

Scientific Dating

Deal Castle, Victoria Road, Deal, Kent

Tree-ring Analysis of Oak and Pine Timbers

Alison Arnold and Robert Howard

Discovery, Innovation and Science in the Historic Environment



Research Report Series no. 39-2015

DEAL CASTLE, VICTORIA ROAD, DEAL, KENT

TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF OAK AND PINE TIMBERS

Alison Arnold and Robert Howard

NGR: TR 3777152197

© Historic England

ISSN 2049-4453 (Online)

The Research Report Series incorporates reports by the expert teams within the Investigation & Analysis Department of the Research Group of Historic England, 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 Historic England.

For more information write to Res.reports@historicengland.org.uk or mail: Historic England, Fort Cumberland, Fort Cumberland Road, Eastney, Portsmouth, PO4 9LD

SUMMARY

Dendrochronological analysis was undertaken on 51 of the 54 core samples obtained from Deal Castle, as well as the measurements, carried out *in situ*, of three boards from a door. This analysis produced six oak site chronologies, accounting for 21 samples, and one pine chronology comprising six samples. The first dated oak site chronology, comprising all six consoles to the ground floor of the Central Tower, is 137 rings long, these spanning AD 1465–1601. Interpretation of the sapwood gives these oak timbers an estimated felling date range of AD 1604–29. The second dated oak chronology comprises two door boards. One board is derived from a timber likely to have been felled after AD 1452, while the timber for the second board is likely to have been felled after AD 1535. The single pine chronology, comprising six samples from the timbers of the Gatehouse roof also dates, its 170 rings spanning the years AD 1520–1689. Interpretation of the sapwood on these samples would give these timbers, probably imported from Scandinavia, an estimated felling date in the late-seventeenth century. Twenty six measured oak samples, one measured pine sample, and one of the boards measured *in situ* remain ungrouped and undated.

CONTRIBUTORS

Alison Arnold and Robert Howard

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Nottingham Tree-ring Dating Laboratory would firstly like to thank both Martin Byrne, English Heritage Site Manager, for allowing access to Deal Castle and Roy Porter, English Heritage Territory Properties Curator South, for his assistance during sampling and the valuable information provided on the possible phasing of the timbers here. Finally we would like to thank Shahina Farid and Cathy Tyers (Historic England Scientific Dating Team) for commissioning this programme of dating, and for the help and assistance provided during analysis and production of this report.

ARCHIVE LOCATION

Kent Historic Environment Record Heritage Conservation, Kent County Council Invicta House, County Hall Maidstone Kent ME14 TXX

DATE OF INVESTIGATION

2014-2016

CONTACT DETAILS

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

CONTENTS

Introdu	uction	I
Gateh	nouse	I
Centr	al Tower	I
Sampliı	ng	2
Analysi	is and Results	3
Interpr	retation and Discussion	3
Oak s	ite chronology DELCSQ01 (dated)	3
Oak s	ite chronology DELCSQ02 (undated)	4
Oak s	ite chronology DELCSQ03 (undated)	4
Oak s	ite chronology DELCSQ04 (undated)	5
Oak s	ite chronology DELCSQ05 (undated)	5
Oak s	ite chronology DELCSQ06 (dated)	5
Oak s	ample DEL-C55 (undated)	6
Pine s	ite chronology DELCSQ07 (dated)	6
Conclu	ısion	6
Bibliog	raphy	8
Tables		10
Figures	5	15
Data o	f Measured Samples	29
Appen	dix: Tree-Ring Dating	42
The P	rinciples of Tree-Ring Dating	42
The P	ractice of Tree-Ring Dating at the Nottingham Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory	42
١.	Inspecting the Building and Sampling the Timbers	42
2.	Measuring Ring Widths	47
3.	Cross-Matching and Dating the Samples	47
4.	Estimating the Felling Date	48
5.	Estimating the Date of Construction.	49
6.	Master Chronological Sequences	50
7.	Ring-Width Indices	50
Refer	ences	54

INTRODUCTION

Deal Castle (Figs 1a–b), a Scheduled Monument, was the middle of three such fortifications built by Henry VIII c AD 1539–42 within three miles of each other and designed to cover shipping in The Downs within Goodwin Sands, and to protect the south-east coast from seaward attack. The other castles are at Walmer, to the south and Sandown to the north, the latter now almost totally destroyed by sea action. All three sites were linked to each other by massive earthworks, these now also obliterated.

Deal is the largest and most elaborate of the castles having a six-lobed keep and a central three-storeyed circular citadel, or tower. These rise only a little way above the six-lobed curtain wall to present up to 145 gunports or embrasures on five tiers, the whole structure set low within a deep moat. Entry is from the west over a stone bridge across the moat, through a stout and heavily studded arched door, and via a narrow vaulted passage into an entrance hall with large-beamed roof. The living quarters of the garrison were within the Central Tower, the various interconnecting segmented rooms on different levels, divided up by timber-framed partition walls, being accessed via a central spiral stairs.

Dendrochronological analysis at Deal Castle was requested by Roy Porter in an attempt to determine, with more precision, the dates of certain areas of the castle and any possible subsequent alterations. The castle has been subject to substantial alteration and repairs over the centuries, the most recent work being in the 1950s, and whilst some of this work has been documented, the dating of other earlier changes to the monument is primarily based on assumption and stylistic evidence. It was hoped that tree-ring analysis would determine the date of various elements of the castle and hence enhance the overall understanding of the historical development of the castle, but in addition the information gained would also feed into a new scheme of presentation.

Gatehouse

The Gatehouse has two roof trusses (Fig 2a). These trusses each comprise a pine tiebeam carrying an oak king-post and two pine principal rafters. These timbers in turn support a single inclined pine roof beam, the roof covering being pitched at an angle. Buried in the walls at the end of each tiebeam is a short vertical oak post. The main gates are composed of stiles, muntins, and rails, with panels between, and having arched/curved top pieces/door heads.

Central Tower

In the Central Tower the ground-floor ceiling is formed by a series of main ceiling beams radiating, like the spokes of a wheel, from the middle of the tower to the outer walls (Fig 2b). It is possible that some of these may represent repairs of the 1950s, though others

would appear to be originals. Both the inner and outer ends of a number of these main ceiling beams (but not all) are supported by console posts, some of which again might be later repairs. The ground floor of the Central Tower is divided by four timber-framed partition walls of posts, rails and studs. These walls do not appear to be integral to the original construction work of the tower, and may represent either a change of design or a later alteration, though how much later is unknown. A central spiral stair provides access to the first floor and it is possible that the newel post and some of the stair treads may be original.

The first floor of the Central Tower is also divided by partition walls. Three doorways in these walls appear to be framed openings, unlike those to the ground floor which simply comprise gaps in the timbers of the partitions. As such, these first-floor doorways could possibly be separate inserts and potentially of a different date. A door, made up of five vertical oak boards, is in one of these first-floor doorways. Its date is also uncertain and whilst it may be original, it is also possible that it is of a later date.

SAMPLING

A comprehensive assessment of timbers throughout the castle as to their suitability for tree-ring analysis led to sampling being focused on a number of specific areas that appeared to contain sufficient numbers of suitable timbers (Figs 3a–b). Specifically, these areas comprise the roof and main gates of the Gatehouse, and the ground-floor ceiling, ground- and first-floor partition walls, the stairs, the first-floor doorways, and a first-floor door in the Central Tower. Sampling of the main gates of the Gatehouse was limited to the curved top pieces, all other elements were too small or too thin to sample, and in any case were derived from fast-grown trees and thus unsuitable for tree-ring analysis.

Thus from the areas selected for analysis a total of 54 samples was obtained by coring and a further three timbers were measured *in situ*. Each sample was given the code DEL-C (for Deal Castle) and numbered 01–57 (Table 1). Four samples (DEL-C01 – DEL-C04) were obtained from the curved architrave or edging pieces to the main gates of the castle, with a further 13 samples (DEL-C05 – DEL-C17) being obtained from the timbers of the two roof trusses to the Gatehouse. In the Central Tower 12 samples (DEL-C18 – DEL-C29) were taken from the ceiling beams and their supporting consoles to the ground floor, with 10 samples (DEL-C30 – DEL-C39) being obtained from the timbers of the ground-floor partition walls. Five samples (DEL-C40 – DEL-C44) were taken from a series of treads to the central spiral staircase of the Central Tower. Also in the Central Tower, at first-floor level, six samples (DEL-C45 – DEL-C50) were obtained from two doorframes, five samples (DEL-C51 – DEL-C54) were obtained from one of the partition walls, and finally samples DEL-C55 – DEL-57 were obtained as *in situ* measurements from the exposed top edges of three of the five boards of a door, the other two boards being unsuitable for analysis. The locations of these samples were recorded at the time of sampling either on sketch drawings, annotated photographs, or simple schematic plans (Figs 4a–k). The trusses, frames, and other timbers have either been located on a north-south or east-west basis as appropriate, or in the case of the ceiling beams and consoles of the Central Tower, by counting clockwise from the northernmost timber. The treads of the stairs have been numbered from bottom to top.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Each of the 54 core samples obtained were prepared by sanding and polishing. It was seen at this time that three samples had less than the 40 rings here deemed necessary for reliable dating and they were rejected from this programme of analysis. The annual growth-ring widths of the remaining 51 samples were measured; the data of these measurements, along with the three *in situ* measurements, is given at the end of this report. The data of all 54 measured series were then compared with each other by the Litton/Zainodin grouping procedure (see Appendix).

This comparative process resulted in the production of six oak site chronologies, DELCSQ01 – DELCSQ06, accounting for a total of 21 samples (Figs 5–10), and one pine site chronology, DELCSQ07, this comprising six samples (Fig 11). Each of the seven site chronologies thus created was then compared, as appropriate, to an extensive corpus of either oak or pine reference material. This process indicated a consistent and repeated match for only two of the six oak site chronologies, DELCSQ01 and DELCSQ06, as well as for the single pine site chronology, DELCSQ07. Site chronology DELCSQ01 with 137 rings spans the years AD 1465–1601 (Table 2), while site chronology DELCSQ06 with 153 rings spans AD 1368–1520 (Table 3). The pine site chronology DELCSQ07, with 170 rings, spans the years AD 1520–1689 (Table 4).

Each site chronology was also compared to the remaining measured but ungrouped oak or pine samples, but there was no further cross-matching. Each of the measured but ungrouped oak and pine samples were then compared individually with the full corpus of its respective reference material, but there was no further satisfactory cross-matching and all such samples must, therefore, remain undated.

INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

Analysis by dendrochronology of the timbers of Deal Castle has produced six oak site chronologies, two of which can be dated, plus one dated pine site chronology.

Oak site chronology DELCSQ01 (dated)

This site chronology comprises exclusively samples from the consoles of the ground-floor ceiling in the Central Tower, its 137 rings spanning the years AD 1465–1601 (Fig 5). None of the samples retain complete sapwood (the last growth ring produced by the

tree before it was felled), and it is thus not possible to provide a precise felling date for any timber. All the samples do, though, retain some sapwood or at least the heartwood/sapwood boundary.

The heartwood/sapwood boundary on the six samples is at a similar relative position/date, varying by only five years, and hence it is very likely that the timbers represented were all felled at the same time as each other. The average heartwood/sapwood boundary on these six samples is dated AD 1589 which, allowing for the minimum and maximum numbers of sapwood rings the trees are likely to have had (the 95% confidence interval being 15–40 sapwood rings), would give all of the timbers an estimated likely felling date range of AD 1604–29.

The interpretation as a single phase of felling is further supported by the overall level of cross-matching between these six samples, with values in excess of t=10.0 seen between samples DEL-C24 and C25, in excess of t=11.0 between samples DEL-C27 and C29, and even in excess of t=15.0 between DEL-C26 and C28. Such high levels of cross-matching suggest that some consoles have been derived from the same tree, with all the source trees probably growing in a single woodland area. In respect of the location of this woodland, site chronology DELCSQ01 matches quite widely across the southern and central parts of England and hence, whilst the timber could readily have been derived relatively locally, it is also possible that it was obtained from a more distant woodland.

The consoles associated with the ground-floor ceiling in the Central Tower therefore indicate a programme of building works in the early-seventeenth century.

Oak site chronology DELCSQ02 (undated)

DELCSQ02, also comprises six samples, all of them exclusively from the ground-floor ceiling beams of the Central Tower (Fig 6). This site chronology is 118 rings long, but it cannot be conclusively dated. Although undated, the relative position of the heartwood/sapwood boundary on the constituent samples varies by only seven years suggesting that these timbers were also cut as part of a single programme of felling. The cross-matching between these samples is somewhat more variable and suggests that the trees may have been derived from relatively widespread, although potentially closely related, woodland areas.

Oak site chronology DELCSQ03 (undated)

Samples DEL-C09 and DEL-C10 (Fig 7) are both from short posts buried in the walls of the Gatehouse and, whilst neither retain the heartwood/sapwood boundary, given that they cross-match with a value of t=7.9, it is likely that the source trees were growing close to each other. This, combined with the fact that both timbers are associated with

the same truss, indicates that it is likely that they do actually represent a single phase of felling.

Oak site chronology DELCSQ04 (undated)

Samples DEL-C39 and DEL-C42 (Fig 8), respectively from a ground-floor partition wall post and a stair tread to the Central Tower, are clearly broadly coeval. However the heartwood/sapwood boundary is present on one, but not the other, and thus it is not possible to ascertain whether they represent a single phase of felling or two separate phases of felling. Whilst they do cross-match with a value of t=5.1 this does not conclusively demonstrate that they were felled at the same time.

Oak site chronology DELCSQ05 (undated)

Two of the three samples, DEL-C51 and DEL-C53 (Fig 9), both from rails of the first-floor partition wall in the Central Tower, were likely to have been felled at the same time as each other. Such an interpretation is based on the fact that their heartwood/sapwood boundaries are at similar positions, that they cross-match with a value of t=6.5, and that both timbers are part of the same partition wall.

Sample DEL-C33 from a door-post in the ground-floor partition wall timber in the Central Tower, on the other hand, is without the heartwood/sapwood boundary and thus its relative felling date cannot be determined. In this instance, although the cross-matching with samples DEL-C51 and DEL-C53 is good (t=4.7 and t=7.8 respectively), the outermost measured heartwood ring on sample DEL-C33 is several decades earlier than on DEL-C51 and DEL-C53 (Fig 9). While this timber could be earlier than those from the first-floor partition wall, the case is not proven as it could simply have been more heavily trimmed during conversion into a post.

Oak site chronology DELCSQ06 (dated)

Neither of the two dated series from boards of the first-floor door retains any sapwood or the heartwood/sapwood boundary (Fig 10), and it thus not possible to provide a felling date range. However, with a last heartwood ring date of AD 1520, and allowing for a minimum of 15 sapwood rings (the lower 95% confidence level) it is likely that the board represented by DEL-C56 was felled after AD 1535, whilst with a last heartwood ring date of AD 1437 it is likely that the board represented by DEL-C56 was felled after the two boards were felled after AD 1452. It is possible that the trees utilised for the two boards were felled at the same as each other and that they are coeval, but this is not certain. If they are of the same date, it is clear that the timber for sample DEL-C57 has been more heavily trimmed during conversion than has the timber represented by sample DEL-C56.

This site chronology matches well with a whole series of other reference chronologies derived from boards used in panelling, triptych's, and panel paintings, all thought to have been derived from sources elsewhere in Europe, predominantly the Baltic region. Thus the dated door boards are also derived from imported timber.

Oak sample DEL-C55 (undated)

Although sample DEL-C55, also from the first-floor door, has 112 rings, quite sufficient for reliable analysis, it remains undated. The sample shows no sign of distortion or stress which might make cross-matching and dating difficult, and the reason for the lack of dating is unknown. It is possible that the source tree grew in an area, and/or at a time, for which as yet there is no available reference material, although this seems relatively unlikely. It is, however, common in most programmes of tree-ring analysis that some samples remain undated, often for no apparent reason.

Pine site chronology DELCSQ07 (dated)

This site chronology comprises exclusively samples from the roof of the Gatehouse (Fig 11), its 170 rings spanning the years AD 1520–1689. It is possible that one, or possibly two, of the pine samples from the Gatehouse roof retain complete sapwood, although this is somewhat more difficult to determine on softwood timbers than on oak. One rafter (DEL-C16) has a last potential complete sapwood ring end-date, and hence a possible felling date, of AD 1689, while another rafter (DEL-C12) has a last possible complete sapwood ring end-date, and hence a possible felling date, of AD 1689, while another rafter (DEL-C12) has a last possible complete sapwood ring end-date, and hence a possible felling date, of AD 1687. The amount of sapwood present on pines is very variable, far more so than oak, however the last measured ring dates on the other pine samples would also be suggestive of felling dates towards the very end of the seventeenth century. Thus it appears that the Gatehouse roof underwent a period of rebuilding or significant repair at the end of the seventeenth century.

The overall cross-matching between the samples in this site chronology suggests the likelihood that the trees may have grown in an extensive area of forest. This site chronology itself matches consistently with reference chronologies from Norway and Sweden, as well as those from other imported assemblages in the UK thought to be of potentially Scandinavian origin. Hence it appears possible that these timbers from the roof of the Gatehouse also have a Scandinavian origin.

CONCLUSION

In this instance, tree-ring analysis has dated relatively few timbers, an unusually high number of samples (75%) remaining undated. This may be due to the character of the timbers available here, there now appearing to be a distinct possibility not only that some of them are reused pieces of different felling dates inserted as part of later periods of

repair, including that undertaken in the 1950s, but that more timbers have been replaced than was previously thought. Small groups of timbers of different dates are often more difficult to date than larger collections where the data is well replicated. It is also possible that many timbers are of dates and/or from areas for which, at present, there is little or no reference material available. This may be particularly applicable to the later 1950s timbers. In this respect it is possible that when further regional data are collected, the unmatched samples from Deal Castle may ultimately be dated.

The dating that has been obtained, however, is no doubt of some use, this demonstrating that one hitherto unknown programme of work appears to have been undertaken in the Central Tower in the early seventeenth century, and that the Gatehouse roof underwent an undocumented period of rebuilding or significant repair at the end of the seventeenth century. Analysis also shows that the boarded first-floor door to the Central Tower may be an early survival. The work undertaken here, furthermore, will add oak and pine chronologies to both the regional and wider European database, these helping to date other timbers in future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arnold, A J, Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 2001 *Tree-ring Analysis of Timbers from 'The Long House', 62 Strand Street, Sandwich, Kent,* Centre for Archaeol Rep, **56/2001**

Arnold, A J, and Litton, C D, 2003 *Tree-ring Analysis of Timbers from Chiddingly Place, Chiddingly, East Sussex,* Centre for Archaeol Rep, **14/2003**

Arnold, A J, Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 2003 *Tree-ring Analysis of Timbers from Cobham Hall, Cobham, Kent,* Centre for Archaeol Rep, **50/2003**

Arnold, A J, Howard, R E, Litton, C D, and Dawson, G, 2005 *The Tree-ring Dating of a Number of Bellframes in Leicestershire,* Centre for Archaeol Rep, **5/2005**

Arnold, A J, and Howard, R E, 2011 unpubl Tree-ring Analysis of Timbers from Avebury Manor, Avebury, Wiltshire – Nottingham Tree-ring Dating Laboratory unpubl computer file *AVBMSQ01*

Arnold, A J, and Howard, R E, 2013 *Kirkleatham Hall Stable Block, Kirkleatham Lane, Redcar, North Yorkshire, Tree-Ring Analysis of Timbers*, English Heritage Res Rep Ser, **53/2013**

Bridge, M, 2015 Bromley Hall, Gillender Street, London Borough of Tower Hamlets, Tree-Ring Analysis of Pine Timbers, Historic England Res Rep Ser, **13/2015**

Bridge, M, and Miles, D 2004 *Tree-ring Analysis of Timbers from the Hall Roof, West Gateway, and Gates at Fulham Palace, London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham,* Centre for Archaeol Rep, **79/2004**

Eidem, P, 1959 n grunnskala Stil tidfesting av trevirke fra Flesberg i Numedal, *Blyttia*, **17**(7), 69-84

Groves, C, 2004 Dendrochronological analysis of timbers from Bowhill, in *Bowhill: The Archaeological Study of a Building Under Repair in Exeter, Devon, 1977-95* (S R Blaylock), Exeter Archaeology Report Series, **5**, 243-267

Groves, C, and Hillam, J, 1997 Tree-ring analysis and dating of timbers, in *A Multi-period Salt Production Site at Droitwich: Excavations at Upwich* (J D Hurst), CBA Res Rep, **107**, 121-6

Groves, C, and Locatelli, C, 2005 *Tree-ring Analysis of Conifer Timbers from 107 Jermyn Street, City of Westminster, London*, Centre for Archaeol Rep, **67/2005**

Hillam, J, and Tyers, I 1995 Reliability and repeatability in dendrochronological analysis: tests using the Fletcher archive of panel-painting date, *Archaeometry* **37**(2), 395-405

Howard, R E, 2002 unpubl, composite site chronology for Ightham Mote, Ivy Hatch, Kent, unpubl computer file *KIMASQ03*, Nottingham Univ Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory

Lavier, C, and Lambert, G, 1996 Dendrochronology and works of art, in *Tree Rings, Environment and Humanity* (J S Dean, D M Meko, and T W Swetnam), 543-556

Tyers, I, 1991 *Dendrochronology Report on Building Timbers and Wooden Panelling from Sutton House, Hackney*, Museum of London EAS Dendro Rep, **2/91**

Tyers, 2000 *Tree-ring Analysis of Panelling from Otley Hall, Otley, Suffolk*, ARCUS Rep **550**

TABLES

Table 1: Details of tree-ring samples from Deal Castle, Kent

Sample number	Sample location	Total	Sapwood	First measured	Last heartwood	Last measured ring
		rings	rings*	ring date AD	ring date AD	date AD
	Gatehouse main gate					
DEL-COI	North door, upper architrave piece	45	h/s			
DEL-C02	North door, lower architrave piece	91	no h/s			
DEL-C03	South door, upper architrave piece	42	no h/s			
DEL-C04	South door, lower architrave piece	nm				
	Gatehouse roof					
DEL-C05	King post, northern truss	71	h/s			
DEL-C06	East wall post, northern truss	nm				
DEL-C07	West wall post, northern truss	57	h/s			
DEL-C08	King post, southern truss	71	6			
DEL-C09	East wall post, southern truss	50	no h/s			
DEL-CI0	West wall post, southern truss	68	no h/s			
DEL-CII	Tiebeam, northern truss (pine)	112	25	1526	1612	1637
DEL-C12	East rafter, northern truss (pine)	168	56C?	1520	1631	1687
DEL-C13	West rafter, northern truss (pine)	130	40	1549	1638	1678
DEL-C14	Roof beam, northern truss (pine)	150	70	1532	1611	1681
DEL-C15	Tiebeam, southern truss (pine)	337	66			
DEL-CI6	East rafter, southern truss (pine)	163	74C?	1527	1615	1689
DEL-CI7	Roof beam, southern truss (pine)	101	21	1523	1602	1623

Sample number	Sample location	Total	Sapwood	First measured	Last heartwood	Last measured ring
		rings	rings*	ring date AD	ring date AD	date AD
	Central Tower, ground-floor ceiling					
DEL-CI8	Ceiling beam 10	96	h/s			
DEL-C19	Ceiling beam 12	73	h/s			
DEL-C20	Ceiling beam 3	89	h/s			
DEL-C21	Ceiling beam 4	76	h/s			
DEL-C22	Ceiling beam 8	116	h/s			
DEL-C23	Ceiling beam 9	88	no h/s			
DEL-C24	Console I	90	h/s	1500	1589	1589
DEL-C25	Console 4	127	h/s	1465	1591	1591
DEL-C26	Console 5	90	h/s	1497	1586	1586
DEL-C27	Console 6	130		1472	1590	1601
DEL-C28	Console 7	115	h/s	1476	1590	1590
DEL-C29	Console 8	95	5	1499	1588	1593
	Central Tower, ground-floor partition walls					
DEL-C30	North-east partition, south-west rail	100	h/s			
DEL-C31	North-east partition, mid-post	106	no h/s			
DEL-C32	North-east partition, north-east post	86	no h/s			
DEL-C33	North-west partition, lower post	66	no h/s			
DEL-C34	North-west partition, mid-post	125	h/s			
DEL-C35	North-west partition, north-west rail	60	no h/s			
DEL-C36	North-west partition, north-west-post		no h/s			
DEL-C37	South-west partition, south-west rail	57	h/s			
DEL-C38	South-west partition, mid-post	46	no h/s			
DEL-C39	South-west partition, south-west post	55	h/s			

Table 1: (continued)

Sample number	Sample location	Total	Sapwood	First measured	Last heartwood	Last measured ring
		rings	rings*	ring date AD	ring date AD	date AD
	Central Tower, stairs					
DEL-C40	Newel post	94	no h/s			
DEL-C41	Tread I (from bottom)	60	no h/s			
DEL-C42	Tread 2	81	no h/s			
DEL-C43	Tread 13	75	no h/s			
DEL-C44	Tread 15	48	no h/s			
	Central Tower, first-floor door frames					
DEL-C45	Doorway I, south jamb	56	h/s			
DEL-C46	Doorway 2, north jamb	59	no h/s			
DEL-C47	Doorway 2, south jamb	69	no h/s			
DEL-C48	Doorway 2, lintel	74	h/s			
DEL-C49	Doorway 3, east jamb	65	no h/s			
DEL-C50	Doorway 3, west jamb	120	h/s			
	Central Tower, first-floor partition walls					
DEL-C51	West partition wall, east top rail	99	h/s			
DEL-C52	West partition wall, main central post	nm				
DEL-C53	West partition wall, west mid-rail	94	h/s			
DEL-C54	West partition wall, west stud post	97	h/s			
	Door I boards					
DEL-C55	Board I (outer/closing board)	112	no h/s			
DEL-C56	Board 2	145	no h/s	1376		1520
DEL-C57	Board 4	70	no h/s	1368		1437

nm = sample not measured

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

C? = possible complete sapwood retained on sample, last measured ring is possibly the felling date of the timber represented

Table 2: Results of the cross-matching of oak site sequence DELCSQ01 and relevant reference chronologies when the first-ring date is AD 1465 and the last-ring date is AD 1601

Reference chronology	Span of chronology	<i>t-</i> value	Reference
Chiddingly Place, East Sussex	AD 1324–1576	8.0	(Arnold and Litton 2003)
Avebury Manor, Avebury, Wiltshire	AD 1393-1596	7.8	(Arnold and Howard 2011 unpubl)
Long House, 62 Strand Street, Sandwich, Kent	AD 1466-1561	7.2	(Arnold <i>et al</i> 2001)
Cobham Hall, Cobham, Kent	AD 1317-1662	7.1	(Arnold <i>et al</i> 2003)
Church of St Andrew, Welham, Leicestershire	AD 1443-1633	6.7	(Arnold <i>et al</i> 2005)
Upwich, Droitwich, Worcestershire	AD 1454-1651	6.7	(Groves and Hillam 1997)
Church of St Peter, Aston Flamville, Leicestershire	AD 1475-1620	6.4	(Arnold <i>et al</i> 2005)
Ightham Mote, Ivy Hatch, Kent	AD 1276-1648	6.2	(Howard 2002 unpubl)

Table 3: Results of the cross-matching of oak site sequence DELCSQ06 and relevant reference chronologies when the first-ring date is AD 1368 and the last-ring date is AD 1520

Reference chronology	Span of chronology	<i>t-</i> value	Reference
Baltic (area I) panel paintings - imported	AD 1156 – 1597	8.2	(Hillam and Tyers 1995)
Flemish masters panel paintings – imported	AD 1169 – 1518	7.3	(Lavier and Lambert 1996)
Fulham Palace gate boards, London - imported	AD 1319–1484	7.0	(Bridge and Miles 2004)
Bowhill ceiling boards, Exeter, Devon - imported	AD 6 - 483	6.8	(Groves 2004)
Sutton House wall panelling (area 1), London - imported	AD 1259 – 1516	6.3	(Tyers 1991)
Otley Hall, wall panelling (area 2) Suffolk - imported	AD 1374 – 1584	6.0	(Tyers 2000)
Otley Hall, wall panelling (area 1) Suffolk - imported	AD 1259 – 1519	5.5	(Tyers 2000)
Albion Place barrel staves, Clerkenwell, London - imported	AD 1363 – 1478	5.5	(Tyers unpubl)

Table 4: Results of the cross-matching of pine site sequence DELCSQ07 and relevant reference chronologies when the first-ring date is AD 1520 and the last-ring date is AD 1689

Reference chronology	Span of chronology	<i>t-</i> value	Reference
Norway: 11-13 Oslo Bolvaerk	AD 1479–1622	7.7	(Daly <i>pers comm</i>)
Norway: Grunnskala Flesberg	AD 1383–1954	5.8	(Eidem 1959)
Sweden: Helsingland	AD 1001-1861	5.1	(Bartholin <i>pers comm</i>)
Sweden: Uppland	AD 1031-1638	5.0	(Bartholin <i>pers comm</i>)
Bromley Hall, London Borough of Tower Hamlets - imported	AD 1520–1689	7.0	(Bridge 2015)
107 Jermyn Street, City of Westminster, London (3) - imported	AD 1367-1710	6.8	(Groves and Locatelli 2005)
107 Jermyn Street, City of Westminster, London (4) - imported	AD 1507-1700	6.3	(Groves and Locatelli 2005)
Kirkleatham Hall Stables, Redcar, North Yorkshire (2) - imported	AD 1550-1701	5.7	(Arnold and Howard 2013)
73 Kew Green, Richmond, Surrey - imported	AD 1551-1699	5.5	(Tyers <i>pers comm</i>)

FIGURES



Figure 1a-b: Map to show the location of Deal (top) and Deal Castle (bottom) © Crown Copyright and database right 2014. All rights reserved. Ordnance Survey Licence number 100024900



Figure 2a–b: View of the timbers to the Gatehouse roof (top), and the ceiling beams, consoles, and partition wall timbers of the Central Tower (bottom) (photographs Robert Howard)



Figure 3a-b: Ground/first-floor plans (top/bottom) of Deal Castle to show sampled areas (after English Heritage Guidebook: Deal Castle)



Figure 4a-b: Photographs to help locate sampled timbers of the main gates (top) and the Gatehouse roof (bottom) (photographs Robert Howard)



Figure 4c: Annotated plan at ground-floor level to help locate sampled timbers (after English Heritage Guidebook: Deal Castle)



Figure 4d: Photograph to help locate sampled timbers from the north-east ground-floor partition wall (photographs Robert Howard





Figure 4e-f: Photographs to help locate sampled timbers from the south-west (top) and southeast (bottom) ground-floor partition walls (photographs Robert Howard)



Figure 4g: General view of the newel post and stairs (cored as samples DEL-C40–44) (photograph Robert Howard)





Figure 4h—i: Photographs to help locate sampled timbers of the first-floor doorway I (top) and 2 (bottom) (photographs Robert Howard)





Figure 4j–k: Photograph to help locate sampled timbers of the first-floor partition wall and doorway 3 (top) and board-built door (bottom) (photographs Robert Howard)



White bars = heartwood rings, red bars = sapwood rings; h/s = heartwood/sapwood boundary

Figure 5: Bar diagram of the oak samples, all from consoles of the ground-floor ceiling timbers in the Central Tower, in site chronology DELCSQ01



White bars = heartwood rings, h/s = heartwood/sapwood boundary

25

39 -

2015

Figure 6: Bar diagram of the oak samples, all from ground-floor ceiling beams in the Central Tower, in site chronology DELCSQ02





Figure 7: Bar diagram of the oak samples, both from short posts associated with the south truss in the Gatehouse, in site chronology DELCSQ03



White bars = heartwood rings, h/s = heartwood/sapwood boundary

Figure 8: Bar diagram of the oak samples, both from different elements of the Central Tower, in site chronology DELCSQ04



White bars = heartwood rings, h/s = heartwood/sapwood boundary

Figure 9: Bar diagram of the oak samples, all associated with partitions in the Central Tower, in site chronology DELCSQ05



White bars = heartwood rings, h/s = heartwood/sapwood boundary

Figure 10: Bar diagram of the oak samples, both associated with boarded first floor door in the Central Tower, in site chronology DELCSQ06



White bars = heartwood rings, red bars = sapwood rings

C? = possible complete sapwood retained on sample, last measured ring is possibly the felling date of the timber represented

Figure 11: Bar diagram of the pine samples, all from the roof of the Gatehouse, in site chronology DELCSQ07

DATA OF MEASURED SAMPLES

Measurements in 0.01mm units

140 176 140 121 187 207 162 134 135 117 126 141 128 154 181 216 89 65 57 81

224 196 163 210 228 209 294 214 196 184 200 181 146 212 194 356 231 227 200 242

100 120 110 150 150 120 220 120 200 120

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 Nottingham Tree-ring Dating Laboratory's Monograph, An East Midlands Master Tree-Ring Chronology and its uses for dating Vernacular Buildings (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 random-like, the widths of these rings will also appear random-like in sequence, reflecting the seasons. This is illustrated in Figure A1 where, for example, the widest rings appear at irregular intervals. This is the key to dating by tree rings, or rather, by their widths. Records of the average ring widths for oaks, one for each year for the last 1000 years or more, are available for different areas. These are called master chronologies. Because of the random-like nature of these sequences of widths, there is usually only one position at which a sequence of ring widths from a sample of oak timber with at least 70 rings will match a master. This will date the timber and, in particular, the last ring.

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

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

1. Inspecting the Building and Sampling the Timbers. Together with a building historian the timbers in a building are inspected to try to ensure that those sampled are not reused or later insertions. Sampling is almost always done by coring into the timber, which has the great advantage that we can sample *in situ* timbers and those judged best to give the date of construction, or phase of construction if there is more than one in the building. The timbers to be sampled are also inspected to see how many rings they have. We normally look for timbers with at least 70 rings, and preferably more. With fewer rings than this, 50 for example, sequences of widths become difficult to match to a unique

position within a master sequence of ring widths and so are difficult to date (Litton and Zainodin 1991). The cross-section of the rafter shown in Figure A2 has about 120 rings; about 20 of which are sapwood rings – the lighter rings on the outside. Similarly the core has just over 100 rings with a few sapwood rings.

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

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

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

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



Figure A1: 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



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



Figure A4: 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 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 a/ 1988; Howard et a/ 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 Figure 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 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'. 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 complement 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.

Master Chronological Sequences. Ultimately, to date a sequence of ring widths, or 6. 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

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**

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1992 List 44 no 17 -Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory: tree-ring dates for buildings in the East Midlands, *Vernacular Architect*, **23**, 51–6.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



Historic England Research and the Historic Environment

We are the public body that looks after England's historic environment. We champion historic places, helping people understand, value and care for them.

A good understanding of the historic environment is fundamental to ensuring people appreciate and enjoy their heritage and provides the essential first step towards its effective protection.

Historic England works to improve care, understanding and public enjoyment of the historic environment. We undertake and sponsor authoritative research. We develop new approaches to interpreting and protecting heritage and provide high quality expert advice and training.

We make the results of our work available through the Historic England Research Report Series, and through journal publications and monographs. Our online magazine Historic England Research which appears twice a year, aims to keep our partners within and outside Historic England 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.HistoricEngland.org.uk/researchreports

Some of these reports are interim reports, making the results of specialist investigations available 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, you should consult the author before citing these reports in any publication. Opinions expressed in these reports are those of the author(s) and are not necessarily those of Historic England.

The Research Report Series incorporates reports by the expert teams within the Investigation& Analysis Division of the Heritage Protection Department of Historic England, 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