RESEARCH REPORT SERIES no. 111-2011

WEST BARN, COMMON LANE, PARBOLD, LANCASHIRE TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS

SCIENTIFIC DATING REPORT

Alison Arnold and Robert Howard

INTERVENTION AND ANALYSIS

This report has been prepared for use on the internet and the images within it have been down-sampled to optimise downloading and printing speeds.

Please note that as a result of this down-sampling the images are not of the highest quality and some of the fine detail may be lost. Any person wishing to obtain a high resolution copy of this report should refer to the ordering information on the following page.

Research Report Series 111-2011

WEST BARN, COMMON LANE, PARBOLD, LANCASHIRE

TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS

Alison Arnold and Robert Howard

NGR: SD 4903 1163

© English Heritage

 ISSN 2046-9799 (Print) ISSN 2046-9802 (Online)

The Research Report Series incorporates reports by the expert teams within the Investigation & Analysis Division of the Heritage Protection Department of English Heritage, alongside contributions from other parts of the organisation. It replaces the former Centre for Archaeology Reports Series, the Archaeological Investigation Report Series, the Architectural Investigation Report Series, and the Research Department Report Series.

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

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

SUMMARY

Dendrochronological analysis of an extensive range of timbers in this barn has produced a single dated site chronology comprising 21 of the 23 samples measured. This site chronology has an overall length of 129 rings, these rings dated as spanning the years AD 1431–1559. Interpretation of the sapwood present on the samples indicates that all the timbers represented, from the main body of the barn, the north aisle, and the eastern floor frame, were cut as part of a single phase of felling in the late AD1550s. Two measured samples remain ungrouped and undated.

CONTRIBUTORS

Alison Arnold and Robert Howard

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Nottingham Tree-ring Dating Laboratory would like to thank the owner of the barn, Mr Martin Ainscoughs, for his support and cooperation with this programme of analysis. We would also like to thank Dylan Jones, consulting architect of A2 Architects, Liverpool, for assisting in arranging access to the site, and for providing plans and other drawings used in this report. Finally we would like to thank Dr Peter Marshall (English Heritage Scientific Dating Team) and Cathy Tyers (Sheffield University Dendrochronology Laboratory) for commissioning this programme of tree-ring dating, for advice, and assistance throughout the production of this report.

ARCHIVE LOCATION

Lancashire Historic Environment Record LCC Environment Directorate PO Box 9 Guild House Cross Street Preston PR1 8RD

DATE OF INVESTIGATION 2011

CONTACT DETAILS Alison Arnold and Robert Howard Nottingham Tree-ring Dating Laboratory 20 Hillcrest Grove Sherwood Nottingham NG5 1FT 0115 960 3833 alisonarnold@tree-ringdating.co.uk roberthoward@tree-ringdating.co.uk

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The barn at Parbold under consideration in this report, commonly referred to as the 'west' barn, stands approximately 30 metres south of Fairhurst Hall, off Common Lane, about half a kilometre north of Parbold village (SD 4903 1163, Figs 1–3). This grade II* listed barn, which is described as being of early-eighteenth century date (http://list.englishheritage.org.uk/), is built of sandstone rubble with a stone slate roof. The south wall is pierced by a cart entrance with segmental arch and hood. To the right of this entrance there are a set of external stone steps to a first-floor doorway. The east gable has a doorway with a segmental head and a segmental hood with scrolled ends and central finial. To each side are keyed circular windows. Above is a similar window, while a fourth window lights a rear outshut which appears to be original.

Internally, although the barn is now only aisled on its north side, it is believed that there may have been an aisle to its south side as well, though there are now no timbers to the south wall. The building is divided into six bays (Fig 4) by the east and west gable walls and five principal rafter and tiebeam trusses with high collars set near the apex. There are straight queen struts from the tiebeams to the principal rafters, and slightly curved braces from the north aisle posts to the tiebeams. The trusses support two rows of purlins to each pitch of the roof, there being straight wind braces from the principal rafters to the purlins (Fig 5a).

Slightly curved braces also rise from the north aisle and intermediate posts to the north aisle plate, and there are aisle ties between the aisle posts and the north wall plate. Short, straight queen struts rise from these ties to the principal aisle rafters, these aisle trusses carrying a single row of purlins to the aisle roof (Fig 5b).

At both the east and west ends of the barn there are first floor frames.

SAMPLING

Sampling and analysis by dendrochronology of the timbers within the barn at Parbold were requested by Cathy Tuck, Historic Building Inspector based at English Heritage's North West Regional Office. This analysis was expected to form part of a programme of archaeological recording to inform listed building consent prior to the barn possibly being converted for residential accommodation. It was hoped that tree-ring analysis would provide dating evidence for the original construction of the barn and help to determine the extent of survival of any historic fabric. In particular it was hoped that tree-ring analysis would establish whether the aisle timbers and the floor frames at each end were contemporary with the main body of the barn, as the structural evidence tends to suggest, or are later additions of different dates as has occasionally been argued.

Thus, from the oak timbers available a total of 24 samples was obtained by coring, an attempt being made to obtain sufficient numbers of cores from each area of the building to ensure the production of reliable dating evidence should each part be of a different

date. Each sample was given the code PBD-A (for Parbold, site 'A') and numbered 01–24. From the main body of the barn a total of 12 samples, PBD-A01–12, was obtained, with a further six samples, PBD-A13–18, and PBD-A19–24, being obtained from the aisle and east floor frame respectively. No samples were obtained from the small number of what appeared to be relatively modern, possibly early-twentieth century, softwood timbers of the west floor frame, many of these timbers, in any case, being wide-ringed and therefore unsuitable for tree-ring analysis.

The location of the sampled timbers was noted at the time of coring and marked on plans made by Dylan Jones of A2 Architects Ltd and provided by English Heritage. These are reproduced here as Figures 6a–f. Further details relating to the samples can be found in Table 1.

ANALYSIS

Each of the 24 samples obtained was prepared by sanding and polishing. It was seen at this time that one sample, PBD-A24, had less than the minimum of 54 rings here deemed necessary for reliable dating, and it was rejected from this programme of analysis. The annual growth-ring widths of the remaining 23 samples were, however, measured, the data of these measurements being given at the end of this report.

The data of the 23 measured samples were then compared with each other by the Litton/Zainodin grouping procedure (see Appendix), allowing a single group of 21 crossmatching samples to be formed at a minimum value of $t=4.0$, the 21 samples crossmatching as shown in the bar diagram Figure 7. The cross-matching samples of this group were combined at their indicated offset positions to form PBDASQ01, a site chronology with an overall length of 129 rings.

Site chronology PBDASQ01 was then compared to an extensive corpus of reference material for oak, this indicating a consistent and repeated match with a large number of these when the date of its first ring is AD 1431 and the date of its last measured ring is AD 1559. The evidence for this dating is given in Table 2.

Site chronology PBDASQ01 was also compared to the two remaining measured but ungrouped samples, PBD-A12 and A13, but there was no further satisfactory crossmatching. These two samples were then compared individually to the full corpus of reference data, but again there was no satisfactory cross-matching and both samples must, therefore, remain undated.

INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSION

Analysis by dendrochronology of 23 measured samples from this building has produced a single site chronology comprising 21 samples, its 129 rings dated as spanning the years AD 1431–1559. As may be seen from Table 1 and Figure 7, one of these samples, PBD-A17, retains complete sapwood (the last ring produced by the tree from which the beam has

been derived before it was cut down, this being indicated by upper case 'C' in Table 1 and the bar diagram). This last, complete, sapwood ring, and thus the felling of the tree represented, is dated to AD 1559.

A number of other dated samples, PBD-A02, A04, A07, A11, A14, A16, and A22, also come from timbers which have complete sapwood on them. In these cases, however, due to its decayed and fragile state, portions of the sapwood were lost from the cores in sampling (this being denoted by lower case 'c' in Table 1 and the bar diagram). In such instances it is possible, at the time of sampling, to estimate in millimetres the amount lost from the core. Following analysis of the core, it is then possible to make an estimate of the number of sapwood rings the lost portion of core might have had, based on the average ring width of the measured rings and the overall growth trends present. In respect of these samples from the barn analysed here, the lost rings would suggest that the timbers they represent were all felled in the late AD 1550s, and hence could represent either a single felling programme spanning a small number of years in the late AD 1550s or could represent a single felling in AD 1559.

There is, in addition, little reason to suspect that the remaining dated timbers, those which do not retain complete sapwood, or which have only the heartwood/sapwood boundary present, were not felled in the late AD 1550s as well. The relative position of the heartwood/sapwood boundary on these timbers varies by 22 years from relative position 90 (AD 1520), on sample PBD-A20, to relative position 112 (AD 1542) on sample PBD-A08. Such a variation is consistent with the timbers represented all being cut in a single episode of felling, and, importantly, is very similar to that on the timbers with complete sapwood.

The dendrochronological analysis therefore indicates that all the dated timbers appear coeval and were cut as part of a single programme of felling in the late AD1550s, possibly just in AD 1559. Thus a common construction date for the main barn, the north aisle, and the east floor frame is indicated. It will be noted that this is considerably earlier than the early-eighteenth century ascribed to it in the listing description.

Two samples, PBD-A12 and A13, remain ungrouped and undated, despite both of them having sufficient numbers of rings for reliable analysis. There appears to be nothing unusual about these samples, the rings being neither distorted or compressed, that might account for this lack of dating, and the reason for it is unknown. It is, however, a very common phenomenon in tree-ring analysis with various studies indicating that a 70-80% dating success rate for measured individual samples is normal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arnold, A, Howard, R, and Litton, C D, 2004 *Tree-ring analysis of timbers from Ordsall* Hall, Taylorson Street, Salford, Greater Manchester, Cent for Archaeol Rep, 49/2004

Bridge, M C, 2003 *Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers from Old Worden Hall, Euxton Lane,* Chorley, Lancashire, Centre for Archaeol Rep, 47/2003

Groves, C, 1999 Tree-ring analysis of Hall I' Th' Wood, Bolton, Greater Manchester, Anc Mon Lab Rep, 12/1999

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1991 List 39 no 2a/b – Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory: general list, Vernacular Architect, 22, 40–3

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1992 List 44 no 14a-d – 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, 1996 List 65 no 8 – Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory: results, Vernacular Architect, 27, 78-81

Nayling, N, 2000 Tree-ring analysis of timbers from Stayley Hall, Greater Manchester, Anc Mon Lab Rep, 6/2000

Tyers, I, 1999 Tree-ring analysis of timbers in Sizergh Castle, near Kendal, Cumbria, ARCUS Rep; 479b

Sample	Sample location	Total	Sapwood	First measured	Last heartwood	Last measured
number		rings	rings*	ring date AD	ring date AD	ring date AD
	Main barn					
PBD-A01	North aisle post, truss 1	90	h/s	1437	1526	1526
PBD-A02	North aisle post, truss 2	91	12c	1462	1540	1552
PBD-A03	Tiebeam, truss 2	80	h/s	1457	1536	1536
PBD-A04	North principal rafter, truss 2	94	25c	1458	1526	1551
PBD-A05	South principal rafter, truss 2	68	h/s	1458	1525	1525
PBD-A06	North aisle post, truss 3	98	h/s	1431	1528	1528
PBD-A07	Tiebeam, truss 3	96	13c	1450	1532	1545
PBD-A08	South principal rafter, truss 3	87	2	1458	1542	1544
PBD-A09	South lower purlin, truss 3-4	72	h/s	1460	1531	1531
PBD-A10	South principal rafter, truss 4	81	8	1458	1530	1538
PBD-A11	North principal rafter, truss 5	90	18 _c	1463	1534	1552
PBD-A12	South queen strut, truss 5	66	13 _c	------	------	------
	North aisle					
PBD-A13	Aisle tie, truss 2	62	10 _c	-------	------	------
PBD-A14	Aisle tie, truss 3	70	13 _c	1482	1538	1551
PBD-A15	Aisle tie, truss 4	71	h/s	1468	1538	1538
PBD-A16	Aisle rafter, truss 4	76	14 _c	1476	1537	1551
PBD-A17	Aisle queen strut, truss 4	81	31C	1479	1528	1559
PBD-A18	Aisle rafter, truss 5	68	h/s	1458	1525	1525

Table 1: Details of tree-ring samples from the West Barn, Parbold

© ENGLISH HERITAGE

O ENGLISH HERITAGE

nm = sample not measured

c = complete sapwood is found on the timber, but all or part has been lost from the sample during coring

C = complete sapwood is retained on the sample; the last measured ring date is the felling date of the tree represented

Table 2: Results of the cross-matching of site sequence PBDASQ01 and relevant reference chronologies when the first-ring date is AD 1431 and the last-ring date is AD 1559

FIGURES

Figure 1: Map to show the general location of Parbold (based on the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright)

Figure 2: Map to show the approximate location of the west barn (based on the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, ©Crown Copyright)

Figure 3: Map to show the location of the west barn (based on the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, ©Crown Copyright)

Figure 4: Plan of the barn (after Dylan Jones)

Figure 5a/b: Internal views of the barn

Figure 6a/b: Drawings to show sampled timbers

Figure 6c/d: Drawings to show sampled timbers

Figure 6e/f: Drawing, and plan of the east floor to show sampled timbers

DATA OF MEASURED SAMPLES

Measurements in 0.01mm units

PBD-A01A 90 418 391 234 298 503 306 282 277 280 211 459 384 613 578 581 609 429 503 472 484 246 232 194 181 199 268 355 278 276 472 660 799 459 682 652 479 779 769 703 434 205 212 199 317 289 308 377 255 278 295 277 236 297 276 169 146 139 183 219 223 217 168 165 167 190 195 172 211 204 253 302 229 224 365 263 239 156 144 139 184 118 120 145 127 112 137 99 118 107 99 PBD-A01B 90 376 401 243 300 481 313 293 251 273 233 458 386 629 575 551 615 435 491 477 493 244 225 203 180 202 267 359 297 267 463 640 805 449 690 704 458 764 763 748 446 173 207 198 336 277 295 377 239 345 310 260 240 288 288 166 152 138 190 214 233 207 160 165 171 191 207 158 232 187 255 295 210 238 349 278 229 171 146 147 162 111 128 142 120 118 125 119 112 101 114 PBD-A02A 91 610 627 465 500 536 568 404 361 390 404 424 467 532 509 298 316 276 412 294 223 149 243 299 307 282 339 189 246 257 253 232 280 261 268 295 215 182 165 163 213 231 107 164 170 177 141 139 191 265 241 238 197 238 204 202 164 249 324 308 286 362 311 300 284 279 366 290 238 287 274 227 204 193 322 276 269 239 267 266 188 168 180 204 228 190 150 158 167 188 161 161 PBD-A02B 91 600 646 448 516 538 550 401 378 384 404 432 465 520 519 277 301 275 400 291 228 148 243 287 311 284 340 204 241 277 238 240 276 259 257 304 211 180 175 160 206 244 117 163 181 183 149 135 195 253 235 252 196 232 193 186 160 261 336 307 282 370 308 298 288 295 375 292 221 280 268 206 212 210 282 303 265 236 260 253 169 168 180 195 212 180 132 162 159 174 166 152 PBD-A03A 80 335 730 308 630 494 641 654 689 795 833 705 798 705 641 298 174 254 233 349 349 262 405 381 432 449 242 450 462 480 408 386 365 383 317 168 144 163 98 258 311 190 187 215 212 91 73 72 83 107 172 117 161 177 201 270 223 142 136 119 248 227 149 131 112 111 209 107 148 142 178 252 147 138 137 222 123 160 169 146 234 PBD-A03B 80 342 769 348 618 517 656 643 662 781 831 763 844 722 681 264 156 269 234 356 368 232 359 392 425 407 238 449 452 495 405 392 394 405 304 178 163 128 110 259 310 187 194 235 226 85 78 75 85 107 182 120 158 177 204 281 231 140 138 108 251 238 150 141 116 114 208 118 145 152 179 249 143 142 141 212 118 156 173 180 241 PBD-A04A 94 922 592 653 544 579 554 523 469 392 514 732 630 527 443 271 422 370 521 414 243 264 240 323 303 305 302 463 184 202 291 158 182 167 123 121 84 164 130 156 119 110 104 130 139 107 138 111 147 151 90 108 132 191 134 138 119 91 76 97 77 182 148 131 164 114 177 152 126 166 133 146 119 67 117 109 126 104 176 122 131 112 101 75 63 52 81 89 94 104 129 131 132 91 123 PBD-A04B 94 901 609 656 524 555 541 521 455 393 512 735 636 528 437 272 411 365 513 409 257 262 231 316 300 304 293 466 188 204 308 145 191 169 131 121 85 159 123 152 124 113 88 150 129 106 135 116 144 150 95 108 143 173 141 144 115 86 80 102 75 168 147 127 160 119 171 151 128 159 135 138 117 85 126 110 111 98 172 134 121 106 107 77 64 49 78 86 99 104 126 130 133 91 131 PBD-A05A 68

779 642 771 743 787 780 425 485 474 620 591 377 450 345 273 363 243 295 344 263

APPENDIX: TREE-RING DATING

The Principles of Tree-Ring Dating

Tree-ring dating, or dendrochronology as it is known, is discussed in some detail in the Laboratory's Monograph, An East Midlands Master Tree-Ring Chronology and its uses for dating Vernacular Building (Laxton and Litton 1988) and Dendrochronology: Guidelines on Producing and Interpreting Dendrochronological Dates (English Heritage 1988). Here we will give the bare outlines. Each year an oak tree grows an extra ring on the outside of its trunk and all its branches just inside its bark. The width of this annual ring depends largely on the weather during the growing season, about April to October, and possibly also on the weather during the previous year. Good growing seasons give rise to relatively wide rings, poor ones to very narrow rings and average ones to relatively average ring widths. Since the climate is so variable from year to year, almost randomlike, the widths of these rings will also appear random-like in sequence, reflecting the seasons. This is illustrated in Figure A1 where, for example, the widest rings appear at irregular intervals. This is the key to dating by tree rings, or rather, by their widths. Records of the average ring widths for oaks, one for each year for the last 1000 years or more, are available for different areas. These are called master chronologies. Because of the random-like nature of these sequences of widths, there is usually only one position at which a sequence of ring widths from a sample of oak timber with at least 70 rings will match a master. This will date the timber and, in particular, the last ring.

If the bark is still on the sample, as in Figure A1, then the date of the last ring will be the date of felling of the oak from which it was cut. There is much evidence that in medieval times oaks cut down for building purposes were used almost immediately, usually within the year or so (Rackham 1976). Hence if bark is present on several main timbers in a building, none of which appear reused or are later insertions, and if they all have the same date for their last ring, then we can be quite confident that this is the date of construction or soon after. If there is no bark on the sample, then we have to make an estimate of the felling date; how this is done is explained below.

The Practice of Tree-Ring Dating at the Nottingham Tree-Ring Dating **Laboratory**

1. Inspecting the Building and Sampling the Timbers. Together with a building historian the timbers in a building are inspected to try to ensure that those sampled are not reused or later insertions. Sampling is almost always done by coring into the timber, which has the great advantage that we can sample in situ timbers and those judged best to give the date of construction, or phase of construction if there is more than one in the building. The timbers to be sampled are also inspected to see how many rings they have. We normally look for timbers with at least 70 rings, and preferably more. With fewer rings than this, 50 for example, sequences of widths become difficult to match to a unique position within a master sequence of ring widths and so are difficult to date (Litton and Zainodin 1991). The cross-section of the rafter shown in Figure A2 has about 120 rings; about 20 of which are sapwood rings – the lighter rings on the outside. Similarly the core has just over 100 rings with a few sapwood rings.

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

Sampling is done by coring into the timber with a hollow corer attached to an electric drill and usually from its outer rings inwards towards where the centre of the tree, the pith, is judged to be. An illustration of a core is shown in Figure A2; it is about 150mm long and 10mm diameter. Great care has to be taken to ensure that as few as possible of the outer rings are lost in coring. This can be difficult as these outer rings are often very soft (see below on sapwood). Each sample is given a code which identifies uniquely which timber it comes from, which building it is from and where the building is located. For example, CRO-A06 is the sixth core taken from the first building (A) sampled by the Laboratory in Cropwell Bishop. Where it came from in that building will be shown in the sampling records and drawings. No structural damage is done to any timbers by coring, nor does it weaken them.

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

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

grew in 1976

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

Figure A3: Measuring ring widths under a microscope. The microscope is fixed while the sample is on a moving platform. The total sequence of widths is measured twice to ensure that an error has not been made. This type of apparatus is needed to process a large number of samples on a regular basis

2. Measuring Ring Widths. Each core is sanded down with a belt sander using medium-grit paper and then finished by hand with flourgrade-grit paper. The rings are then clearly visible and differentiated from each other with a result very much like that shown in Figure A2. The core is then mounted on a movable table below a microscope and the ring-widths measured individually from the innermost ring to the outermost. The widths are automatically recorded in a computer file as they are measured (see Fig A3).

3. Cross-Matching and Dating the Samples. Because of the factors besides the local climate which may determine the annual widths of a tree's rings, no two sequences of ring widths from different oaks growing at the same time are exactly alike (Fig A4). Indeed, the sequences may not be exactly alike even when the trees are growing near to each other. Consequently, in the Laboratory we do not attempt to match two sequences of ring widths by eye, or graphically, or by any other subjective method. Instead, it is done objectively (ie statistically) on a computer by a process called cross-matching. The output from the computer tells us the extent of correlation between two sample sequences of widths or, if we are dating, between a sample sequence of widths and the master, at each relative position of one to the other (offsets). The extent of the correlation at an offset is determined by the t-value (defined in almost any introductory book on statistics). That offset with the maximum t-value among the t-values at all the offsets will be the best candidate for dating one sequence relative to the other. If one of these is a master chronology, then this will date the other. Experiments carried out in the past with sequences from oaks of known date suggest that a t-value of at least 4.5, and preferably at least 5.0, is usually adequate for the dating to be accepted with reasonable confidence (Laxton and Litton 1988; Laxton et al 1988; Howard et al 1984–1995).

This is illustrated in Figure A5 with timbers from one of the roofs of Lincoln Cathedral. Here four sequences of ring widths, LIN-C04, 05, 08, and 45, have been cross-matched with each other. The ring widths themselves have been omitted in the bar diagram, as is usual, but the offsets at which they best cross-match each other are shown; eg the sequence of ring widths of C08 matches the sequence of ring widths of C45 best when it is at a position starting 20 rings after the first ring of C45, and similarly for the others. The actual t-values between the four at these offsets of best correlations are in the matrix. Thus at the offset of +20 rings, the t-value between C45 and C08 is 5.6 and is the maximum found between these two among all the positions of one sequence relative to the other.

It is standard practice in our Laboratory first to cross-match as many as possible of the ring-width sequences of the samples in a building and then to form an average from them. This average is called a site sequence of the building being dated and is illustrated in Figure A5. The fifth bar at the bottom is a site sequence for a roof at Lincoln Cathedral and is constructed from the matching sequences of the four timbers. The site sequence width for each year is the average of the widths in each of the sample sequences which has a width for that year. Thus in Fig A5 if the widths shown are 0.8mm for C45, 0.2mm for C08, 0.7mm for C05, and 0.3mm for C04, then the corresponding width of the site

sequence is the average of these, 0.55mm. The actual sequence of widths of this site sequence is stored on the computer. The reason for creating site sequences is that it is usually easier to date an average sequence of ring widths with a master sequence than it is to date the individual component sample sequences separately.

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

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

Quite often some, though not all, of the original outer rings are missing on a timber. The outer rings on an oak, called sapwood rings, are usually lighter than the inner rings, the heartwood, and so are relatively easy to identify. For example, sapwood can be seen in the corner of the rafter and at the outer end of the core in Figure A2, both indicated by arrows. More importantly for dendrochronology, the sapwood is relatively soft and so liable to insect attack and wear and tear. The builder, therefore, may remove some of the sapwood for precisely these reasons. Nevertheless, if at least some of the sapwood rings are left on a sample, we will know that not too many rings have been lost since felling so that the date of the last ring on the sample is only a few years before the date of the original last ring on the tree, and so to the date of felling.

Various estimates have been made and used for the average number of sapwood rings in mature oak trees (English Heritage 1998). A fairly conservative range is between 15 and 50 and that this holds for 95% of mature oaks. This means, of course, that in a small number of cases there could be fewer than 15 and more than 50 sapwood rings. For example, the core CRO-A06 has only 9 sapwood rings and some have obviously been lost over time – either they were removed originally by the carpenter and/or they rotted away in the building and/or they were lost in the coring. It is not known exactly how many sapwood rings are missing, but using the above range the Laboratory would estimate between a minimum of 6 (=15-9) and a maximum of 41 (=50-9). If the last ring of CRO-A06 has been dated to 1500, say, then the estimated felling-date range for the tree from which it came originally would be between 1506 and 1541. The Laboratory uses this estimate for sapwood in areas of England where it has no prior information. It

also uses it when dealing with samples with very many rings, about 120 to the last heartwood ring. But in other areas of England where the Laboratory has accumulated a number of samples with complete sapwood, that is, no sapwood lost since felling, other estimates in place of the conservative range of 15 to 50 are used. In the East Midlands (Laxton et al 2001) and the east to the south down to Kent (Pearson 1995) where it has sampled extensively in the past, the Laboratory uses the shorter estimate of 15 to 35 sapwood rings in 95% of mature oaks growing in these parts. Since the sample CRO-A06 comes from a house in Cropwell Bishop in the East Midlands, a better estimate of sapwood rings lost since felling is between a minimum of 6 $(=15-9)$ and 26 $(=35-9)$ and the felling would be estimated to have taken place between 1506 and 1526, a shorter period than before. Oak boards quite often come from the Baltic region and in these cases the 95% confidence limits for sapwood are 9 to 36 (Howard et al 1992, 56).

Even more precise estimates of the felling date and range can often be obtained using knowledge of a particular case and information gathered at the time of sampling. For example, at the time of sampling the dendrochronologist may have noted that the timber from which the core of Figure A2 was taken still had complete sapwood but that some of the soft sapwood rings were lost in coring. By measuring into the timber the depth of sapwood lost, say 20mm, a reasonable estimate can be made of the number of sapwood rings lost, say 12 to 15 rings in this case. By adding on 12 to 15 years to the date of the last ring on the sample a good tight estimate for the range of the felling date can be obtained, which is often better than the 15 to 35 years later we would have estimated without this observation. In the example, the felling is now estimated to have taken place between AD 1512 and 1515, which is much more precise than without this extra information.

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

5. Estimating the Date of Construction. There is a considerable body of evidence collected by dendrochronologists over the years that oak timbers used in buildings were not seasoned in medieval or early modern times (English Heritage 1998; Miles 1997, 50– 5). Hence, provided that all the samples in a building have estimated felling-date ranges broadly in agreement with each other, so that they appear to have been felled as a group, then this should give an accurate estimate of the period when the structure was built, or soon after (Laxton et al 2001, fig 8; 34–5, where 'associated groups of fellings' are discussed in detail). However, if there is any evidence of storage before use, or if there is evidence the oak came from abroad (eg Baltic boards), then some allowance has to be made for this.

6. Master Chronological Sequences. Ultimately, to date a sequence of ring widths, or a site sequence, we need a master sequence of dated ring widths with which to crossmatch it, a Master Chronology. To construct such a sequence we have to start with a sequence of widths whose dates are known and this means beginning with a sequence from an oak tree whose date of felling is known. In Figure A6 such a sequence is SHE-T, which came from a tree in Sherwood Forest which was blown down in a recent gale. After this other sequences which cross-match with it are added and gradually the sequence is 'pushed back in time' as far as the age of samples will allow. This process is illustrated in Figure A6. We have a master chronological sequence of widths for Nottinghamshire and East Midlands oak for each year from AD 882 to 1981. It is described in great detail in Laxton and Litton (1988), but the components it contains are shown here in the form of a bar diagram. As can be seen, it is well replicated in that for each year in this period there are several sample sequences having widths for that year. The master is the average of these. This master can now be used to date oak from this area and from the surrounding areas where the climate is very similar to that in the East Midlands. The Laboratory has also constructed a master for Kent (Laxton and Litton 1989). The method the Laboratory uses to construct a master sequence, such as the East Midlands and Kent, is completely objective and uses the Litton-Zainodin grouping procedure (Laxton et al 1988). Other laboratories and individuals have constructed masters for other areas and have made them available. As well as these masters, local (dated) site chronologies can be used to date other buildings from nearby. The Laboratory has hundreds of these site sequences from many parts of England and Wales covering many short periods.

7. Ring-Width Indices. Tree-ring dating can be done by cross-matching the ring widths themselves, as described above. However, it is advantageous to modify the widths first. Because different trees grow at different rates and because a young oak grows in a different way from an older oak, irrespective of the climate, the widths are first standardized before any matching between them is attempted. These standard widths are known as ring-width indices and were first used in dendrochronology by Baillie and Pilcher (1973). The exact form they take is explained in this paper and in the appendix of Laxton and Litton (1988) and is illustrated in the graphs in Figure A7. Here ring-widths are plotted vertically, one for each year of growth. In the upper sequence of (a), the generally large early growth after 1810 is very apparent as is the smaller later growth from about 1900 onwards when the tree is maturing. A similar phenomenon can be observed in the lower sequence of (a) starting in 1835. In both the widths are also changing rapidly from year to year. The peaks are the wide rings and the troughs are the narrow rings corresponding to good and poor growing seasons, respectively. The two corresponding sequence of Baillie-Pilcher indices are plotted in (b) where the differences in the immature and mature growths have been removed and only the rapidly changing peaks and troughs remain, that are associated with the common climatic signal. This makes cross-matching easier.

t-value/offset Matrix

Figure A5: Cross-matching of four sequences from a Lincoln Cathedral roof and the formation of a site sequence from them

The bar diagram represents these sequences without the rings themselves. The length of the bar is proportional to the number of rings in the sequence. Here the four sequences are set at relative positions (offsets) to each other at which they have maximum correlation as measured by the t-values. The t-value/offset matrix contains the maximum t-values below the diagonal and the offsets above it. Thus, the maximum t-value between C08 and C45 occurs at the offset of +20 rings and the t-value is then 5.6. The site sequence is composed of the average of the corresponding widths, as illustrated with one width.

Figure A7 (a): The raw ring-widths of two samples, THO-A01 and THO-B05, whose felling dates are known

Here the ring widths are plotted vertically, one for each year, so that peaks represent wide rings and troughs narrow ones. Notice the growth-trends in each; on average the earlier rings of the young tree are wider than the later ones of the older tree in both sequences

Figure A7 (b): The Baillie-Pilcher indices of the above widths

The growth trends have been removed completely

References

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1989 Construction of a Kent master dendrochronological sequence for oak, AD 1158 to 1540, Medieval Archaeol, 33, 90–8

Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Howard, R E, 2001 Timber: Dendrochronology of Roof Timbers at Lincoln Cathedral, Engl Heritage Res Trans, 7

Litton, C D, and Zainodin, H J, 1991 Statistical models of dendrochronology, J Archaeol Sci¸18, 29–40

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

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

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

ENGLISH HERITAGE RESEARCH AND THE HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

English Heritage undertakes and commissions research into the historic environment, and the issues that affect its condition and survival, in order to provide the understanding necessary for informed policy and decision making, for the protection and sustainable management of the resource, and to promote the widest access, appreciation and enjoyment of our heritage. Much of this work is conceived and implemented in the context of the National Heritage Protection Plan. For more information on the NHPP please go to http://www.english-heritage. org.uk/professional/protection/national-heritage-protection-plan/.

The Heritage Protection Department provides English Heritage with this capacity in the fields of building history, archaeology, archaeological science, imaging and visualisation, landscape history, and remote sensing. It brings together four teams with complementary investigative, analytical and technical skills to provide integrated applied research expertise across the range of the historic environment. These are:

- * Intervention and Analysis (including Archaeology Projects, Archives, Environmental Studies, Archaeological Conservation and Technology, and Scientific Dating)
- * Assessment (including Archaeological and Architectural Investigation, the Blue Plaques Team and the Survey of London)
- * Imaging and Visualisation (including Technical Survey, Graphics and Photography)
- * Remote Sensing (including Mapping, Photogrammetry and Geophysics)

The Heritage Protection Department undertakes a wide range of investigative and analytical projects, and provides quality assurance and management support for externally-commissioned research. We aim for innovative work of the highest quality which will set agendas and standards for the historic environment sector. In support of this, and to build capacity and promote best practice in the sector, we also publish guidance and provide advice and training. We support community engagement and build this in to our projects and programmes wherever possible.

We make the results of our work available through the Research Report Series, and through journal publications and monographs. Our newsletter *Research News*, which appears twice a year, aims to keep our partners within and outside English Heritage up-to-date with our projects and activities.

A full list of Research Reports, with abstracts and information on how to obtain copies, may be found on www.english-heritage.org.uk/researchreports

For further information visit www.english-heritage.org.uk

