Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report 29/99

TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS FROM THE DOWER HOUSE, FAWSLEY PARK, FAWSLEY, NR DAVENTRY, NORTHAMPTONSHIRE

R E Howard R R Laxton C D Litton

))

))

))

 $\rangle \rangle$

))

 $\rangle\rangle$

 \rangle

))

))

 $) \rangle$

))

))

))

))

))

į۶

j)

ž)

 j_{j}

)÷

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

Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report 29/99

TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS FROM THE DOWER HOUSE, FAWSLEY PARK, FAWSLEY, NR DAVENTRY, NORTHAMPTONSHIRE

R E Howard R R Laxton C D Litton

Summary

Analysis was undertaken of samples from twenty-nine oak beams at the Dower House, Fawsley. This resulted in the production of two site chronologies. The first has 149 rings and spans the period AD 1427 - 1575. The second site chronology has 176 rings spanning the period AD 1720 - 1895. A number of other samples date individually. Interpretation of the heartwood/sapwood boundaries and the sapwood, where it exists, suggests a range of felling dates are represented. The earliest certain felling date is estimated to be in the range AD 1514 - 1539 which may relate to the initial construction of the Dower House. A number of the dated timbers appear to have been felled in the later-sixteenth century and may represent a major reconstruction or extension; it is possible that this is connected with the visit of Queen Elizabeth the First to the house in AD 1575. There is then a "romantic" repair at the end of the nineteenthcentury.

Authors' addresses :-

R E Howard UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM University Park Nottingham NG7 2RD

Dr R R Laxton UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM University Park Nottingham NG7 2RD Dr C D Litton UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM University Park Nottingham NG7 2RD

© Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England

TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS FROM THE DOWER HOUSE, FAWSLEY PARK, FAWSLEY, NR DAVENTRY, NORTHAMPTONSHIRE

Introduction

This ruinous grade II listed brick building and scheduled ancient monument stands in a deer park set between the B438 and B407 a few miles south of Daventry in Northamptonshire (SP 570578, see Fig 1). The Manor of Fawsley was bought in AD 1416 by Richard Knightly and held by his descendants until AD 1938. A deer park had been created in the area some time after AD 1331 and this was enlarged during the reign of Elizabeth in the second half of the sixteenth century, the enlargement area being termed the "New Park". The Dower House stands in this enlargement area.

The Dower House began life in the sixteenth century as a brick lodge or stand, the use of brick marking it out as a fashionable up-to-date structure; it is reputedly the earliest brick-built structure in Northamptonshire. Later in the sixteenth century the lodge was extended in stone. The owner responsible for the alteration may have been Richard Knightly who held the estate from AD 1566 to AD 1615. It is known that he entertained Queen Elizabeth there in AD 1575.

The last recorded inhabitant of the Dower House was Anne Devereux, who died there in AD 1703. Although some attempts at maintenance were made it appears to have been a ruin since the eighteenth century. In the nineteenth century further repairs were made but it appears to have been maintained specifically as a ruined building.

Sampling and analysis by tree-ring dating was commissioned by English Heritage. The purpose of this was to inform a programme of grant-aided repairs and consolidation. At the time of sampling (October 1998) the Dower house was scaffolded and partly covered with tarpaulins and boarding, see photograph, Figure 2.

The Laboratory would like to take this opportunity to thank the owner, The Right Honourable Henry Nicolas, 8th Viscount Gage, for granting permission to sample and J Morgan, of John German, for arranging access to the site.

Sampling

A total of twenty-nine different oak timbers was sampled by coring. All these timbers take the form of either door or window lintels, bressumers over large openings, wall lacing timbers or remnants of wedges and blocks set deep within the walls. From the presence of empty peg holes and redundant mortises it is apparent that many of the timbers are reused in their present positions. The building is without a roof, this having decayed in the eighteenth century, and without floor or ceiling beams.

Each sample was given the code FAW-A (for Fawsley site "A") and numbered 01 - 29. The positions of the cores were recorded at the time of sampling on drawings made by the architects Peter Inskip and Peter Jenkins or on a plan made by The Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England and supplied by English Heritage. Where no drawing or plan existed a photograph was taken. These diagrams are reproduced here as Figure 3a- 3g. Details of the samples are given in Table 1. Where possible the positions of the samples are recorded by reference to feature numbers on the drawings provided.

Analysis and dating

The twenty-nine samples obtained from this building were prepared by sanding and polishing and their growth-ring widths measured. Where a single core is obtained from a timber this is measured twice and the measurements meaned together. A number of timbers at Fawsley required two or more cores to obtain the optimum number of growth rings. In these cases each core was measured only once and the measurements meaned together. In such cases as this the readings of the same sample have different numbers of rings, sample FAW-A01A/B/C, for example. The data of the measurements of the samples is given at the end of the report.

The measured growth-ring widths of all twenty-nine samples were compared with each other by the Litton/Zainodin grouping procedure (see Appendix). At a value of t=4.5 two groups of samples formed. The sixteen samples of the first group cross-matched with each other as shown in the bar diagram, Figure 4. The ring widths from these sixteen samples were combined at their suggested relative offsets to form FAWASQ01, a site chronology of 149 rings. Site chronology FAWASQ01 was successfully cross-matched with a series of relevant reference chronologies for oak, giving it a first ring date of AD 1427 and a last measured ring date of AD 1575. Evidence for this date is given in the t-values of Table 2.

The second group to form at a value of t=4.5 by the Litton/Zainodin grouping procedure consisted of two samples. These two cross-match with each other as shown in the bar diagram, Figure 5. The ring widths from these two samples were combined at their suggested relative offsets to form FAWASQ02, a site chronology of 176 rings. Site chronology FAWASQ02 was successfully cross-matched with a series of relevant reference chronologies for oak, giving it a first ring date of AD 1720 and a last measured ring date of AD 1895. Evidence for this date is also given in the t-values of Table 2.

The two site chronologies thus created, FAWASQ01 and FAWASQ02, were compared with each other but, as expected given their different date spans, there was no cross-matching between them. Each of the two site chronologies was then compared with the remaining eleven ungrouped samples. This process gave low t-value cross-matches between site chronology FAWASQ01 and samples FAW-A08 and FAW-A12. A maximum t-value of 4.3 is found between FAWASQ01 and sample FAW-A08 when the first ring of the sample is at plus 82 years relative to the first ring of the site chronology. A maximum t-value of 3.5 is found between FAWASQ01 and sample FAW-A08 when the first relative to the first ring of the sample is at minus 17 years relative to the first ring of the sample is at minus 17 years relative to the site chronology. Given these low t-values, the two samples were not combined with those of the site chronology.

Each of the eleven ungrouped samples was then compared individually with a full range of reference chronologies. This indicated cross-matches and dates for a further three samples, FAW-A08, FAW-A09 and FAW-A12. The t-values of the cross-matches with the reference chronologies of these samples are shown in Table 2. It will be seen from Table 2 that the first ring dates of samples FAW-A08 and FAW-A12, AD 1509 and AD 1410 respectively, are consistent with their relative cross-matching positions against site chronology FAWASQ01, which has a first ring date AD 1427. The dating of these three additional samples indicates the possible relative cross-matching positions between them. There is, however, no satisfactory t-value obtained at such relative off-sets. Because of this, and the low t-value cross-matching of two of the samples with the site chronology, the three additional samples were not combined with those of FAWASQ01.

Interpretation

The bar diagram of Figure 4 shows that there are a number of samples with complete or near complete sapwood, but which have substantially different last measured ring dates. Sample FAW-A05, for example, has a last measured complete sapwood ring date, and therefore a felling date, of AD 1565 while sample FAW-A21 has a last measured complete sapwood ring date of AD 1575. Sample FAW-A02 has a last measured ring date of AD 1542 and has lost, according to observations and notes made at the time of sampling, only a few rings to complete sapwood. It is estimated that the felling date of the timber represented by this sample is c AD 1545. Sample FAW-A12 has an estimated felling date in the range AD 1514 - 1539.

The earliest last measured ring date, AD 1455, is found on sample FAW-A09. This sample, however, does not have a heartwood/sapwood boundary and it is thus not possible to estimate its felling date except to say that it is unlikely to be before c AD 1470. These felling date ranges are calculated using the usual 95% confidence limits for sapwood on mature oaks from this part of England, 15 to 40 rings. The site has also produced two samples, FAW-A22 and A24, which have a felling date of AD 1895. It is probable that these two samples are a pair. Other pairs of samples probably from the same trees are FAW-A05 and A06, and samples FAW-A17 and A29.

Information, for dated samples with the heartwood/sapwood boundary only, is summarised overpage.

Sample number	Last measured ring date	*Sapwood rings	Felling date or estimated felling date range
FAW-A01	AD 1570	14c	c AD 1575
FAW-A02	AD 1542	32c	c AD 1545
FAW-A04	AD 1562	41c	c AD 1565
FAW-A05	AD 1565	25C	AD 1565
FAW-A06	AD 1548	h/s	AD 1563 - 1588
FAW-A07	AD 1549	h/s	AD 1564 - 1589
FAW-A08	AD 1564	h/s	AD 1579 - 1604
FAW-A12	AD 1499	h/s	AD 1514 - 1539
FAW-A15	AD 1545	h/s	AD 1560 - 1585
FAW-A16	AD 1555	h/s	AD 1570 - 1595
FAW-A17	AD 1540	h/s	AD 1555 - 1580
FAW-A21	AD 1575	28C	AD 1575
FAW-A22	AD 1891	28c	AD 1895
FAW-A24	AD 1895	27C	AD 1895
FAW-A27	AD 1545	h/s	AD 1560 - 1585

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

c = complete sapwood on timber; all or part lost from sample in coring

C = complete sapwood retained on sample; last ring date is felling date of timber

It is thus apparent that the above are timbers with different felling dates. However, it would appear that most of the timber was felled at slightly different dates in the third quarter of the sixteenth century. The only definite exceptions to this are samples FAW-A02 and FAW-A12 felled earlier in the sixteenth-century, though at different dates, and samples FAW-A22 and FAW-A24, felled in AD 1895.

Conclusion

Q,

The tree-ring dating indicates that timbers with different felling dates are present within the building. A few of these timbers were felled in the late-nineteenth century and probably represent repairs of that period, but many others were felled in the sixteenth century. Some of these may represent the original early sixteenth-century construction while others may belong to the alterations made by Richard Knightly in connection with the visit there of Queen Elizabeth in AD 1575. The variation in felling date may equate to re-use of timbers as a result of the nineteenth-century attempts to maintain the building as a ruin by using "authentic" timbers.

The results do not highlight the lodge section in particular as being earlier than the extension, but then only one sample sixteenth-century sample, FAW-A12. is from the lodge; it is, however, the one with the earliest certain felling date range.

Eight timbers remain undated. Six of these have rather few rings, though in fact sufficient for satisfactory analysis. Two samples do have a higher number of rings and the lack of dating may be due to the fact that these are singletons and as such, without very high t-values, any cross-matching is unreliable.

Sample number	Last measured ring date	*Sapwood rings	Felling date or estimated felling date range
FAW-A01	AD 1570	14c	c AD 1575
FAW-A02	AD 1542	32c	c AD 1545
FAW-A04	AD 1562	41c	c AD 1565
FAW-A05	AD 1565	25C	AD 1565
FAW-A06	AD 1548	h/s	AD 1563 - 1588
FAW-A07	AD 1549	h/s	AD 1564 - 1589
FAW-A08	AD 1564	h/s	AD 1579 - 1604
FAW-A12	AD 1499	h/s	AD 1514 - 1539
FAW-A15	AD 1545	h/s	AD 1560 - 1585
FAW-A16	AD 1555	h/s	AD 1570 - 1595
FAW-A17	AD 1540	h/s	AD 1555 - 1580
FAW-A21	AD 1575	28C	AD 1575
FAW-A22	AD 1891	28c	AD 1895
FAW-A24	AD 1895	27C	AD 1895
FAW-A27	AD 1545	h/s	AD 1560 - 1585

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

c = complete sapwood on timber; all or part lost from sample in coring

C = complete sapwood retained on sample; last ring date is felling date of timber

It is thus apparent that the above are timbers with different felling dates. However, it would appear that most of the timber was felled at slightly different dates in the third quarter of the sixteenth century. The only definite exceptions to this are samples FAW-A02 and FAW-A12 felled earlier in the sixteenth-century, though at different dates, and samples FAW-A22 and FAW-A24, felled in AD 1895.

Conclusion

The tree-ring dating indicates that timbers with different felling dates are present within the building. A few of these timbers were felled in the late-nineteenth century and probably represent repairs of that period, but many others were felled in the sixteenth century. Some of these may represent the original early sixteenth-century construction while others may belong to the alterations made by Richard Knightly in connection with the visit there of Queen Elizabeth in AD 1575. The variation in felling date may equate to re-use of timbers as a result of the nineteenth-century attempts to maintain the building as a ruin by using "authentic" timbers.

The results do not highlight the lodge section in particular as being earlier than the extension, but then only one sample sixteenth-century sample, FAW-A12. is from the lodge; it is, however, the one with the earliest certain felling date range.

Eight timbers remain undated. Six of these have rather few rings, though in fact sufficient for satisfactory analysis. Two samples do have a higher number of rings and the lack of dating may be due to the fact that these are singletons and as such, without very high t-values, any cross-matching is unreliable.

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, 1989 - Leverhulme Cruck Project Results: 1988, List 31 no 1, Vernacular Architect, 20, 43-45

Alcock, N W, Warwick University, Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory, and Miles, D, 1990 - Leverhulme Cruck Project Results: 1989, List 35 no 13, *Vernacular Architect*, **21**, 42-44

Alcock, N W, Warwick University, Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory, and Miles, D, 1991 - Leverhulme Cruck Project Results: 1990, List 41 nos 3, 12, *Vernacular Architect*, **22**, 45-47

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

Esling, J, Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1989 List 29 no 6b - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results, *Vernacular Architect*, **20**, 39-41

Fletcher, J, 1978 unpubl computer file MC10---H, deceased

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1992 List 44 no 16 - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results, *Vernacular Architect*, 23, 51-56

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1993 List 48 no 11 - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results, *Vernacular Architect*, 24, 40-42

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1995 List 60 no 2a - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results, *Vernacular Architect*, **26**, 47-53

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1996 List 65 no 5 - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results, *Vernacular Architect*, 27, 78-81

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1997 List 77 nos 1b, 5 - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results: Dendrochronological Dating for English Heritage, *Vernacular Architect*, 28, 130-132

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, forthcoming - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results: Dendrochronological Dating for English Heritage, *Vernacular Architect*, 29

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

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

Tyers, I, Groves, C, Hillam, J, and Boswijk, G, 1997 List 80 no 58 - Tree-ring Dates from Sheffield University, Vernacular Architect, 28, 138-158

Tyers, I, 1997 unpub computer file LOND1175





⁽based upon the Ordnance Survey 1:50000 map with permission of The Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, ©Crown Copyright).



Figure 2: General view of the Dower House from the south looking north



. **. .** .

Figure 3a: Plan of the Dower House to show approximate positions of samples FAW-A01-06 and general location of other samples

A07/08



Figure 3b: Drawing to show positions of samples FAW-A07 and FAW-A08 from window 22 in the south wall



Figure 3c: Drawing to show positions of samples FAW-A10, A11 and A12 from window 13 in the south wall

Figure 3d: Drawing to show positions of samples FAW-A09, A13, A14, and A15 from the doorway between north-south party wall



. . .



Figure 3e: Drawing to show positions of samples FAW-A16, A17, A18, A19, A20, and A21 from windows 16, 17, and 18 in the south wall

and the first the second s

Figure 3f: Drawing to show positions of samples FAW-A22, A23, and A24 from window 10 in the west wall



Figure 3g: Photograph to show position of samples FAW-A25, A26, A27, A28, and A29 from timbers in the north wall



)

)



White bar = heartwood rings, shaded area = sapwood rings

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

c = complete sapwood on timber; all or part lost from sample in coring

C = complete sapwood retained on sample; last ring date is felling date of timber



1.1

White bar = heartwood rings, shaded area = sapwood rings c = complete sapwood on timber; all or part lost from sample in coring

C = complete sapwood retained on sample; last ring date is felling date of timber

Table 1: Details of tree-ring samples from the Dower House, Fawsley Park, Fawsley, nr Daventry

Sample no.	Sample location	Total rings	Sapwood rings*	First measured ring date	Last heartwood ring date	Last measured ring date
FAW-A01	Inner lintel, north window, east wall	91	14c	AD 1480	1556	1570
FAW-A02	Outer lintel, north window, east wall	94	32c	AD 1449	1510	1542
FAW-A03	Inner lintel, centre window, east wall	77	no h/s	AD 1443		1519
FAW-A04	Outer lintel, centre window, east wall	100	41c	AD 1463	1521	1562
FAW-A05	Inner lintel, south window, east wall	125	25C	AD 1441	1540	1565
FAW-A06	Outer lintel, south window, east wall	86	h/s	AD 1463	1548	1548
FAW-A07	Inner lintel, window 22, south wall	84	h/s	AD 1466	1549	1549
FAW-A08	Outer lintel, window 22, south wall	56	h/s	AD 1509	1564	1564
FAW-A09	East lintel of north-south party wall doorway	94	no h/s	AD 1362		1455
FAW-A10	Inner lintel, window 13, south wall	61	no h/s			
FAW-A11	East bracket to window 13, south wall	95	h/s	*****		
FAW-A12	West bracket to window 13, south wall	90	h/s	AD 1410	1499	1499
FAW-A13	Middle lintel of north-south party wall doorway	54	no h/s		******	
FAW-A14	West lintel of north-south party wall doorway	54	no h/s			
FAW-A15	Stub block in north-south party wall	97	h/s	AD 1449	1545	1545
FAW-A16	Outer lintel, window 16, south wall	89	h/s	AD 1467	1555	1555
FAW-A17	Inner lintel, window 16, south wall	103	h/s	AD 1438	1540	1540
FAW-A18	Inner pad-block to west side window 17, south wall	95	no h/s	AD 1431		1525
FAW-A19	Outer pad-block to west side, window 17, south wall	55	no h/s			*****

Table 1: continued

19

Sample no.	Sample location	Total rings	Sapwood rings*	First measured ring date	Last heartwood ring date	Last measured ring date
FAW-A20	Outer pad-block to east side, window 17, south wall	62	no h/s	**====	******	
FAW-A21	Lacing beam/lintel, window 18, south wall	144	28C	AD 1432	1547	1575
FAW-A22	Inner lintel, window 10, west wall	172	28c	AD 1720	1863	1891
FAW-A23	Outer lintel, window 10, west wall	54	no h/s	** ** == ==		
FAW-A24	Middle lintel, window 10, west wall	132	27C	AD 1764	1868	1895
FAW-A25	Inner lintel, ground-floor window, north wall	78	no h/s	AD 1455		1532
FAW-A26	Inner lintel, first-floor window, north wall	80	no h/s	AD 1446		1525
FAW-A27	Outer lintel, first-floor window, north wall	119	h/s	AD 1427	1545	1545
FAW-A28	Lacing beam, north wall	71	h/s			
FAW-A29	Inner lintel, second-floor window, north wall	71	по h/s	AD 1454	487 AN AL AL	1524

*h/s = the heartwood/sapwood boundary is the last ring on sample
 c = complete sapwood on timber; all or part lost from sample in coring
 C = complete sapwood retained on sample; last ring date is felling date of timber

Table 2: Results of the cross-matching of site chronologies and individual samples against relevant reference chronologies

Reference chronology Sp

à

J

J

ч. *Д*

·)

e. 2

Span of chronology t-value

Site chronology FAWASQ01 when first ring date is AD 1427 and last ring date is AD 1575

East Midlands MGB-F01	AD 882 - 1981	8.7 8 7	(Laxton and Litton 1988) (Baillie and Bilcher 1982 unpubl.)
Wales and West Midlands	AD 1341 - 1636	8.8	(Siebenlist-Kerner 1978)
MC10H	AD 1386 - 1585	6.7	(Fletcher 1978)
26 Westgate Street, Gloucester	AD 1399 - 1622	6.7	(Howard et al forthcoming)
Manor House, Donington-le-Heath, Leics	AD 1411 - 1618	5.1	(Esling et al 1989)
Coats Barn, Cosby, Leics	AD 1426 - 1562	6.6	(Alcock et al 1991)
26 Manor Rd, Didcot, Oxon	AD 1415 - 1509	6.2	(Alcock <i>et al</i> 1989)

Site chronology FAWASQ02 when first ring date is AD 1720 and last ring date is AD 1895

East Midlands	AD 882 - 1981	6.6	(Laxton and Litton 1988)
MGB-E01	AD 401 - 1981	6.7	(Baillie and Pilcher 1982 unpubl)
Sherwood Trees, Notts	AD 1426 - 1981	5.1	(Laxton and Litton 1988)
Bradgate Trees, Leics	AD 1595 - 1975	7.4	(Laxton and Litton 1988)
Hagworthingham Church, Lincs	AD 1797 - 1881	5.3	(Laxton and Litton 1988)

Sample FAW-A08 when first ring date is AD 1509 and last ring date is AD 1564

East Midlands	AD 882 - 1981	3.9	(Laxton and Litton 1988)
MGB-E01	AD 401 - 1981	4.5	(Baillie and Pilcher 1982 unpubl)
Wales and West Midlands	AD 1341 - 1636	4.8	(Siebenlist-Kerner 1978)
MC10H	AD 1386 - 1585	4.5	(Fletcher 1978)
Coats Barn, Cosby, Leics	AD 1426 - 1562	4.5	(Alcock et al 1991)
Astley Castle, Warwicks	AD 1495 - 1627	3.8	(Howard et al 1997)
26 Westgate Street, Gloucester	AD 1399 - 1622	4.1	(Howard et al forthcoming)
Lodge Park, Aldsworth, Glos	AD 1324 - 1587	3.8	(Howard et al 1995)
Sinai Park, Burton on Trent, Staffs	AD 1227 - 1750	3.9	(Tyers et al 1997)
Staunton Harold Church, Leics	AD 1508-1661	3.6	(Howard et al 1996)

Table 2: continued

Reference chronology Span of chronology t-value

J

1.7

·)

.)

..)

1.)

.)

Sample FAW-A09 when first ring date is AD 1362 and last ring date is AD 1455

East Midlands	AD 882 - 1981	4.9	(Laxton and Litton 1988)
LOND1175	AD 413 - 1728	3.9	(Tyers 1997)
Breamhill Farm, Calne, Wilts	AD 1353 - 1484	5.2	(Alcock et al 1991)
Mercers Hall, Gloucester	AD 1289 - 1541	4.8	(Howard et al 1997)
244 Forest Rd, Woodhouse Eaves, Leics	AD 1374 - 1455	5.4	(Alcock et al 1990)
Lodge Park, Aldsworth, Glos	AD 1324 - 1587	4.9	(Howard <i>et al</i> 1995)
Tusmore Park, Oxon	AD 1359 - 1545	4.1	(Howard et al 1992)
Cuttlepool Farm, Solihull, Warwicks	AD 1337 - 1478	4.7	(Howard <i>et al</i> 1993)

Sample FAW-A12 when first ring date is AD 1410 and last ring date is AD 1499

East Midlands	AD 882 - 1981	6.8	(Laxton and Litton 1988)
MGB-E01	AD 401 - 1981	6.4	(Baillie and Pilcher 1982 unpubl)
Wales and West Midlands	AD 1341 - 1636	5.4	(Siebenlist-Kerner 1978)
MC10H	AD 1386 - 1585	5.5	(Fletcher 1978)
26 Westgate Street, Gloucester	AD 1399 - 1622	4.6	(Howard et al forthcoming)
Mercers Hall, Gloucester	AD 1289 - 1541	6.4	(Howard <i>et al</i> 1997)
Lodge Park, Aldsworth,, Glos	AD 1324 - 1587	6.7	(Howard <i>et al</i> 1995)
Cuttlepool Farm, Solihull, Warwicks	AD 1337 - 1478	5.9	(Howard <i>et al</i> 1993)
Sinai Park, Burton on Trent, Staffs	AD 1227 - 1750	5.3	(Tyers et al 1997)

Ξ

Data of measured samples - measurements in 0.01mm units

FAW-A01A 75

FAW-A06A 86

1)

173 293 239 228 268 205 201 150 173 219 268 162 143 142 131 138 125 128 127 87 119 77 91 69 64 76 136 66 66 46 62 44 40 73 67 52 61 39 61 55 57 48 54 44 34 31 31 35 35 24 19 39 28 33 30 40 47

:)

33 48 61

 $\langle - \rangle$

 52
 36
 60
 96
 97
 43
 61
 77
 101
 105
 72
 69
 65
 113
 132
 108
 73
 103
 125
 150

 155
 116
 145
 108
 97
 89
 85
 94
 119
 119
 87
 81
 92
 109
 104
 70
 77
 69
 57
 85

 76
 95
 80
 95
 94
 86
 85
 81
 88
 64
 53
 42
 43
 42
 58
 57
 47
 57
 53
 42

 37
 42
 48
 38
 71
 46
 50
 43
 48
 58
 67
 46
 127

FAW-A27B 119

270 296 424 569 390 266 158 121 223 251 234 158 197 211 247 192 167 200 141 113 89 102 79 47 73 66 43 51 67 58 39 26 31 52 44 60 109 66 77 70 56 44 71 95 92 51 60 91 112 133 70 67 67 114 130 106 76 94 130 154 160 118 146 104 104 81 83 98 116 120 88 84 94 99 106 73 79 67 68 94 96 95 75 97 104 88 90 90 80 66 52 57 54 34 60 60 49 56 46 37 42 45 57 44 68 40 56 41 48 59 68 61 100 84 79 92 148 120 97 FAW-A28A 71

260 411 322 217 200 187 470 482 530 618 292 263 243 203 230 230 337 179 90 101 136 98 98 142 205 191 238 212 219 247 186 252 196 221 213 216 227 170 194 189 253 294 281 244 271 183 264 291 267 322 313 157 120 107 107 62 91 81 124 124 182 94 152 115 161 199 187 143 218 180 264

FAW-A28B 71

253 439 313 204 175 201 471 491 537 648 288 248 232 205 220 229 323 185 93 92 131 109 93 131 202 210 232 216 204 273 177 248 205 220 211 219 209 173 185 194 274 292 287 230 276 185 264 284 278 307 355 154 89 84 67 54 57 71 81 81 144 80 102 108 147 207 183 149 206 175 262

FAW-A29A 71

141 182 252 192 154 149 165 216 136 149 121 118 95 111 125 141 266 189 161 147 204 252 176 61 85 108 122 188 70 113 101 115 121 156 169 200 181 114 138 121 181 177 307 217 145 158 131 130 86 85 146 94 84 92 141 169 102 109 151 117 129 69 117 121 137 125 104 120 131 79 155

FAW-A29B 71

()

152 180 259 189 154 157 171 217 139 117 126 114 92 113 125 151 250 185 153 120 185 225 166 67 86 95 119 179 62 115 104 117 116 149 164 193 216 112 140 121 170 179 288 219 158 156 127 130 92 74 151 94 68 101 141 169 100 122 151 113 124 75 120 120 136 125 100 121 127 67 164

đ

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 Buildings' (Laxton and Litton 1988b) and, for example, in Tree-Ring Dating and Archaeology (Baillie 1982) or A Slice Through Time (Baillie 1995). 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, 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 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. 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 we inspect the timbers in a building 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. Similarly the core has just over 100 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 be determined by counting back from the outside ring, which grew in 1976.



D)

)

)

 $\langle \rangle$

1)

(

 $\langle \rangle$

 $\left(\cdot \right)$

()

-)

 $\langle \rangle$

Fig 2. Cross-section of a rafter showing the presence of sapwood rings in the corners; 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.



)

J

 $: \uparrow$

 $\langle \dot{} \rangle$

)

 (\cdot)

(``)

 $\langle \hat{} \rangle$

``)

 \cdot

· ``)

 $\langle - \rangle$

; j)

 $\langle \rangle$

 (\cdot, \cdot)

:)

: İ)

 $\langle \rangle$

()

 $\langle \cdot \rangle$

()

()

()

()

()

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 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.



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. 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 inspecton 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 is insured with the CBA.

- 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 5.0, is usually adequate for the dating to be accepted with reasonable confidence (Laxton *et al* 1988a,b; 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. C08 matches C45 best when it is at a position starting 20 rings after the first ring of 45, 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 between these two whatever the position of one sequence relative to the other.

It is standard practice in our Laboratory first to cross-match as many as possible of the 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 from 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. 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. average sequence of ring widths with a master sequence than it is to date the individual component sample sequences separately.

This 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'. This was developed and tested in the Laboratory and has been published (Litton and Zainodin 1991; Laxton *et al* 1988a). To illustrate the difference between the two approaches with the above example, consider sequences C08 and C05. They are the most similar pair with a t-value of 10.4. Therefore, these two are first averaged with the first ring of C05 at +17 rings relative to C08 (the offset at which they match each other). This average sequence is then used in place of the individual sequences C08 and C05. The cross-matching continues in this way gradually building up averages at each stage eventually to form the site sequence.

4. Estimating the Felling Date. 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, they can be seen in two upper corners of the rafter and at the outer end of the core in Figure 2. 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 for 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. Thus in these circumstances the date of the present last ring is at least close to the date of the original last ring on the tree, and so to the date of felling.

Various estimates have been made for the average number of sapwood rings in a mature oak. One estimate is 30 rings, based on data from living oaks. So, in the case of the core in Figure 2 where 9 sapwood rings remain, this would give an estimate for the felling date of 21 (= 30 - 9) years later than of the date of the last ring on the core. Actually, it is better in these situations to give an estimated range for the felling date. Another estimate is that in 95% of mature oaks there are between 15 and 50 sapwood rings. So in this example this would mean that the felling took place between 6 (= 15 - 9) and 41 (= 50 - 9) years after the date of the last ring on the core and is expected to be right in at least 95% of the cases (Hughes *et al* 1981; see also Hillam *et al* 1987).

Data from the Laboratory has shown that when sequences are considered together in groups, rather than separately, the estimates for the number of sapwood can be put at between 15 and 40 rings in 95% of the cases with the expected number being 25 rings. We would use these estimates, for example, in calculating the range for the common felling date of the four sequences from Lincoln Cathedral using the average position of the heartwood/sapwood boundary (Fig 5). These new estimates are now used by us in all our publications except for timbers from Kent and Nottinghamshire where 25 and between 15 to 35 sapwood rings, respectively, is used instead (Pearson 1995).

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. Sapwood rings were only lost in coring, because of their softness. By measuring in the timber the depth of sapwood lost, say 2 cm., a reasonable estimate can be made of the number of sapwood rings missing from the core, 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 40 years later we would have estimated without this observation.

T-value/Offset Matrix

-)

	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	\sum

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.

2

0

Even if all the sapwood rings are missing on all the timbers sampled, an estimate of the felling date is still possible in certain cases. For provided the original last heartwood ring of the tree, called the heartwood/sapwood boundary (H/S), is still on some of the samples, an estimate for the felling date of the group of trees can be obtained by adding on the full 25 years, or 15 to 40 for the range of felling dates.

If none of the timbers have their heartwood/sapwood boundaries, then only a *post quem* date for felling is possible.

- 5. Estimating the Date of Construction. There is a considerable body of evidence in the data collected by the Laboratory that the oak timbers used in vernacular buildings, at least, were used 'green' (see also Rackham (1976)). Hence provided the samples are taken *in situ*, and several dated with the same estimated common felling date, then this felling date will give an estimated date for the construction of the building, or for the phase of construction. If for some reason or other we are rather restricted in what samples we can take, then an estimated common felling date may not be such a precise estimate of the date of construction. More sampling may be needed 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 1988b, 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 1988a). 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 (1988b) 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 (a), the generally large early growth after 1810 is very apparent as is the smaller generally later growth from about 1900 onwards. A similar difference can be observed in the lower sequence 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, hopefully corresponding to good and poor growing seasons, respectively. The two corresponding sequences of Baillie-Pilcher indices are plotted in (b) where the differences in the early and late growths have been removed and only the rapidly changing peaks and troughs remain. only associated with the common climatic signal and so make 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.

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

.

REFERENCES

 $\left\langle \cdot \right\rangle$

· ' }

)

.)

:)

Baillie, M G L, 1982 Tree-Ring Dating and Archaeology, London.

Baillie, M G L, 1995 A Slice Through Time, London

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

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 treering dates, *J Archaeol Sci*, 8, 381-90

Laxton, R R, Litton, R R, and Zainodin, H J, 1988a An objective method for forming a master ringwidth sequence, PACT, 22, 25-35

Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1988b 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, A.D. 1158 to 1540, *Medieval Archaeol*, 33, 90-8

Litton, C D, and Zainodin, H J, 1991 Statistical models of Dendrochronology, J Archaeol Sci, 18, 429-40

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

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