-ring</u> <u>studies - current research in dendrochronology and related areas</u>, BAR S333 165-185.

Varley GC 1978 The effects of insect defoliation on the growth of oaks in England. In "<u>Dendrochronology in Europe</u>" Fletcher JM (ed), BAR International Series 51, 179-183.

| sample number | number of rings | sapwood | average ring width | sketch | maximum dimensions | |
|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------|-----------------------|--|
| | - | | - (mm) | | (mm) | |
| CAW1 | 79 | 18 ⁻ | 3.24 | | 360x245 | |
| CAW2 | 45 | ?hs | 3.18 | | 185×140 | |

.

Table 1: Details of the samples; sketches are not to scale; hs - indicates heartwood-sapwood transition.

Table 2: Ring width data, in units of 0.02mm, of CAW1.

| year | ring widths | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| 1 | 84 | 90 | 101 | 114 | 172 | 198 | 183 | 185 | 255 | 234 | | |
| 11 | 145 | 234 | 185 | 213 | 186 | 147 | 160 | 128 | 143 | 112 | | |
| 21 | 220 | 151 | 147 | 178 | 153 | 171 | 169 | 210 | 181 | 194 | | |
| 31 | 236 | 226 | 209 | 204 | 121 | 198 | 265 | 239 | 155 | 118 | | |
| 41 | 181 | 341 | 324 | 155 | 251 | 75 | 33 | 22 | 26 | 28 | | |
| 51 | 33 | 40 | 49 | 60 | 68 | 90 | 131 | 118 | 157 | 160 | | |
| 61 | 194 | 133 | 202 | 164 | 234 | 149 | 150 | 181 | 272 | 147 | | |
| 71 | 118 | 114 | 145 | 184 | 140 | 211 | 153 | 244 | 290 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Table 3: Ring width data, in units of 0.02mm, of <u>CAW2</u> . | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| year | ring widths | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 31 | 77 | 136 | 86 | 135 | 183 | 194 | 203 | 181 | 220 | | |
| 11 | 203 | 241 | 179 | 185 | 220 | 209 | 184 | 150 | 217 | 158 | | |
| 21 | 153 | 186 | 206 | 152 | 180 | 169 | 198 | 177 | 200 | 130 | | |

31 123 122 107 136 105 122 163 132 198 157

41 142 161 91 130 119



.

Figure 1: The tree-ring sequence of <u>CAW1</u> with the narrow band of growth rings between years 46-56.



Figure 2: Diagram of the structure of oak growth rings. The springwood consists of large vessels formed between March and May. The summerwood becomes increasingly fibrous and contains much smaller vessels.