Centre for Archaeology Report 14/2004

Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from the Timber Loft, The College, Durham

A J Arnold, R E Howard and Dr C D Litton

© English Heritage 2004

ISSN 1473-9224

The Centre for Archaeology Report Series incorporates the former Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report Series. Copies of Ancient Monuments Laboratory Reports will continue to be available from the Centre for Archaeology (see back cover for details). Centre for Archaeology Report 14/2004

Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from the Timber Loft, The College, Durham

A J Arnold, R E Howard and Dr C D Litton

Summary

Analysis undertaken on 22 samples from timbers of the ground and first-floor ceilings of this building resulted in the construction of two site sequences.

Site sequence DUROSQ01, of 145 rings, containing seven samples, all from reused timbers, spans the period AD 975-1119. Four of the samples are from timbers estimated to have been felled within the range AD 1129-64 with the last measured ring dates of the other three making it possible they were also felled at this time.

Site sequence DUROSQ02, of 140 rings, contains 11 samples, and spans the period AD 1402-1541. One sample, DUR-O14, from a reused main beam, is from a timber felled in AD 1516. Another five samples are from timbers all felled in AD 1541, with the estimated felling date range of a further five samples also consistent with this felling.

Sample DUR-O10 was dated individually to the period AD 1355-1445, with the timber represented estimated to have been felled in AD 1446-63.

The first-floor ceiling contains reused joists of AD 1129-64 and at least one other joist felled in AD 1446-63. The ground-floor ceiling is constructed from joists and main beams felled in AD 1541, but incorporates a reused timber of AD 1516.

Keywords

Dendrochronology Standing Building

Author's address

Department of Mathematics, University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD.

Many CfA 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 may sometimes have to be modified in the light of archaeological information that was not available at the time of the investigation. Readers are therefore advised to consult the author before citing the report in any publication and to consult the final excavation report when available.

Opinions expressed in CfA reports are those of the author and are not necessarily those of English Heritage.

Introduction

This Grade II listed building, currently known as the Timber Loft, is a late medieval/early post-medieval barn or service building situated within the outer court of Durham Cathedral Priory (now The College; Fig 1; NZ 273420).

The gable end of an adjacent building, the plumbers/electricians shop, forms part of the north wall of the timber loft (Fig 2). It is this section that is thought to be the earliest phase of construction within the timber loft. Incorporated into the earliest section of wall is a substantial post which has evidence, in the form of a cut-off piece of timber still in a mortice, for a brace which is thought would have risen to a now absent wall plate. A vertical indent and a base pad located in the main western section of the north wall of the timber loft, which butts the earliest section of wall, suggests the position of another post. These posts are neither integral to the timber loft nor the earliest section of the wall associated with the plumbers/electricians shop. It has previously been suggested that they represent another earlier building but this is currently under discussion.

In the eighteenth or nineteenth century the roof of the timber loft was raised to create a new upper floor. The tiebeams of the original roof are however thought to be retained in the first-floor ceiling structure. This structure also contains a series of joists that are clearly reused timbers. The east gable wall includes a timber framed screen (Fig 3) facing the road that runs into the masons yard. This is also thought to be potentially associated with the primary construction of the timber loft and hence contemporary with the tiebeams currently located within the first-floor ceiling structure.

At ground-floor level there appears to be two or possibly three phases of stonework in the south wall, though at the time of sampling this was largely concealed by scaffolding and ladders. The ceiling beams are set within these various phases and it is therefore possible that they represent an inserted floor. These timbers generally show no evidence of reuse but the main north-south beam at the west end, truss 5 (Fig 5), appears likely to be reused.

Similar to this building is Number 4, The College, the roof of which has previously been dated by this Laboratory to *c* AD 1445 (Howard *et al* 1995). This building is of rubble sandstone with surviving triangular vents and the vestigial remains of opposed cart door openings indicating it was probably also a small barn. Additionally, timbers from 1-2 The College, have been dated to a felling of AD 1531 (Howard *et al* 1992).

Sampling and analysis by tree-ring dating was commissioned and funded by English Heritage. Dating of the potentially early post located within the north wall of the timber loft was hoped to inform the growing evidence of the early monastic buildings. These survive in fragments within or below the standing buildings, which, if pre-Dissolution, are predominantly later medieval (fifteenth to sixteenth century). It was hoped that dating of the principal building would help inform imminent repairs of the west gable, develop a more comprehensive understanding of the medieval monastic buildings, and inform the Durham World Heritage Management plan, currently in preparation. The Laboratory would like to thank Norman Emery, the Cathedral Archaeologist, for arranging access to the building and for providing the drawings used to illustrate this report (Figs 2-5). Mr Emery also provided much of the information included in the introduction and his comments were very helpful in interpreting the dates gained.

Sampling

The brief provided requested sampling of the potentially early post embedded into the north wall of the timber loft and the surviving elements of the primary construction of the building. Unfortunately, the timbers in the timber framed screen in the east wall of the timber loft were unsuitable for tree-ring analysis. These had insufficient numbers of rings for successful dating and so no samples were taken from these. However, following on-site discussions it was agreed that the brief could be extended to include the reused joists in the firstfloor ceiling and the reused main beam in the ground-floor ceiling. It was thought these may have been reused from the original roof of the timber loft or may aid the understanding of the medieval monastic buildings within the Priory complex.

Samples were taken from the post located in the north wall, the ground-floor ceiling, and the first-floor ceiling. In all 24 core samples were taken from a variety of other timbers at this building. Each sample was given the code DUR-O (for Durham, site O) and numbered 01-24. The position of all samples was noted at the time of sampling and has been marked on Figures 4 and 5. Further details relating to the samples are recorded in Table 1.

Analysis and Results

At this point it was seen that the sample taken from the post (DUR-O24) had too few rings to make secure dating a possibility. Additionally, the sample taken from one of the main joists on the first floor (DUR-O02) had a distorted ring pattern, and so both of these samples were discarded prior to measurement. The remaining 22 samples were prepared by sanding and polishing and their growth-ring widths measured; the data of these measurements are given at the end of the report. The growth-ring widths of the samples were compared with each other by the Litton/Zainodin grouping procedure (see appendix).

At a least value of t=4.5, 18 samples formed two groups. Firstly, seven samples matched each other and site sequence DUROSQ01, of 145 rings, was constructed containing these samples at the offsets shown in the bar diagram (Fig 6). This site sequence was successfully matched against the relevant reference chronologies for oak at a first-ring date of AD 975 and a last-ring date of AD 1119. The evidence for this dating is given by the *t*-values in Table 2.

Eleven samples matched each other and site sequence DUROSQ02, of 140 rings, was constructed containing these samples at the offsets shown in the bar diagram (Fig 7). This site sequence was successfully matched against the reference chronologies at a first-ring date of AD 1402 and a last-ring date of AD 1541. The evidence for this dating is given by the *t*-values in Table 3.

Attempts were then made to date the remaining four samples individually by comparing them with the reference chronologies. This resulted in sample DUR-O10 being matched at a first-ring date of AD 1355 and a last-ring date of AD 1445. The evidence for this dating is given by the *t*-values in Table 4.

Interpretation

Analysis of samples from the timbers of this building has resulted in the production of two dated site sequences and one individually dated sample.

Site sequence DUROSQ01 contains seven samples and spans the period AD 975-1119. Four of these samples have the heartwood/sapwood boundary ring. The average of this is AD 1114 which allows an estimated felling date range to be calculated for the timbers represented of AD 1129-64. The other three samples do not have this boundary ring and so a felling date cannot be calculated for them. However, they are clearly broadly contemporary with last measured ring dates of AD 1077 (DUR-008), AD 1100 (DUR-009), and AD 1108 (DUR-004) making it possible that they were also felled at the same time as the others. All of these samples are from first-floor ceiling joists which show signs of reuse.

Site sequence DUROSQ02 contains 11 samples and spans the period AD 1402-1541. Contained within this site sequence are six samples with complete sapwood. One of these, DUR-O14, has the last-ring date of AD 1516, the felling date of the timber represented. This timber has signs of reuse. The other five all have the last-ring date of AD 1541, the felling date of the five timbers represented. The average heartwood/sapwood boundary ring of the remaining five samples is AD 1518, which allows an estimated felling date to be calculated for the five timbers represented to within the range AD 1533-68, entirely consistent with these having also been felled in AD 1541. These 11 samples are taken from three main beams and eight ceiling joists from the ground floor.

Sample DUR-O10 was dated individually to the period AD 1355-1445. The heartwood/sapwood boundary ring of this sample is AD 1413 which, taking account of a last measured ring date of AD 1445, gives an estimated felling date for the timber represented to within the range AD 1446-63. This sample is taken from a first-floor ceiling joist which did not have empty mortices like the others but did show signs of reuse in the way it had been trimmed to fit.

All felling date ranges have been calculated using the estimate that 95% of mature oak trees in this area have between 15-50 sapwood rings.

Discussion

It is unfortunate that timbers thought to be associated with the primary construction of the timber loft have proved undateable in the case of the firstfloor main beams (tiebeams from the original roof) or unsuitable in the case of the timber framed screen in the east wall. It has also not been possible to date the post located in the north wall of the timber loft. However, four felling phases have been identified by the dendrochronological analysis. These relate to the ground-floor ceiling and the joists of the first-floor ceiling.

Four of the reused first-floor ceiling joists are now known to have been felled some time between AD 1129-64, with it likely that at least another three were also felled at this time. From the evidence of carpenter's marks and the appearance of the timbers themselves it is thought probable that a large number of them are reused from the same building. A detailed survey of these timbers may make it possible to reconstruct the roof for which they were originally cut. An eighth ceiling joist from the first floor was felled some time between AD 1446-63. Although this timber did not have the empty mortices of the other joists it had been trimmed and shaped to sit over the main beam which could suggest that it is also reused. The inability to date the main beams (tiebeams from the original roof) prevents any relationship between these and the reused joists being established.

Dendrochronological analysis has shown that the first-floor ceiling is constructed from reused timbers, the majority of which are thought to date from the mid-twelfth century, but also at least one timber from the mid-fifteenth century. The felling dates of the recycled common joists, AD 1129-64, is of interest. The Cathedral nave was vaulted around AD 1133, and was probably completed by the AD 1150s. Work on the cloistral buildings started in the AD 1070s, and a new chapter house (or upgrading of the existing one) was completed by *c* AD 1141. Therefore, it is possible that the timbers used in the timber loft came from upgraded cloistral buildings, or from the buildings of the outer court of which little is known of their earlier structural history).

Eleven timbers from the ground-floor ceiling were successfully dated. One of the main beams, the only one that showed signs of reuse, is now known to have been felled in AD 1516 with a second main beam and four common joists being felled a little later in AD 1541. A third main beam and four more common joists have a felling date range of AD 1533-68 which is entirely consistent with a felling of AD 1541. One of the main beams thought to have been felled in AD 1541 (DUR-O23) appears to support the gable framing, originally thought to be part of the primary phase of the building. However, this does not necessarily mean that the gable framing is contemporary or later than AD 1541 as the construction makes it possible that this beam was inserted beneath it with brick packing around it.

As mentioned above a number of different phases of stonework were seen in the south wall at ground-floor level, with the ceiling beams being set into all of these. The majority of timbers were felled in AD 1541, with the exception of the reused beam felled in AD 1516. Therefore, this ceiling may represent a modification to a monastic structure immediately post-dissolution.

It has not been possible to provide a dendrochronological date for the initial construction of the timber loft. However, if the ground-floor ceiling was inserted shortly after felling in AD 1541 this would suggest that the primary construction of the timber loft pre-dates this. The dendrochronological analysis has identified four different phase of felling, though two of these are represented by only a single timber. The timbers from the AD 1541 felling show no evidence of reuse but those timbers from the earliest major felling phase in the mid-twelfth century and the two timbers felled in the mid-fifteenth and early sixteenth century all show evidence of reuse. The results indicate that this is a potentially more complex structure than initially thought. Further survey work would help elucidate the rather confusing results from the dendrochronological analysis and may identify areas in which further dendrochronological sampling may be of use in aiding the overall understanding of the building.

Bibliography

Arnold, A J, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 2002a Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from Bull Hole Byre, Bearpark, Durham, Centre for Archaeol Rep, 111/2002

Arnold, A J, Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 2002b *Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from the Latrine Block, Aydon Castle, Corbridge, Northumberland*, Centre for Archaeol Rep, **36/2002**

Baillie, M G L, and Pilcher, J R, 1982 unpubl A master tree-ring chronology for England, unpubl computer file *MGB-E01*, Queens Univ, Belfast

Groves, C, 1997 Dendrochronological analysis of Ightfield Hall Farm Barn, Ightfield, Whitchurch, Shropshire, 1997, Anc Mon Lab Rep, **91/97**

Hillam, J, and Groves, C, 1991 *Tree-ring dating of oak timbers from Aydon Castle, Corbridge, Northumberland*, Anc Mon Lab Rep, **42/91**

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1988 unpubl Seaton Holme, Easington, Durham unpubl computer file *EASASQ10*, Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1991 Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory results, *Vernacular Architect*, **22**, 40-3

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, Nottingham University, Thornes, R, and Hook, R, Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, 1992 Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory: Truncated principal trusses project, *Vernacular Architect*, **23**, 59-61

Howard R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1994a Nottingham University Tree-ring Dating Laboratory Results: General List, *Vernacular Architect*, **25**, 36-40

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory, and Hook, R, RCHME, 1994b Nottingham University Treering Dating Laboratory: North List, *Vernacular Architect*, **25**, 43-4

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory, and Roberts, H M, North East Vernacular Architect Group, 1995a Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory: buildings of the religious estates in Medieval Durham; dendrochronological survey, 1994-5, *Vernacular Architect*, **26**, 55-6

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1995b Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory: General List, *Vernacular Architect*, **26**, 47-53

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory, and Roberts, H M, North East Vernacular Architect Group, 1996 Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory: buildings of the religious estates in Medieval Durham; dendrochronological survey, 1995-6, *Vernacular Architect*, 27, 85-6

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 2001 *Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from Hallgarth Manor Cottages, Hallgarth, Pittington, Co Durham,* Centre for Archaeol Rep, **86/2001**

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 2002 Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from the Rigging Loft and Chapel Undercroft, Trinity House, Broad Chare, Newcastle upon Tyne, Tyne and Wear, Centre for Archaeol Rep, 63/2002

Howard, R E and Litton, C D, 2003 unpubl Carlisle Cathedral/Carlisle Castle, unpubl computer file *CRLCDSQ01*, Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory

Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1988 An East Midlands master tree-ring chronology and its uses in dating vernacular buildings, University of Nottingham, Dept of Classical and Archaeol Studies, Monograph Series, III

Miles, D, Haddon-Reece, D, and Moran, M, 1994 Tree-ring dates for buildings: List 56, *Vernacular Architect*, **25**, 28-36

Miles, D W H, 2001 The Tree-Ring Dating of Hergest Court, Kingston, Herefordshire, Centre for Archaeol Rep, **13/2001**

Roberts, M, Laxton, R, Howard, R, and Litton, C, 1999 The buildings of the religious estates in Medieval Durham A tree-ring dating project, *Durham Archaeological Journal*, **14-15**, 141-160

Siebenlist-Kerner, V, 1978 Chronology, 1341-1636, for hillside oaks from Western England and Wales, in *Dendrochronology in Europe* (ed J M Fletcher), BAR Int Ser, **51**, 295-301

Tyers, I, 1999 Dendrochronological analysis of timbers from Black Ladies, near Brewood, Staffordshire, ARCUS Rep, **484**

Table 1:	Details	of tree-rinc	samples	from the	Timber loft,	The College,	Durham

Sample	Sample location	Total	Sapwood	First measured	Last heartwood	Last measured	
number		rings	rings*	ring date (AD)	ring date (AD)	ring date (AD)	
First-floor beams							
DUR-O01	North-south main joist, truss 3	91	20c			110 JB. 401 400	
DUR-002	North-south main joist, truss 1	NM					
DUR-003	®Common joist, no 8, bay 4	99	h/s	1019	1117	1117	
DUR-O04	BCommon joist, no 12, bay 2	91		1018		1108	
DUR-O05	®Common joist, no 10, bay 4	145	h/s	975	1119	1119	
DUR-O06	®Common joist, no 5, bay 1	102	h/s	1009	1110	1110	
DUR-007	®Common joist, no 7, bay 4	131	h/s	980	1110	1110	
DUR-O08	®Common joist, no 7, bay 1	74		1004		1077	
DUR-009	®Common joist, no 9, bay 4	103		998		1100	
DUR-O10	®?Common joist, no 3, bay 1	91	32c	1355	1413	1445	
Ground-floo	or beams						
DUR-011	North-south main beam, truss 2	104	20C				
DUR-012	North-south main beam, truss 4	108	26C	1434	1515	1541	
DUR-O13	North-south main beam, truss 3	106	36C				
DUR-O14	®North-south main beam, truss 5	80	23C	1437	1493	1516	
DUR-O15	Common joist, no 9, bay 2	110	20C	1432	1521	1541	
DUR-O16	Common joist, no 5, bay 3	97	21c	1441	1516	1537	
DUR-017	Common joist, no 6, bay 1	94	21C	1448	1520	1541	
DUR-O18	Common joist, 4, bay 3	99	23c	1440	1515	1538	
DUR-019	Common joist, 5, bay 2	62	20C	1480	1521	1541	
DUR-O20	Common joist 6, bay 3	98	15	1440	1522	1537	
DUR-O21	Common joist, no 2, bay 2	111	15C	1431	1526	1541	
DUR-022	Common joist, no 9, bay 3	83	17c	1455	1520	1537	
DUR-023	North-south main beam, truss 1	135	21c	1402	1515	1536	

Sample	Sample location	Total	Sapwood	First measured	Last heartwood	Last measured
number		rings	rings*	ring date (AD)	ring date (AD)	ring date (AD)
DUR-024	Post	NM				

* NM = not measured

h/s = the heartwood/sapwood boundary is the last ring on the sample

C = complete sapwood retained on sample, last measured ring is the felling date

c = complete sapwood on timber, all or part lost in sampling

Table 2: Results of the cross-matching of site sequence DUROSQ01 and relevant reference chronologies when the first-ring date is AD 975 and the last-ring date is AD 1119

Reference chronology	<i>t</i> -value	Span of chronology	Reference
East Midlands	8.0	AD 882-1982	Laxton and Litton 1988
England	6.0	AD 404-1981	Baillie and Pilcher 1982 unpubl
Trinity House (Rigging loft), Newcastle-upon-Tyne	8.8	AD 950-1181	Howard et al 2002
Carlisle Cathedral/Castle	7.2	AD 961-1446	Howard <i>et al</i> 2003 unpubl
Lincoln Cathedral (St Hughs Choir), Lincs	6.8	AD 882-1191	Laxton and Litton 1988
Brecon Cathedral (Chapter House), Powys	5.5	AD 996-1227	Howard <i>et al</i> 1994a
Hemington timbers, Notts	5.3	AD 888-1087	Laxton and Litton 1988
Lincoln Cathedral (Angel Choir), Lincs	5.2	AD 912-1248	Laxton and Litton 1988
Guildhall (East range), Market Place, Carlisle, Cumbria	4.9	AD 976-1382	Howard et al 1994b

Table 3: Results of the cross-matching of site sequence DUROSQ02 and relevant reference chronologies when the first-ring date is AD 1402 and the last ring date is AD 1541

Reference chronology	<i>t</i> -value	Span of chronology	Reference
Western England and Wales	6.0	AD 1341-1636	Siebenlist-Kerner 1978
England	6.0	AD 404-1981	Baillie and Pilcher 1982 unpubl
East Midlands	5.5	AD 882-1982	Laxton and Litton 1988
1-2 The College, Cathedral Precinct, Durham	14.1	AD 1364-1531	Howard et al 1992
Bull Hole Byre, Bearpark, Durham	10,4	AD 1452-1620	Arnold <i>et al</i> 2002a
Aydon Castle (Kitchen range), Corbridge, Northumberland	9.4	AD 1424-1543	Hillam and Groves 1991
Aydon Castle (Latrine block), Corbridge, Northumberland	8.4	AD 1406-1545	Arnold <i>et al</i> 2002b
Seaton Holme, Easington, Durham	7.3	AD 1375-1489	Howard et al 1988 unpubl
35 The Close, Newcastle-upon-Tyne	7.0	AD 1365-1513	Howard et al 1991

Table 4: Results of the cross-matching of sample DUR-O10 and relevant reference chronologies when the first-ring date is AD 1355 and the last ring date is AD 1445

Reference chronology	t-value	Span of chronology	Reference
Hergest Court, Kingston, Herefordshire	6.4	AD 1406-1665	Miles 2001
Cottage Farm, Easthope, Shropshire	6.0	AD 1308-1454	Miles <i>et al</i> 1994
Black Ladies, near Brewood, Staffordshire	5.9	AD 1372-1671	Tyers 1999
Ightfield Hall Barn, Shropshire	5.7	AD 1341-1566	Groves 1997
Crook Hall, Sidegate, Durham	5.3	AD 1354-1467	Howard et al 1992
Redroofs, Sawbridge, Warwicks	5.2	AD 1355-1448	Howard <i>et al</i> 1995b
Durham Cathedral (Choir roof), Durham	5.1	AD 1346-1458	Howard et al 1992
Witton Hall (barn), Witton Gilbert, Tyne & Wear	4.9	AD 1342-1441	Howard <i>et al</i> 1996
Hallgarth Manor Cottages, Hallgarth, Pittington, Co Durham	4.7	AD 1336-1624	Howad et al 2001



Figure 1: Map to show the location of Durham Cathedral

© Crown Copyright and database right 2013. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence number 100024900 Figure 2: Sketch plan of the ground-floor showing the earliest phase, based on a sketch by Norman Emery





Figure 3: East gable end, drawn by Norman Emery



Figure 4: First-floor plan, showing the location of samples DUR-O01-10, based on a drawing by Norman Emery

15



Figure 5: Ground-floor plan, showing the location of samples DUR-O11-24, drawn by Norman Emery



Figure 6: Bar diagram of samples in site sequence DUROSQ01

Heartwood rings h/s = heartwood/sapwood ring



Figure 7: Bar diagram of samples in site sequence DUROSQ02

h/s = heartwood/sapwood ring

C = complete sapwood retained on sample, last measured ring date is the felling date

c = complete sapwood on timber, all or part lost in sampling

Data of measured samples - measurements in 0.01mm units

DUR-001A 91

DUR-012B 108

DUR-023B 135

.

255 514 377 435 415 419 466 345 292 258 275 219 250 349 288 273 337 220 319 315 291 309 297 232 193 230 195 255 270 204 199 184 232 202 158 160 175 156 182 174 164 139 145 174 104 92 82 121 136 140 137 94 90 117 134 131 90 79 91 132 127 102 116 103 115 128 169 126 123 144 105 69 69 99 156 126 129 124 121 123 95 106 102 100 117 125 86 86 127 108 112 78 79 86 111 123 112 113 78 59 54 58 70 88 111 85 140 117 109 94 74 73 86 85 97 91 108 115 109 99 74 115 90 112 114 79 95 113 95 87 91 114 97 114 112

APPENDIX

Tree-Ring Dating

The Principles of Tree-Ring Dating

Tree-ring dating, or dendrochronology as it is known, is discussed in some detail in the Laboratory's Monograph, 'An East Midlands Master Tree-Ring Chronology and its uses for dating Vernacular Building' (Laxton and Litton 1988) and, Dendrochronology; Guidelines on Producing and Interpreting Dendrochronological Dates (English Heritage 1988). Here we will give the bare outlines. Each year an oak tree grows an extra ring on the outside of its trunk and all its branches just inside its bark. The width of this annual ring depends largely on the weather during the growing season, about April to October, and possibly also on the weather during the previous year. Good growing seasons give rise to relatively wide rings, poor ones to very narrow rings and average ones to relatively average ring widths. Since the climate is so variable from year to year, almost random-like, the widths of these rings will also appear random-like in sequence, reflecting the seasons. This is illustrated in Figure 1 where, for example, the widest rings appear at irregular intervals. This is the key to dating by tree rings, or rather, by their widths. Records of the average ring widths for oaks, one for each year for the last 1000 years or more, are available for different areas. These are called master chronologies. Because of the random-like nature of these sequences of widths, there is usually only one position at which a sequence of ring widths from a sample of oak timber with at least 70 rings will match a master. This will date the timber and, in particular, the last ring.

If the bark is still on the sample, as in Figure 1, then the date of the last ring will be the date of felling of the oak from which it was cut. There is much evidence that in medieval times oaks cut down for building purposes were used almost immediately, usually within the year or so (Rackham 1976). Hence if bark is present on several main timbers in a building, none of which appear reused or are later insertions, and if they all have the same date for their last ring, then we can be quite confident that this is the date of construction or soon after. If there is no bark on the sample, then we have to make an estimate of the felling date; how this is done is explained below.

The Practice of Tree-Ring Dating at the University of Nottingham Tree-Ring dating Laboratory

1. **Inspecting the Building and Sampling the Timbers.** Together with a building historian the timbers in a building are inspected to try to ensure that those sampled are not reused or later insertions. Sampling is almost always done by coring into the timber, which has the great advantage that we can sample *in situ* timbers and those judged best to give the date of construction, or phase of construction if there is more than one in the building. The timbers to be sampled are also inspected to see how many rings they have. We normally look for timbers with at least 70 rings, and preferably more. With fewer rings than this, 50 for example, sequences of widths become difficult to match to a unique position within a master sequence of ring widths and so are difficult to date (Litton and Zainodin 1991). The cross-section of the rafter shown in Figure 2 has about 120 rings; about 20 of which are sapwood rings.

To ensure that we are getting the date of the building as a whole, or the whole of a phase of construction if there is more than one, about 8 to 10 samples per phase are usually taken. Sometimes we take many more, especially if the construction is complicated. One reason for taking so many samples is that, in general, some will fail to give a date. There may be many reasons why a particular sequence of ring widths from a sample of timber fails to give a date even though others from the same building do. For example, a particular tree may have grown in an odd ecological niche, so odd indeed that the widths of its rings were determined by factors other than the local climate! In such circumstances it will be impossible to date a timber from this tree using the master sequence whose widths, we can assume, were predominantly determined by the local climate at the time.



Fig 1. A wedge of oak from a tree felled in 1976. It shows the annual growth rings, one for each year from the innermost ring to the last ring on the outside just inside the bark. The year of each ring can determined by counting back from the outside ring, which grew in 1976.



Fig 2. Cross-section of a rafter showing the presence of sapwood rings in the left hand corner, the arrow is pointing to the heartwood/sapwood boundary (H/S). Also a core with sapwood; again the arrow is pointing to the H/S. The core is about the size of a pencil.



Fig. 3 Measuring ring widths under a microscope. The microscope is fixed while the sample is on a moving platform. The total sequence of widths is measure twice to ensure that an error has not been made. This type of apparatus is needed to process a large number of samples on a regular basis.



Fig 4. Three cores from timbers in a building. They come from trees growing at the same time. Notice that, although the sequences of widths look similar, they are not identical. This is typical.

Sampling is done by coring into the timber with a hollow corer attached to an electric drill and usually from its outer rings inwards towards where the centre of the tree, the pith, is judged to be. An illustration of a core is shown in Figure 2; it is about 15cm long and 1cm diameter. Great care has to be taken to ensure that as few as possible of the outer rings are lost in coring. This can be difficult as these outer rings are often very soft (see below on sapwood). Each sample is given a code which identifies uniquely which timber it comes from, which building it is from and where the building is located. For example, CRO-A06 is the sixth core taken from the first building (A) sampled by the Laboratory in Cropwell Bishop. Where it came from in that building will be shown in the sampling records and drawings. No structural damage is done to any timbers by coring, nor does it weaken them.

During the initial inspection of the building and its timbers the dendrochronologist may come to the conclusion that, as far as can be judged, none of the timbers have sufficient rings in them for dating purposes and may advise against sampling to save further unwarranted expense.

All sampling by the Laboratory is undertaken according to current Health and Safety Standards. The Laboratory's dendrochronologists are insured.

- 2. *Measuring Ring Widths*. Each core is sanded down with a belt sander using medium-grit paper and then finished by hand with flourgrade-grit paper. The rings are then clearly visible and differentiated from each other with a result very much like that shown in Figure 2. The core is then mounted on a movable table below a microscope and the ring-widths measured individually from the innermost ring to the outermost. The widths are automatically recorded in a computer file as they are measured (see Fig 3).
- 3. Cross-matching and Dating the Samples. Because of the factors besides the local climate which may determine the annual widths of a tree's rings, no two sequences of ring widths from different oaks growing at the same time are exactly alike (Fig 4). Indeed, the sequences may not be exactly alike even when the trees are growing near to each other. Consequently, in the Laboratory we do not attempt to match two sequences of ring widths by eye, or graphically, or by any other subjective method. Instead, it is done objectively (ie statistically) on a computer by a process called cross-matching. The output from the computer tells us the extent of correlation between two sample sequences of widths or, if we are dating, between a sample sequence of widths and the master, at each relative position of one to the other (offsets). The extent of the correlation at an offset is determined by the *t*-value (defined in almost any introductory book on statistics). That offset with the maximum t-value among the t-values at all the offsets will be the best candidate for dating one sequence relative to the other. If one of these is a master chronology, then this will date the other. Experiments carried out in the past with sequences from oaks of known date suggest that a t-value of at least 4.5, and preferably at least 5.0, is usually adequate for the dating to be accepted with reasonable confidence (Laxton and Litton 1988; Laxton et al 1988; Howard et al 1984-1995).

This is illustrated in Fig 5 with timbers from one of the roofs of Lincoln Cathedral. Here four sequences of ring widths, LIN-C04, 05, 08, and 45, have been cross-matched with each other. The ring widths themselves have been omitted in the *bar-diagram*, as is usual, but the offsets at which they best cross-match each other are shown; eg the sequence of ring widths of C08 matches the sequence of ring widths of C45 best when it is at a position starting 20 rings after the first ring of C45, and similarly for the others. The actual *t*-values between the four at these offsets of best correlations are in the matrix. Thus at the offset of +20 rings, the *t*-value between C45 and C08 is 5.6 and is the maximum found between these two among all the positions of one sequence relative to the other.

It is standard practice in our Laboratory first to cross-match as many as possible of the ringwidth sequences of the samples in a building and then to form an average from them. This average is called a *site sequence* of the building being dated and is illustrated in Fig 5. The fifth bar at the bottom is a site sequence for a roof at Lincoln Cathedral and is constructed from the matching sequences of the four timbers. The site sequence width for each year is the average of the widths in each of the sample sequences which has a width for that year. Thus in Fig 5 if the widths shown are 0.8mm for C45, 0.2mm for C08, 0.7mm for C05, and 0.3mm for C04, then the corresponding width of the site sequence is the average of these, 0.55mm. The actual sequence of widths of this site sequence is stored on the computer. The reason for creating site sequences is that it is usually easier to date an average sequence of ring widths with a master sequence than it is to date the individual component sample sequences separately.

The straightforward method of cross-matching several sample sequences with each other one at a time is called the 'maximal *t*-value' method. The actual method of cross-matching a group of sequences of ring-widths used in the Laboratory involves grouping and averaging the ring-width sequences and is called the 'Litton-Zainodin Grouping Procedure'. It is a modification of the straight forward method and was successfully developed and tested in the Laboratory and has been published (Litton and Zainodin 1991; Laxton *et al* 1988).

4. *Estimating the Felling Date*. As mentioned above, if the bark is present on a sample, then the date of its last ring is the date of the felling of its tree. Actually it could be the year after if it had been felled in the first three months before any new growth had started, but this is not too important a consideration in most cases. The actual bark may not be present on a timber in a building, though the dendrochronologist who is sampling can often see from its surface that only the bark is missing. In these cases the date of the last ring is still the date of felling.

Quite often some, though not all, of the original outer rings are missing on a timber. The outer rings on an oak, called *sapwood* rings, are usually lighter than the inner rings, the *heartwood*, and so are relatively easy to identify. For example, sapwood can be seen in the corner of the rafter and at the outer end of the core in Figure 2, both indicated by arrows. More importantly for dendrochronology, the sapwood is relatively soft and so liable to insect attack and wear and tear. The builder, therefore, may remove some of the sapwood for precisely these reasons. Nevertheless, if at least some of the sapwood rings are left on a sample, we will know that not too many rings have been lost since felling so that the date of the last ring on the sample is only a few years before the date of the original last ring on the tree, and so to the date of felling.

Various estimates have been made and used for the average number of sapwood rings in mature oak trees (English Heritage 1998). A fairly conservative range is between 15 and 50 and that this holds for 95% of mature oaks. This means, of course, that in a small number of cases there could be fewer than 15 and more than 50 sapwood rings. For example, the core CRO-A06 has only 9 sapwood rings and some have obviously been lost over time - either they were removed originally by the carpenter and/or they rotted away in the building and/or they were lost in the coring. It is not known exactly how many sapwood rings are missing, but using the above range the Laboratory would estimate between a minimum of 6 (=15-9) and a maximum of 41 (=50-9). If the last ring of CRO-A06 has been dated to 1500, say, then the estimated felling-date range for the tree from which it came originally would be between 1506 and 1541. The Laboratory uses this estimate for sapwood in areas of England where it has no prior information. It also uses it when dealing with samples with very many rings, about 120 to the last heartwood ring. But in other areas of England where the Laboratory has accumulated a number of samples with complete sapwood, that is, no sapwood lost since felling, other estimates in place of the conservative range of 15 to 50 are used. In the East Midlands (Laxton et al 2001) and the east to the south down to Kent (Pearson 1995) where it has sampled extensively in the past, the Laboratory uses the shorter estimate of 15 to 35 sapwood rings in 95% of mature oaks growing in these parts. Since the sample CRO-A06 comes from a house in Cropwell Bishop in the East Midlands, a better estimate of sapwood rings lost since felling is between a minimum of 6 (=15-9) and 26 (=35-9) and the felling would be estimated to have taken place between 1506 and 1526, a shorter period than before. (Oak boards quite often come from the Baltic and in these cases the 95% confidence limits for sapwood are 9 to 36 (Howard et al 1992, 56)).

Even more precise estimates of the felling date and range can often be obtained using knowledge of a particular case and information gathered at the time of sampling. For example, at the time of sampling the dendrochronologist may have noted that the timber from which the core of Figure 2 was taken still had complete sapwood but that none of the soft sapwood rings were lost in coring. By measuring into the timber the depth of sapwood lost, say 2 cm, a reasonable estimate can be made of the number of sapwood rings lost, say 12 to 15 rings in this case. By adding on 12 to 15 years to the date of the last ring on the sample a good tight estimate for the range of the felling date can be obtained, which is often better than the 15 to 35 years later we would have estimated without this observation. In the example, the felling is now estimated to



	C45	C08	C05	C04
C45		+20	+37	+47
C08	5.6		+17	+27
C05	5.2	10.4		+10
C04	5.9	3.7	5.1	

Bar Diagram



Fig 5. Cross-matching of four sequences from a Lincoln Cathedral roof and the formation of a site sequence from them.

The *bar diagram* represents these sequences without the rings themselves. The length of the bar is proportional to the number of rings in the sequence. Here the four sequences are set at relative positions (*offsets*) to each other at which they have maximum correlation as measured by the *t*-values.

The *t*-value/offset matrix contains the maximum *t*-values below the diagonal and the offsets above it. Thus, the maximum *t*-value between C08 and C45 occurs at the offset of +20 rings and the *t*-value is then 5.6.

The *site sequence* is composed of the average of the corresponding widths, as illustrated with one width.

have taken place between AD 1512 and 1515, which is much more precise than without this extra information.

Even if all the sapwood rings are missing on a sample, but none of the heartwood rings are, then an estimate of the felling-date range is possible by adding on the full compliment of, say, 15 to 35 years to the date of the last heartwood ring (called the heartwood/sapwood boundary or transition ring and denoted H/S). Fortunately it is often easy for a trained dendrochronologist to identify this boundary on a timber. If a timber does not have its heartwood/sapwood boundary, then only a *post quem* date for felling is possible.

- 5. *Estimating the Date of Construction*. There is a considerable body of evidence collected by dendrochronologists over the years that oak timbers used in buildings were not seasoned in medieval or early modern times (English Heritage 1998 and Miles 1997, 50-55). Hence provided all the samples in a building have estimated felling-date ranges broadly in agreement with each other, so that they appear to have been felled as a group, then this should give an accurate estimate of the period when the structure was built, or soon after (Laxton *et al* 2001, figure 8 and pages 34-5 where 'associated groups of fellings' are discussed in detail). However, if there is any evidence of storing before use or if there is evidence the oak came from abroad (eg Baltic boards), then some allowance has to be made for this.
- 6. Master Chronological Sequences. Ultimately, to date a sequence of ring widths, or a site sequence, we need a master sequence of dated ring widths with which to cross-match it, a Master Chronology. To construct such a sequence we have to start with a sequence of widths whose dates are known and this means beginning with a sequence from an oak tree whose date of felling is known. In Fig 6 such a sequence is SHE-T, which came from a tree in Sherwood Forest which was blown down in a recent gale. After this other sequences which cross-match with it are added and gradually the sequence is 'pushed back in time' as far as the age of samples will allow. This process is illustrated in Fig 6. We have a master chronological sequence of widths for Nottinghamshire and East Midlands oak for each year from AD 882 to 1981. It is described in great detail in Laxton and Litton (1988), but the components it contains are shown here in the form of a bar diagram. As can be seen, it is well replicated in that for each year in this period there are several sample sequences having widths for that year. The master is the average of these. This master can now be used to date oak from this area and from the surrounding areas where the climate is very similar to that in the East Midlands. The Laboratory has also constructed a master for Kent (Laxton and Litton 1989). The method the Laboratory uses to construct a master sequence, such as the East Midlands and Kent, is completely objective and uses the Litton-Zainodin grouping procedure (Laxton et al 1988). Other laboratories and individuals have constructed masters for other areas and have made them available. As well as these masters, local (dated) site chronologies can be used to date other buildings from nearby. The Laboratory has hundreds of these site sequences from many parts of England and Wales covering many short periods.
- 7. **Ring-width Indices.** Tree-ring dating can be done by cross-matching the ring widths themselves, as described above. However, it is advantageous to modify the widths first. Because different trees grow at different rates and because a young oak grows in a different way from an older oak, irrespective of the climate, the widths are first standardized before any matching between them is attempted. These standard widths are known as ring-width indices and were first used in dendrochronology by Baillie and Pilcher (1973). The exact form they take is explained in this paper and in the appendix of Laxton and Litton (1988) and is illustrated in the graphs in Fig 7. Here ring-widths are plotted vertically, one for each year of growth. In the upper sequence of (a), the generally large early growth after 1810 is very apparent as is the smaller later growth from about 1900 onwards when the tree is maturing. A similar phenomena can be observed in the lower sequence of (a) starting in 1835. In both the widths are also changing rapidly from year to year. The peaks are the wide rings and the troughs are the narrow rings corresponding to good and poor growing seasons, respectively. The two corresponding sequence of Baillie-Pilcher indices are plotted in (b) where the differences in the immature and mature growths have been removed and only the rapidly changing peaks and troughs remain, that are associated with the common climatic signal. This makes cross-matching easier.



Fig. 6 Bar diagram showing the relative positions and dates of the first rings of the component site sequences in the East Midlands Master Dendrochronological Sequence, EM08/87





Fig 7. (a) The raw ring-widths of two samples, THO-A01 and THO-B05, whose felling dates are known. Here the ring widths are plotted vertically, one for each year, so that peaks represent wide rings and troughs narrow ones. Notice the growth-trends in each; on average the earlier rings of the young tree are wider than the later ones of the older tree in both sequences.

Fig 7. (b) The *Baillie-Pilcher* indices of the above widths. The growth-trends have been removed completely.

REFERENCES

Baillie, M G L, and Pilcher, J R, 1973, A simple cross-dating program for tree-ring research, *Tree-Ring Bulletin*, **33**, 7-14

English Heritage, 1998 Dendrochronology; Guidelines on Producing and Interpreting Dendrochronological Dates, London

Hillam, J, Morgan, R A, and Tyers, I, 1987, Sapwood estimates and the dating of short ring sequences, *Applications of tree-ring studies*, BAR Int Ser, **3**, 165-85

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1984-95, Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results, *Vernacular Architecture*, **15-26**

Hughes, M K, Milson, S J, and Legett, P A, 1981 Sapwood estimates in the interpretation of tree-ring dates, *J Archaeol Sci*, **8**, 381-90

Laxon, R R, Litton, C D, and Zainodin, H J, 1988 An objective method for forming a master ring-width sequence, *P A C T*, **22**, 25-35

Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1988 An East Midlands Master Chronology and its use for dating vernacular buildings, University of Nottingham, Department of Archaeology Publication, Monograph Series III

Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1989 Construction of a Kent Master Dendrochronological Sequence for Oak, AD 1158 to 1540, *Medieval Archaeol*, **33**, 90-8

Laxon, R R, Litton, C D, and Howard, R E, 2001 *Timber; Dendrochronology of Roof Timbers at Lincoln Cathedral*, English Heritage Research Transactions, **7**

Litton, C D, and Zainodin, H J, 1991 Statistical models of Dendrochronology, *J Archaeol Sci*, 18, 29-40

Miles, D W H, 1997 The interpretation, presentation and use of tree-ring dates, *Vernacular* Architecture, **28**, 40-56

Pearson, S, 1995 The Medieval Houses of Kent, An Historical Analysis, London

Rackham, O, 1976 Trees and Woodland in the British Landscape, London