Centre for Archaeology Report 7/2003

# Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from Manor House, High Street/Kings Street, Fordwich, Kent

A J Arnold and Dr C D Litton

© English Heritage 2003

ISSN 1473-9224

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

## Centre for Archaeology Report 7/2003

# Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from Manor House, High Street/Kings Street, Fordwich, Kent

A J Arnold and Dr C D Litton

## Summary

Analysis undertaken on seventeen samples from beams at this property resulted in the construction of a single site sequence and two individually dated samples.

Site sequence KMFASQ01, of 293 rings, contains twelve samples and spans the period AD 1264-1556. One of the samples has complete sapwood and a last ring date of AD 1556, the felling date of the timber represented. Eight further samples have the heartwood/sapwood boundary ring, which allows an estimated felling date for the timbers represented to be calculated to within the range AD 1549-72, consistent with an AD 1556 felling also.

Sample KMF-A06 was dated individually to the period AD 1510-56. This sample has complete sapwood and so its last ring is the felling date. Sample KMF-A16 spans the period AD 1289-1459. This sample does not have the heartwood/sapwood boundary ring and so no estimated felling date can be calculated except to say that this would be AD 1475 at the earliest, but could be much later.

Tree-ring analysis of timbers from this house has shown it to be built from trees felled in AD 1556.

## Keywords

Dendrochronology Standing Building

Author's address University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD

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

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

## Introduction

Manor House is located on the corner of High Street and Kings Street in the centre of Fordwich (Figs 1 and 2; TR 184599). The building, thought to date from the early seventeenth century, comprises two distinct but contemporary ranges, forming an 'L' shape. The upper floors are timber-framed and jettied in a conventional manner whilst the ground-floor elevations are of brick construction.

The rooms and features of the Kings Street range are clearly domestic. However, the upper chambers of the High Street range are poorly lit, unheated, and open to the roof, and the ground floor is one long, undivided, and unheated room. This half of the building does not appear to have been for domestic use and is more likely to have been a workshop and/or store.

The name Manor House is thought to have been acquired in recent times simply because it was occupied by a person named Manners (Austin 1997 unpubl).

This building was sampled and analysed as part of a project, funded by English Heritage, to establish a master chronology for Kent, covering the later part of the sixteenth century to the present day.

The Laboratory would like to thank Rupert Austin of Canterbury Archaeological Trust on whose report the above buildings description is based and for providing drawings with which to illustrate this report (Figs 3-6). Thanks are also given to Mr and Mrs Kingston, the owners of the property for allowing sampling to be undertaken.

### Sampling

Twenty core samples were taken from a variety of different beams, from both ranges, with the core holes being plugged with dowel and stained. Each sample was given the code KMF-A (for Kent, Manor house, Fordwich; site A) and numbered 01-20. The position of all samples was noted at the time of sampling and has been marked on Figures 3-8. Further details relating to the samples are recorded in Table 1.

#### Analysis and Results

At this stage three of the samples were discarded as having too few rings to make successful dating a possibility. The remaining seventeen samples were prepared by sanding and polishing and their growth-ring widths measured; the data of these measurements are given at the end of the report. The growth-ring widths of the samples were compared with each other by the Litton/Zainodin grouping procedure (see appendix).

At a least value of t=5 twelve samples grouped and site sequence KMFASQ01, of 293 rings, was constructed containing these samples at the offsets shown in the bar diagram (Fig 9). This site sequence was successfully matched against the relevant reference chronologies for oak at a first-ring date of AD 1264 and a last-ring date of AD 1556. The evidence for this dating is given by the *t*-values in Table 2.

Attempts were then made to date the remaining five samples individually by comparing them with the reference chronologies. As a result samples KMF-A06 and KMF-A16 were dated to the periods AD 1510-56, and AD 1289-1459, respectively. The evidence for both of these dates is given by the *t*-values in Tables 3 and 4.

#### Interpretation

Analysis of samples from the timbers of this house has resulted in the production of one site sequence and two individually dated samples.

Site sequence KMFASQ01, contains twelve samples and spans the period AD 1264-1556. One of these samples, KMF-A08, has complete sapwood and a last-ring date of AD 1556, the felling date of

the timber represented. Eight further samples have the heartwood/sapwood boundary ring, the average of which is AD 1532. This allows the calculation of an estimated felling date for the eight timbers represented to within the range AD 1549-72, consistent with an AD 1556 felling also. The other three samples in this site sequence do not have the heartwood/sapwood boundary ring and so estimated felling dates cannot be calculated for these timbers. However, with last measured ring dates of AD 1439 (KMF-A20), AD 1526 (KMF-A03), and AD 1529 (KMF-A05), these would be AD 1455, AD 1542, and AD 1545 at the earliest, respectively.

Sample KMF-A06 was individually dated to a first-ring date of AD 1510 and a last-ring date of AD 1556. This sample has complete sapwood and so the last measured ring date of AD 1556 is the felling date of the timber represented. Sample KMF-A16 was also individually dated, to spanning the period AD 1289-1459. This sample does not have the heartwood/sapwood boundary ring, however, the earliest it is estimated to have been felled is AD 1475.

All felling date ranges have been calculated using the estimate that 95% of mature oak trees in this area have between 15-40 sapwood rings.

### Discussion

Tree-ring analysis has resulted in the successful dating of fourteen timbers at this house. Two of these are from trees felled in AD 1556 with a further eight having a felling date range entirely consistent with this felling date also.

As mentioned above, prior to the analysis being carried out, this building was believed to date to the early part of the seventeenth century. It is now known that it is constructed from timbers felled in AD 1556, and is therefore likely to be over half a century earlier than expected. With samples from both ranges being dated to AD 1556 this also supports the interpretation that both ranges are coeval.

Sample KMF-A06, with only 47 rings, is shorter than would usually be preferred when dating single samples. However, it matches against the reference chronologies consistently and strongly at the last ring date of AD 1556. Additionally this date corresponds with those produced by the site sequence.

### Bibliography

Alcock, N W, Warwick University; Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory, and Miles, D, 1990 Leverhulme cruck project (Warwick University and Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory) results: 1989, *Vernacular Architect*, **21**, 42-4

Arnold, A J, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 2002 Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from Manor Farm Barn, Frindsbury, Kent, Centre for Archaeol Rep, 42/2002

Austin, R, 1997 unpubl, Manor House, High St/Kings St, Fordwich, unpubl Canterbury Archaeological Trust Ltd Rep

Bridge, M C, 1985 City of London Polytechnic Tree-Ring Dates, Vernacular Architect, 16, 54-5

Bridge, M C, 1988 The Dendrochronological dating of buildings in Southern England, Medieval Archaeol, 32, 155-74

Esling, J, Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1990 Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results, *Vernacular Architect*, **21**, 37-40

Fletcher, J M, 1980 A list of tree-ring dates for building timber in Southern England and Wales, Vernacular Architect, 11, 32-8

Haddon-Reece, D, and Miles, D H, 1987 Tree-ring Dates from the Ancient Monuments Laboratory, Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England, *Vernacular Architect*, **18**, 54-5

Hillam, J, 1997 unpubl Windsor Castle (kitchen), Berks, unpubl computer file *WINDSOR*, Sheffield Dendrochronology Laboratory

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1990 unpubl Lounge Opencast Coal Pit, Coleorton, Leics unpubl computer file *COLASQ11*, Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1992 unpubl Ely Cathedral unpubl computer file *ELYSQ10*, Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1992 Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results, *Vernacular Architect*, 23, 51-6

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

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1996 Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results: General List, *Vernacular Architect*, **27**, 78-81

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1997 unpubl Charterhouse (Great Hall), London unpubl computer file *LCHBSQ01*, Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1997a Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from the Keep of Walmer Castle, Walmer, Kent, Anc Mon Lab Rep, 75/97

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1997b Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results: General List, *Vernacular Architect*, **28** 124-9

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1998a Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from the Archbishop's Palace, Charing, Kent, Anc Mon Lab Rep, 45/98

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1998b Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from Chicksands Priory, Chicksands, Bedfordshire, Anc Mon Lab Rep, 30/98 Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1999 Nottingham University Tree-ring Dating Laboratory: Dendrochronological Dating for English Heritage, *Vernacular Architect*, **30**, 91-6

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 2000 Tree-ring Analysis of Timbers from Church House, Edenbridge, Kent, Centre for Archaeol Rep, 34/2000

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 2002 unpubl Cobham Hall, Cobham, Kent, unpubl computer file *COBBCDHF1*, Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory

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

Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1989 Construction of a Kent master chronological sequence for oak, 1158-1540, Medieval Archaeol, 33, 90-8

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

Tyers, I, 1997 unpubl Essex, unpubl computer file ESSEX, Sheffield Dendrochronology Laboratory

Tyers, I, 1997 Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from Sinai Park, Staffordshire, Anc Mon Lab Rep, 80/97

Tyers, I, 1999 unpubl England London, unpubl computer file *LOND1175*, Sheffield Dendrochronology Laboratory

Sample	Sample location	Total	Sapwood rings*	First measured ring date	Last heartwood ring	Last measured ring date (AD)
King Street Range						
KMF-A01	North purlin, trusses 2-3	79	h/s	1459	1537	1537
KMF-A02	South purlin, trusses 2-3	82	9c	1467	1539	1548
KMF-A03	East brace, north, truss 3	89		1438		1526
KMF-A04	Collar, truss 2	NM				
KMF-A05	West brace, north, truss 2	83		1447		1529
KMF-A06	South rafter, first from east, bay 1	47	24C	1510	1532	1556
KMF-A07	Major stud	NM				
KMF-A08	Collar, truss 3	92	19C	1465	1537	1556
KMF-A09	West brace, north, truss 3	61	15C			
KMF-A10	Rail	56	8			
KMF-A11	East brace, north, truss 4	127	h/s	1408	1534	1534
KMF-A12	Tiebeam, truss 4	NM				
High Street Range						
KMF-A13	West purlin, trusses 1-2	112	12c	1431	1530	1542
KMF-A14	Tiebeam, truss 2	73	2c	1457	1527	1529
KMF-A15	West principal rafter, truss 1	148	h/s	1385	1532	1532
KMF-A16	South-west corner post	171		1289		1459
KMF-A17	West purlin, T1-north end	92	h/s	1436	1527	1527
KMF-A18	East purlin, trusses 1-2	105	h/s	1423	1527	1527
KMF-A19	Tiebeam, truss 1	71	13		(	
KMF-A20	Axial spine beam, trusses 1-2	174		1264		1439

Table 1: Details of tree-ring samples from Manor House, High Street/Kings Street, Fordwich, Kent

\* NM = not measured

h/s = the heartwood/sapwood boundary is the last ring on the sample c = complete sapwood on timber, all or part lost in sampling C = complete sapwood retained on sample, last measured ring is the felling date

Table 2: Results of the cross-matching of site sequence KMFASQ01 and relevant reference chronologies when the first-ring date is AD 1264 and the last-ring date is AD 1556

Reference chronology	<i>t</i> -value	Span of chronology	Reference
England London	8.5	AD 413-1728	Tyers 1999 unpubl
Kent	8.4	AD 1158-1540	Laxton and Litton 1989
East Midlands	5.8	AD 882-1982	Laxton and Litton 1988
Tower-lo	7.7	AD 1379-1534	Bridge 1988
Chilton Manor ('Secret Room'), Sittingbourne	6.6	AD 1368-1520	Laxton and Litton 1989
Archbishops Palace, Charing, Kent	6.3	AD 1451-1559	Howard et al 1998a
Charterhouse, Charterhouse Square, London	6.1	AD 1382-1545	Howard et al 1996
Brewhouse Yard Museum, Nottingham, Notts	5.9	AD 1445-1551	Howard et al 1994
Church House, Edenbridge, Kent	5.9	AD 1377-1538	Howard et al 2000
Walmer Castle, Kent	5.8	AD 1396-1523	Howard et al 1997a
Old Rectory, Cossington, Leics	5.6	AD 1375-1526	Howard et al 1992

Table 3: Results of the cross-matching of sample KMF-A06 and relevant reference chronologies when the first-ring date is AD 1510 and the last ring date is AD 1556

Reference chronology	<i>t</i> -value	Span of chronology	Reference
Southern England and Wales	5.9	AD 1386-1585	Fletcher 1980
Essex	5.9	AD 878-1622	Tyers 1997 unpubl
Western England Wales	5.4	AD 1341-1636	Siebenlist-Kerner 1978
Sinai Park, Burton, Staffs	6.7	AD 1227-1750	Tyers 1997
Owston Church, Oakham	6.2	AD 1485-1611	Howard et al 1999
Windsor Castle (kitchen), Berks	5.1	AD 1331-1573	Hillam 1997 unpubl
Ely Cathedral, Cambs	5.0	AD 1466-1610	Howard et al 1992 unpubl
White House, Main Street, Blyth, Notts	4.8	AD 1453-1595	Howard et al 1994
Charterhouse (Great Hall), London	4.6	AD 1452-1592	Howard et al 1997 unpubl
Lounge Opencast Coal Pit, Coleorton, Leics	4.6	AD 1502-1598	Howard et al 1990 unpubl
Keyworth Barn, Notts	4.3	AD 1451-1628	Laxton and Litton 1988
15/19 Station Street, Mansfield Woodhouse, Notts	4.2	AD 1432-1621	Howard et al 1997b

Reference chronology	<i>t</i> -value	Span of chronology	Reference
England London	5.0	AD 413-1728	Tyers and Groves 1999 unpubl
Kent	4.9	AD 1158-1540	Laxton and Litton 1989
Southern England	4.4	AD 1083-1589	Bridge 1988
High Halden Church, Kent	6.7	AD 1299-1462	Bridge 1985
Chicksands Priory, Chicksands, Beds	6.3	AD 1200-1541	Howard et al 1998b
Cobham Hall (combined), Kent	6.3	AD 1317-1662	Howard et al 2002 unpubl
Manor Farm Barn, Frindsbury, Kent	5.5	AD 1254-1403	Arnold et al 2002
244 Forrest Road, Woodhouse Eaves, Leics	5.4	AD 1374-1455	Alcock et al 1990
Old Manor House, Mapledurham	5.4	AD 1278-1438	Haddon-Reece and Miles 1987
Lacock Abbey (frater), Lacock, Wilts	5.0	AD 1314-1448	Esling et al 1990
Walmer Castle	5.0	AD 1396-1523	Howard et al 1997a

Table 4: Results of the cross-matching of sample KMF-A16 and relevant reference chronologies when the first-ring date is AD 1289 and the last ring date is AD 1459

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

Figure 1: Map to show the location of Fordwich, Kent



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





Figure 3: Manor House, Fordwich - ground-floor plan (drawn by Rupert Austin)





Figure 4: Manor House, Fordwich - section A-A to north, showing the location of samples KMF-A01, KMF-A03-06, KMF-A08-09, and KMF-A11-12 (drawn by Rupert Austin)



Figure 5: Manor House, Fordwich - section B-B to east, showing the location of samples KMF-A14, and KMF-A18-19 (drawn by Rupert Austin)





Figure 7: Manor House, Fordwich -sketch of truss 5 to west at first-floor/roof level, showing the location of samples KMF-A07 and KMF-A10

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_0.jpeg)

Figure 8: Manor House, Fordwich - sketch first-floor plan, showing the location of samples KMF-A13, KMF-A15, KMF-A16-17, and KMF-A20

![](_page_17_Figure_0.jpeg)

Figure 9: Bar diagram of samples in site sequence KMFASQ01

h/s = heartwood/sapwood ring

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

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

Data of measured samples - measurements in 0.01mm units

KMF-A01A 79

120 114 97 136 191 97 165 187 130 89 188 166

19

### 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.

![](_page_23_Picture_0.jpeg)

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.

![](_page_23_Picture_2.jpeg)

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.

![](_page_24_Picture_0.jpeg)

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.

![](_page_24_Picture_2.jpeg)

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	$\backslash$	+20	+37	+47
<b>C</b> 08	5.6		+17	+27
C05	5.2	10.4		+10
C04	5.9	3.7	5.1	$\mathbf{i}$

## **Bar Diagram**

![](_page_27_Figure_3.jpeg)

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.

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.

![](_page_29_Figure_0.jpeg)

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.

![](_page_30_Figure_0.jpeg)

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

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, P A C T, 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