

## WOOD SAMPLES FOR SPECIES IDENTIFICATION

by Dana Challinor

Sample	Context	Identification
1	Timber sprag by cartway 3022	<i>Pinus</i> sp. (pine)
4	Timber sprag by barrow-way 1204	<i>Pinus</i> sp. (pine)
11	Timber sprag from stubs T3 and T15	<i>Pinus</i> sp. (pine)
14	Timber sprag by barrow-way 1230	<i>Ulmus</i> sp. (elm)
15	Timber sprag by barrow plank 399	cf. <i>Picea</i> sp. (spruce)
16	Timber sprag by barrow plank 401	cf. <i>Picea</i> sp. (spruce)

### Notes on identification

It was not possible, on the basis of anatomy, to make identifications to species level.

#### *Ulmus/Robinia*

It was suggested in the field that sample 14 was from *Robinia* (false acacia) wood. The identification of *Ulmus* was determined on the basis of the distinct tangential banding, row of upright cells in rays, absence of vasicentric parenchyma, ray height, and after checking with modern reference material (provided by Damian Goodburn) and confirmed by Phil Austin (Freelance wood and charcoal specialist).

#### *Picea* sp.

The pieces were distinguished from *Pinus* on the size of the ray pits. Both had strong helical fissures, which indicates compression, and can sometimes be mistaken for spiral thickenings. The identification of *Picea* is likely, but it can be difficult to distinguish from *Larix*. However, no clear *crassulae* were noted, and the axial tracheid pits tended to be uniseriate.