ST LEONARD'S CHURCH MAIN STREET APETHORPE NORTHAMPTONSHIRE TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS

SCIENTIFIC DATING REPORT

Alison Arnold and Robert Howard

ARCHAEOLOGICAL **SCIENCE**

Research Department Report Series 85-2008

ST LEONARD'S CHURCH MAIN STREET APETHORPE NORTHAMPTONSHIRE

TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS

Alison Arnold and Robert Howard

NGR: TL 025 957

© English Heritage

ISSN 1749-8775

The Research Department Report Series incorporates reports from all the specialist teams within the English Heritage Research Department: Archaeological Science; Archaeological Archives; Historic Interiors Research and Conservation; Archaeological Projects; Aerial Survey and Investigation; Archaeological Survey and Investigation; Architectural Investigation; Imaging, Graphics and Survey, and the Survey of London. It replaces the former Centre for Archaeology Reports Series, the Archaeological Investigation Report Series and the Architectural Investigation Report Series.

Many of these are interim reports which make available the results of specialist investigations in advance of full publication. They are not usually subject to external refereeing, and their conclusions may sometimes have to be modified in the light of information not available at the time of the investigation. Where no final project report is available, readers are advised to consult the author before citing these reports in any publication. Opinions expressed in Research Department reports are those of the author(s) and are not necessarily those of English Heritage.

Requests for further hard copies, after the initial print run, can be made by emailing: Res.reports@english-heritage.org.uk or by writing to: English Heritage, Fort Cumberland, Fort Cumberland Road, Eastney, Portsmouth PO4 9LD Please note that a charge will be made to cover printing and postage.

SUMMARY

Four phases of felling have been detected amongst the samples from St Leonard's Church. The earliest is that represented by samples from tiebeams of the north and south aisles, plus two king-posts in the chancel roof. These timbers have an estimated felling date in the range AD 1412–37.

A second phase of felling is represented by samples from the chancel, notably the cranked tiebeam and four moulded common rafters. These timbers have a felling date in the range AD1611–36.

This early seventeenth-century roof appears to have been replaced in the lateseventeenth century by the present roof, comprising the two king-post trusses with straight tiebeams, these timbers having an estimated felling date in the range AD 1675– 1700.

A fourth and final phase of felling is represented by a further, individually dated sample from the chancel. This timber has an estimated felling date range AD 1737–62. It is possible that it represents a phase of minor repair to the roof.

Three site chronologies have been created from the material sampled here, APTCSQ01, SQ02, and SQ03 of six, seven, and six samples, with 193, 139, and 87 rings, these dated as spanning the years AD 1211–1403, AD 1458 –1596, and AD 1579–1665, respectively.

CONTRIBUTORS

Alison Arnold and Robert Howard

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Laboratory would like to take this opportunity to thank the local Parish Community, particularly Lord and Lady Brassey, Tamara Ord, and Richard Parkinson, for their enthusiasm for this programme of tree-ring analysis, and for their help and cooperation during sampling. We would also like to thank Nicholas Hill, project manager at English Heritage's Northampton Office, for his help and advice during sampling and also for providing background material.

ARCHIVE LOCATION

Northamptonshire Sites and Monuments Record Northamptonshire County Council PO Box 163, County Hall Guildhall Road Northampton NN1 1AX

DATE OF INVESTIGATION 2008

CONTACT DETAILS

Alison Arnold and Robert Howard Nottingham Tree-ring Dating Laboratory 20 Hillcrest Grove Sherwood Nottingham NG5 1FT

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

St Leonard's church lies towards the east end of the village of Apethorpe (TL 025 957, Figs 1 and 2) to the north-east of Apethorpe Hall, former seat of the Earls of Westmorland. The fabric of the church is dated stylistically to the late-fifteenth and earlyseventeenth centuries, though a single chevron voussoir, reset in the facing of the north aisle, is a possible hint that an earlier structure may have stood on the site.

The building comprises a west tower, a nave flanked by aisles to north and south, a south porch, and a chancel with a chapel attached to its south side. This southern chapel, known as the Mildmay Chapel, contains one of the finest and most imposing seventeenth-century tombs in England: that of Sir Anthony Mildmay, attributed to the sculptor Maximilian Colt and known to have been built in AD 1621.

THE ROOFS

The nave and aisle roofs

The nave roof of St Leonard's church (Fig 3a) comprises four principal rafter with tiebeam trusses (the principal rafters hidden above the nave ceiling), the tiebeams being steeply cambered and supported at each end by short wall posts and knee braces, both of which rise from stone corbels. The tiebeams, posts, and the braces are all given moulded decoration.

Between each truss may be seen intermediate, cambered, lateral, beams, the ends having neither wall posts or braces. The nave is ceiled by a longitudinal ridge rib, supported at the apex of the cambered beams, and single intermediate longitudinal 'purlin' ribs to either side. All these further timbers are plain and unmoulded.

The aisles roofs to the north and south sides of the nave comprise four main 'tiebeams', cranked and moulded in a similar fashion to those of the nave roof, though of course much shorter (Fig 3b). Between the cranked tiebeams there are again a series of unmoulded intermediate beams, these intermediates, however, being straight rather than cranked, and acting as rafters, running 'lean-to' fashion from the wall plates of the aisles to a plate set above the arches of the nave. A plain longitudinal rib runs between the beams ceiling the aisle.

It was believed, on the basis of stylistic similarities and the overall structural integrity of the masonry, that the nave and both aisle roofs are of the same date, and could be associated with the early development of Apethorpe Hall in the late-fifteenth century. There is, however, no real evidence that St Leonard's is not a generation or so earlier than this, and that it may date to the early- to mid-fifteenth century . It is also possible that the aisles themselves could be of different dates to each other, although the masonry gives no indication of this.

The chancel roof

Whilst the roofs of the nave and aisles are similar throughout, that of the chancel shows greater variation, comprising three bays formed by three trusses (a possible further truss at the east end wall, truss '1', not extant). Two of these trusses, the 'middle' two, are of shallow pitched, king-post form with straight tiebeams, whilst the 'fourth' truss, at the chancel arch, is formed of a cranked tiebeam, similar, though with a shallower pitch, to those seen in the nave (Fig 4a/b). Between the trusses runs a ridge beam as well as, to each pitch of the roof, single, slightly staggered, purlins. All three tiebeams, the principal rafters, the ridge beam and purlins are given moulded decoration. The king posts are plain.

Each bay comprises four common rafters, the upper rafters, ie, those between purlin and ridge, always being slightly wider than the lower rafters, those between wall plate and purlin. Almost all these common rafters are plain, square-cut, and undecorated. The exception to this rule are those seen in bay three, where the upper four on the south side are all moulded in a style similar to that on the other decorated timbers of the chancel roof (Fig 5a).

It is clear, from the precision of the edges, the straightness of the timbers, and the regularity of the circular saw-marks, that some, probably twentieth or perhaps latenineteenth century, repair and replacement has taken place within this roof; some sections of purlin, and several common rafters, are modern copies, the moulding, where necessary, being faithfully reproduced (Fig 5b). One or two of the older pieces have also had modern sections spliced into them.

The cranked tiebeam over the chancel arch also shows evidence for a possible still earlier phase of work to this roof. The end of the present ridge beam, for example, does not fit snugly into the mortice at the apex here, this being too large for the present timber and having a slightly different outline. There are also redundant mortices on this tiebeam where, it would appear, former purlins were housed, new mortices having been cut for the present purlins.

There is thus some evidence that timbers with different felling dates may be present in the chancel roof. The form of the chancel roof, however, with its king-post trusses, straight tiebeams, and purlins, is very similar, if not identical to that of the Mildmay Chapel, the timbers here having similar decorative mouldings. It is believed that this roof was constructed in AD 1621

SAMPLING

Sampling and analysis by tree-ring dating of timbers at Apethorpe church was requested by English Heritage. This was undertaken to support a programme of research being carried out at Apethorpe Hall by this body's Architectural Investigation Team, which will not only inform future repair and conservation decisions, but will also contribute towards several publications (Cattell et al forthcoming; Arnold and Howard 2008).

The sampling brief requested that the timbers in two areas in particular should be cored. Primarily these were the timbers of the north and south aisles, it being presumed that these were of the same date as those in the nave, the latter being currently inaccessible due to the height of this roof, the presence of fixed pews precluding the use of a mobile scaffold tower. The second area of sampling concerned the timbers of the chancel roof.

It was hoped that this programme of analysis would establish with greater certainty the date of both the north and south aisles, and by inference the date of the nave, and establish whether or not there is any difference in date between them. It was also hoped that tree-ring analysis would establish the date of the chancel roof, and whether it was earlier, the same, or a later date than that of the Mildmay Chapel, known to have been constructed in AD 1621.

Thus, from the material available, a total of 30 oak samples was obtained by coring, each sample being given the code APT-C (for Apethorpe, site 'C') and numbered 01–30. Of these 30 samples, seven, APT-C01–07, were taken from the cranked tiebeams of the north and south aisle. Whilst in theory other timbers were available here, particularly the straight intermediate rafters, all these, along with wall plates, wall beams, and longitudinal ribs, were derived from fast-grown trees; as such it was felt that they would be unlikely to provide samples with the minimum of 54 rings necessary for reliable tree-ring analysis. The remaining 23 samples, APT-C08–30, were obtained from the chancel roof, an attempt being made to sample a selection of different beam types and possible phases.

Where possible the positions of these samples are marked on plans and drawings made at the time of sampling, these being reproduced here as Figures 6a/b. Details of the samples are given in Table 1. In this Table all the trusses and other timbers have been numbered from east to west and further identified on a north–south basis as appropriate.

ANALYSIS

Each of the 30 samples obtained was prepared by sanding and polishing. It was seen at this point that six samples, APT-C04, C05, C15, C21, C22, and C26, had less than 54 rings, the minimum required for reliable dating, and so these were rejected from this programme of analysis. The annual growth rings of the remaining 24 samples were, however, measured, the data of these measurements being given at the end of this report. The data of these 24 measured samples were then compared with each other by the Litton/Zainodin grouping procedure (see Appendix), allowing three separate groups of cross-matching sample to be formed.

The first group comprises six samples, four from the cranked tiebeams of the north and south aisles, and two from the chancel roof, both of them representing king-posts. The samples of this group, shown in the bar diagram Figure 7, were combined at the offsets indicated to form site chronology APTCSQ01, with an overall length of 193 rings. Site chronology APTCSQ01 was then compared with an extensive corpus of reference chronologies, cross-matching consistently with a number of these when the date of its first ring is AD 1211 and the date of its last ring is AD 1403. The evidence of this crossmatching is given in the t -values of Table 2.

The second group comprises seven samples, all from the chancel roof, and includes all four moulded upper common rafters to the south side of bay 3 and the cranked tiebeam of truss 4; the other two samples are plain common rafters. The samples of this group, shown in the bar diagram Figure 8, were combined at the offsets indicated to form site chronology APTCSQ02, with an overall length of 139 rings. Site chronology APTCSQ02 was also compared with the reference chronologies, cross-matching consistently with a number of these when the date of its first ring is AD 1458 and the date of its last ring is AD 1596. The evidence of this cross-matching is given in the t-values of Table 3.

The third and final group to form comprises six samples, all of them again from the chancel roof. This group includes the principal rafters of the two king-post trusses, all such timbers being moulded, a moulded ridge beam, and one plain common rafter. The samples of this third group, shown in the bar diagram Figure 9, were combined at the offsets indicated to form site chronology APTCSQ03, with an overall length of 87 rings. Site chronology APTCSQ03 was also compared with the reference chronologies, crossmatching consistently with a number of these when the date of its first ring is AD 1579 and the date of its last ring is AD 1665. The evidence of this cross-matching is given in the ^t-values of Table 4.

Each of the three site chronologies was then compared with the remaining four measured but ungrouped samples. There was, however, no further satisfactory cross-matching. Each of the four remaining ungrouped samples was then compared individually with the reference chronologies, this indicating a cross-match for sample APT-C14 only, when the date of its first ring is AD 1659 and the date of its last ring is AD 1722. The evidence of this cross-matching is given in the t -values of Table 5.

This analysis can be summarised as below:

INTERPRETATION

Site chronology APTCSQ01 – the north and south aisle roofs and the chancel roof

None of the samples obtained from any of these timbers retains complete sapwood and it is thus not possible to indicate the precise felling date of any of the timbers represented. Several of them, however, do retain the heartwood/sapwood boundary. This means that only the sapwood element of the trees is missing, and it is thus possible to calculate an estimated felling date range for some of them.

Five of the six samples in site chronology APTCSQ01, representing timbers from the north and south aisles but also including two timbers from the chancel roof, retain the heartwood/sapwood boundary.

The position of the heartwood/sapwood boundary on these five samples varies by only 12 years, from relative position 181 (AD 1391) on sample APT-C02 to relative position 193 (AD 1403) on sample APT-C18. Given that such a limited variation is usually indicative of single-phase timbers, it is likely that the timbers represented were felled at the same time. The average date of this on these five samples is AD 1397. Using the usual 95% confidence limit of 15–40 rings for the amount of sapwood the trees might have had, would give the timbers represented an estimated felling date in the range AD 1412– 37.

It is not possible to be certain of the felling date of the timber represented by the single remaining sample, APT-C09 in site chronology APTCSQ01, as it does not retain the heartwood/sapwood boundary. However, given the degree of cross-matching between APT-C09 and the other samples, with a value of $t=12.9$ with sample C18 and $t=11.2$ with samples C03, there is no reason to suspect that it is not of the same date.

Importantly in this respect, there is a high degree of cross-matching between sample APT-C03 from the north aisle roof and sample APT-C06 from the south aisle roof, with $t=11.9$. Such a level would indicate that the timbers represented are derived from two trees that were growing very close to each other, or indeed, derived from the same tree. If this is indeed the case it would support the view that the north and south aisles are of the same date as each other, the probability of two samples cross-matching with each other so highly being much less likely if the timbers were felled at different times.

Site chronology APTCSQ02 – chancel roof cranked tiebeam and moulded common rafters

The seven dated samples of site chronology APTCSQ02 represent the cranked tiebeam of the chancel roof along with the four moulded common rafters in bay 3 of the south

slope, plus two plain common rafters. Only the sample representing the tiebeam retains the heartwood/sapwood boundary, this boundary being dated to AD 1596. Using the same 95% confidence limit of 15–40 rings for the amount of sapwood the tree might have had, would give the timber represented an estimated felling date in the range AD 1611–36.

The felling date range of the timbers represented by the other six samples in this group cannot be estimated because they do not have the heartwood/sapwood boundary. However, given the high degree of cross-matching seen between some of these samples, with values in excess of $t=8.0$, $t=9.0$, and even $t=10.0$ being seen, suggesting that the trees used are all from the same source, and indeed, the possibility that some beams are derived from the same tree, it is likely that all these timbers were felled at the same time.

Site chronology APTCSQ03 – chancel roof principal timbers

Of the six samples of site chronology APTCSQ03, four represent the principal rafters of the king post trusses, one represents a ridge beam, and the sixth a common rafter. All six samples retain the heartwood/sapwood boundary, the average date of this being AD 1660. Using the same 95% confidence for the amount of sapwood as above, would give the timbers represented an estimated felling date in the range AD 1675–1700. Given the similar position of the heartwood/sapwood boundaries on these samples, there is no reason to suspect that the timbers they represent were not all felled at the same time, a supposition supported by the fact that, with values in excess of $t=11.0$, $t=12.0$, and even $t=14.0$ being seen, it is likely that some timbers are derived from the same tree.

Sample APT-C14

A final timber is represented by the individually dated sample, APT-C14, a plain upper common rafter to the south side of bay 2. Having a heartwood/sapwood boundary date of AD 1722, and allowing for 15–40 sapwood rings, would give the timber represented an estimated felling date in the range AD 1737–62.

CONCLUSION

It would appear, therefore, that four phases of felling are have been detected amongst the sampled timbers of Apethorpe church. The earliest is that represented by site chronology APTCSQ01, comprised mainly of samples from the north and south aisles, plus the two king-posts, both presumably reused, in the chancel roof. These timbers have an estimated felling date in the range AD 1412–37.

A second phase of felling is represented by site chronology APTCSQ02, comprised of samples from timbers of the chancel, notably the cranked tiebeam at the chancel arch and the four moulded common rafters in bay 3 of the south slope of the roof. These timbers have a felling date in the range AD 1611–36. Such a date would suggest the possibility that the chancel was at least partly reroofed with cranked tiebeam trusses in the early seventeenth century, of which only one truss, that over the chancel arch, now remains. The construction of the adjoining Mildmay Chapel in 1621, which required the south wall of the chancel to be rebuilt, could have prompted the reroofing.

This early-seventeenth century roof appears to have been largely replaced in the lateseventeenth century by the present roof, comprising the two king-post trusses with straight tiebeams, and represented by the samples of site chronology APTCSQ03. These timbers (the principal rafters of these two trusses, and the ridge beam between them) have an estimated felling date in the range AD 1675–1700. A substantial rebuild of the chancel roof in the late-seventeenth century may imply that the early seventeenth-century roof retained a significant amount of medieval fabric, which needed replacing by the end of the century, with at least one medieval timber reused to provide king-posts for the new trusses.

Although the estimated felling date of the cranked tiebeam, AD 1611–36, brackets the date, AD 1621, of the Mildmay Chapel, the form of the chapel roof trusses is similar to that of the king-post trusses in the chancel roof, which are dated to AD 1675–1700. This might suggest that the present chapel roof is also later than AD 1621, but the lateseventeenth century chancel trusses may simply copy the basic form of the king-post trusses in the Mildmay Chapel; the mouldings on these trusses are not identical.

Be that as it may, a final phase of felling appears to be represented by the dating of the individual sample APT-C14. This timber, a plain common rafter, has an estimated felling date range of AD 1737–62. It is possible that it represents a phase of minor repair to the roof.

As intimated above, a number of samples probably represent timbers that were at least growing very close to each other in the same copse or stand of woodland, or, indeed, may represent timbers derived from the same tree. The timbers represented by samples APT-C03, C09, and C18 (a timber in the north aisle and the king posts of the chancel), in site chronology APTCSQ01, for example, cross-match with each other, with values in excess of $t=11.0$ and $t=12.0$. Samples APT-C24, C25, C27, and C29, all moulded common rafters, in site chronology APTCSQ02, also cross-match well, values in excess of $t=9.0$ and 10.0 being seen. The best matches, however, are seen between samples in site chronology APTCSQ03, where values approaching $t=15.0$ are seen, strongly suggesting timbers derived from the same tree.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alcock, N W, Warwick University, Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, Nottingham University Tree-ring Dating Laboratory, and Miles, D H, 1989 List 31 no 8 – Leverhulme Cruck Project Results: 1988, Vernacular Architect, 20, 43–5

Arnold, A J, Howard, R E, and Litton, C D, 2003 Tree-ring analysis of timbers from the roofs of the Lady Chapel north and south aisle, and the Choir south aisle, Worcester Cathedral, Worcester, Cent for Archaeol Rep, 96/2003

Arnold, A J, Howard, R E, Litton, C D, and Dawson, G, 2005 – The tree-ring fating of a number of bellframes in Leicestershire, Centre for Archaeol Rep, 5/2005

Arnold, A J, and Howard, R E, 2006 Kingsbury Hall, Kingsbury, Warwickshire: tree-ring analysis of timbers, Centre for Archaeol Rep, 53/2006

Arnold, A J, and Howard, R E, 2007 Leicester's Gatehouse, Kenilworth Castle, Kenilworth, Warwickshire: tree-ring analysis of timbers, Engl Heritage Res Dep Rep Ser, 8/2007

Arnold, A I, and Howard, R E, 2008 Apethorpe Hall, Apethorpe, Northamptonshire: treering analysis of timbers, Engl Heritage Res Dep Rep Ser, 87/2008

Arnold, A J, Howard, R E, and Litton, C D, 2008 Shenton Hall, Shenton, Leicestershire, tree-ring analysis of timbers from the dovecote, Res Dep Rep Ser, 22/2008

Arnold, A J, Howard, R E, and Tyers, C, 2008 Ulverscroft Priory, Ulverscroft, Charnwood Forest, Leicestershire, tree-ring analysis of timbers, Res Dep Rep Ser, 48/2008

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

Bridge, M C, 1998 Tree-ring analysis of timbers from the Home Farm Complex, Newdigate, Surrey, Anc Mon Lab Rep, 37/1998

Cattell, J, Cole, E, and Morrison, K forthcoming (2010) Fit for a King: the Story of Apethorpe Hall, Northamptonshire [provisional title], New Haven and London (Yale Univ Press)

Groves, C, Hillam, J, and Pelling-Fulford, F, 1997 Dendrochronology, in *Excavations on* Reading Waterfront sites 1979–1988 (eds J W Hawkes and P J Fasham), Wessex Archaeol Rep, 5, 64–70

Haddon-Reece, D, Miles, D, Tapper, M C, and Fletcher, J M, 1987 Tree-ring dates from the Ancient Monuments Laboratory: List 22, Vernacular Architect, 18, 54–5.

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1996 List 68 no 5a - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory: Sherwood Forest Oak; a dendrochronological Survey, Vernacular Architect, 27, 87–90

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1998 Tree-ring analysis of timbers from Chicksands Priory, Chicksands, Bedfordshire, Anc Mon Lab Rep, 30/1998

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 2000 Tree-ring analysis of timbers from the Barn and Cottage, Abbey Farm, Thetford, Norfolk, Anc Mon Lab Rep, 48/2000

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 2000, Tree-ring analysis of timbers from Stoneleigh Abbey, Stoneleigh, Warwickshire, Anc Mon Lab Rep, 80/2000

Howard, R E, 2000 unpubl, Nottingham Tree-ring Dating Laboratory unpubl computer file for Brockworth Court, Hall and Cross-wing, Brockworth, Glos, BRKASQ01

Howard, R E, 2001 unpubl, Nottingham University Tree-ring Dating Laboratory unpubl computer file for Nevill Holt, Leicestershire, NVHASQ01

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 2005 Tree-ring analysis of timbers from the Riding School, Bolsover Castle, Bolsover, Derbyshire, Centre for Archaeol Rep, 40/2005

Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1988 An East Midlands master tree-ring chronology and its use for dating vernacular buildings, University of Nottingham, Dept of Classical and Archaeol Studies, Monograph Series, III Tyers, I, and Groves C, 1999 unpubl England

Nayling, N, 1998 Dendrochronological Analysis of Timbers from Old Abbey Farm, Risley, Cheshire, ARCUS Rep 412

Nayling, N, 2000 Tree-ring analysis of timbers from the Old Hat Shop, 100 Church Street, Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire, Anc Mon Lab Rep, 68/2000

Nayling, N, 2000 Tree-ring analysis of timbers from Lathom House, Lancashire, Anc Mon Lab Rep, 5/2000

Tyers I, 1995 Tree-ring analysis of Claydon House, Middle Claydon, Buckinghamshire, Anc Mon Lab Rep, 13/1995

TABLES

Table 1: Details of tree-ring samples from St Leonard's Church, Apethorpe, Northamptonshire

*NM = not measured

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

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

Table 3: Results of the cross-matching of site sequence APTCSQ02 and relevant reference chronologies when first ring date is AD 1458 and last ring date is AD 1596

Table 4: Results of the cross-matching of site sequence APTCSQ03 and relevant reference chronologies when first ring date is AD 1579 and last ring date is AD 1665

Table 5: Results of the cross-matching of sample APT-C14 and relevant reference chronologies when first ring date is AD 1659 and last ring date is AD 1722

Reference chronology	Span of chronology	t-value	
Shenton dovecote, Shenton, Leics	AD 1606-1719	6.1	Arnold et al 2008)
Old Abbey Farm, Risley, Cheshire	1667–1753 AD.	6.1	Nayling 1998)
Claydon House, Claydon, Bucks	AD 1613-1756	6.0	Tyers 1995)
Mapledurham, New Farm barn, Oxon	1658-1739 AD.	6.0	Haddon-Reece 1987)
East Midlands	882-1981 AD.	5.8	Laxton and Litton 1988)
Worcester Cathedral	AD 1484-1772	5.8	Arnold et al 2003)
Lathom House, Lancashire	AD 1633-1726	5.1	Nayling 2000)
St John The Baptist, Knossington, Leics	$1662 - 1721$ AD	5.0	Arnold et al 2005)

FIGURES

Figure 1: location of Apethorpe, Northamptonshire (circled)

© Crown Copyright and database right 2013. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence number 100024900

Figure 2: location of St Leonard's Church, Apethorpe, Northamptonshire (circled)

© Crown Copyright and database right 2013. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence number 100024900

Figure 3a (top): View of the nave roof from the east end looking west Figure 3b (bottom): View of the north aisle roof from the west looking east

Figure 4a (top): View of the chancel roof looking west to east showing the straight tiebeams of trusses 2 and 3

Figure 4b (bottom): View of the chancel roof looking east to west showing the cranked tiebeam of truss 4 at the chancel arch

Figure 5a (top): View of the moulded tiebeam of truss 3, the moulded upper south common rafters in bay 3 and the plain common rafters.

Figure 5b (bottom): Modern replacement purlin and lower common rafters

Figure 6a: Plan of St Leonard's Church to show position of sampled timbers

Figure 6b: Sketch sections of the chancel trusses to show sampled timbers (viewed as noted in each drawing)

© ENGLISH HERITAGE

 \sim Empty bars \equiv = heartwood rings
h/s = the last ring on the sample is at the heartwood/sapwood boundary, only the sapwood rings are missing

Figure 7: Bar diagram of samples in site chronology APTCSQ01

Empty bars \Box = heartwood rings.

 $h/s =$ the last ring on the sample is at the heartwood/sapwood boundary, only the sapwood rings are missing

Figure 8: Bar diagram of samples in site chronology APTCSQ02

Empty bars \Box = heartwood rings

 $h/s =$ the last ring on the sample is at the heartwood/sapwood boundary, only the sapwood rings are missing

Figure 9: Bar diagram of samples in site chronology APTCSQ03

DATA OF MEASURED SAMPLES

Measurements in 0.01mm units

 236 322 255 273 131 183 247 241 179 116 177 165 197 192 272 225 356 244 166 136 243 196 254 205 205 172 181 274 299 265 377 299 415 279 230 142 226 372 369 507 260 246 266 179 97 124 173 189 225 160 144 125 136 155 249 214 174 147 194 185 233 150 151 172 77 92 169 160 212 247 362 306 252 170 162 165 118 181 202 193 116 96 83 99 104 123 171 193 137 168 122 161 153 64 51 58 70 89 133 159

APT-C28A 73 318 354 372 449 428 349 325 278 233 426 506 380 230 320 255 271 217 214 278 300 236 181 240 254 195 255 299 214 185 210 203 137 162 117 165 145 180 130 108 146 160 144 128 140 158 178 183 128 117 185 216 200 197 199 224 143 112 137 163 171 153 207 158 158 153 105 103 97 100 113 139 208 116 APT-C28B 73 215 344 374 453 405 357 332 270 245 428 500 382 245 302 249 287 212 219 277 283 238 175 242 255 203 272 290 215 185 207 185 152 151 121 170 146 170 139 114 139 160 136 142 140 145 179 197 122 120 164 216 202 181 196 224 137 115 134 166 182 164 197 169 161 143 109 92 105 95 114 144 197 116 APT-C29A 55 278 415 374 151 192 157 157 280 189 181 269 210 176 224 211 196 262 198 180 195 209 202 213 174 263 228 278 228 210 213 251 147 218 184 127 125 158 154 223 236 116 111 141 85 87 77 86 118 132 126 64 100 89 203 279 APT-C29B 55 278 413 379 157 186 166 155 284 180 172 257 222 157 262 219 192 270 160 167 188 217 204 216 185 249 217 258 221 238 239 230 161 225 195 136 135 156 132 206 188 122 94 153 99 79 62 61 153 103 124 69 100 89 200 279 APT-C30A 95 446 533 434 461 360 350 367 373 400 653 738 666 433 494 329 269 426 498 353 233 276 208 221 145 208 271 265 217 195 232 165 194 186 315 265 264 236 235 202 262 226 254 223 228 154 100 180 242 155 192 111 153 161 172 132 129 135 163 162 142 161 130 127 101 101 104 110 102 101 120 84 95 71 58 67 88 83 98 124 101 74 139 146 353 414 305 182 244 171 199 214 287 395 313 367 APT-C30B 95 491 521 450 443 372 348 357 361 394 625 774 691 426 462 352 248 435 506 358 244 269 201 225 140 233 250 264 212 195 230 174 185 179 298 249 267 239 236 202 266 221 243 232 227 143 109 174 240 161 197 100 168 152 175 134 117 139 169 148 141 165 125 117 108 100 99 111 103 101 95 93 101 62 53 70 99 79 104 116 97 86 132 147 371 387 311 162 244 184 188 238 281 380 322 374

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 randomlike, the widths of these rings will also appear random-like in sequence, reflecting the seasons. This is illustrated in Figure A1 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 A1, 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 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 A2 has about 120 rings; about 20 of which are sapwood rings – the lighter rings on the outside. Similarly the core has just over 100 rings with a few 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 8–10 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.

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 A2; it is about 150mm long and 10mm 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.

Figure A2: Cross-section of a rafter, showing sapwood rings in the left-hand corner, the arrow points to the heartwood/sapwood boundary (H/S); and a core with sapwood; again the arrow is pointing to the H/S. The core is about the size of a pencil

Figure A3: Measuring ring widths under a microscope. The microscope is fixed while the sample is on a moving platform. The total sequence of widths is measured 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

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 A2. 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 A3).

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 A4). 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 Figure A5 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 ring-width 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 Figure A5. 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 A5 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 crossmatching 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 straightforward 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 (or the last full year before felling, if it was felled in the first three months of the following calendar year, 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 A2, 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 a/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 region 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 A2 was taken still had complete sapwood but that some of the soft sapwood rings were lost in coring. By measuring into the timber the depth of sapwood lost, say 20mm, 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 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; Miles 1997, 50– 5). Hence, provided that 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, fig 8; 34–5, where 'associated groups of fellings' are discussed in detail). However, if there is any evidence of storage 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 crossmatch 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 Figure A6 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 Figure A6. 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 Figure A7. 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 phenomenon 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.

t-value/offset Matrix

Figure A5: 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

Figure A7 (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

Figure A7 (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 Bull, 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 Architect, 15-26

Hughes, M K, Milson, S J, and Legett, P A, 1981 Sapwood estimates in the interpretation of tree-ring dates, */ 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, $PA \, C \, T$, 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

Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Howard, R E, 2001 Timber: Dendrochronology of Roof Timbers at Lincoln Cathedral, Engl Heritage Res Trans, 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 Architect, 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