Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report 52/1999

TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS FROM MAISON DIEU, OSPRINGE, KENT

C D Litton R E Howard R R Laxton

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

Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report 52/1999

TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS FROM MAISON DIEU, OSPRINGE, KENT

R E Howard R R Laxton C D Litton

Summary

Twenty samples from various parts of Maison Dieu, Ospringe, were analysed by treering dating. This analysis produced two site chronologies. The first, consisting of eight samples, has 89 rings but it did not cross-match with any reference chronologies. Although it is undated, the cross-matching of the samples, and the relative positions of the heartwood/sapwood boundaries on the samples within it strongly suggest that the timbers they represent are all of a single felling phase.

The second site chronology, composed of four samples, has 65 rings, and is dated as spanning the period AD 1388-1452. Interpretation of the sapwood boundary on the samples in this site chronology gives an estimated felling date in the range AD 1462-1482.

Authors' addresses :-

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

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

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

© Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England

TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS FROM MAISON DIEU, OSPRINGE, KENT

Introduction

Maison Dieu at Ospringe lies alongside the main A2 trunk-road running from London to Canterbury (TR 003608; Fig 1). The house incorporates parts of a building formerly belonging to the Hospital of Blessed Mary of Ospringe, commonly known from its earliest days as God's House, hence its name, Maison Dieu. It was one of a particular concentration of such medieval establishments along Watling Street, in Kent. These catered for pilgrims traveling to and from the shrine of St Thomas a Becket at Canterbury, an activity that grew after his re-enshrinement in AD 1220. The establishment at Ospringe was staffed by Brethren of the Holy Cross, living under the rule of the Augustinian order. Whilst their duties were mainly spiritual they did also attend to medical needs as well as providing general hospitality to pilgrims.

The earliest record of Maison Dieu is for grants of corn and building materials by Henry III in AD 1234. A charter was granted in AD 1246 and there are a dozen or so other thirteenth-century references to the site. At its height it comprised a substantial collection of buildings on both side of Watling Street. A plan of the site, taken from the English Heritage guide (Rigold *et al* 1985), is given in Figure 2. The fourteenth century, however, saw a gradual decline of the establishment, with high costs and expensive maintenance, bad stewardship and the demands made on it by various monarchs. A number of commissions of inquiry made investigation of the running of the house, but no practical change was made and when the last brethren died in AD 1470 he was not replaced. In AD 1516 the Bishop of Rochester obtained the dissolution of the hospital and its revenues were added to the newly founded St John's College, Cambridge. To this day the College owns part of the hospital lands and the patronage of its living at Headcorn, Kent.

Some time after AD 1547 the site was leased to Robert Streynsham. Some of the buildings were demolished about this time, their materials being used to build a new house. Part of the existing structure was turned into a shop in AD 1894. In 1947 the building passed to the State and then into the care of the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England.

Only the two substantial fragments of the hospital remain, on the south side of the A2, these being subsidiary buildings of the main complex which was on the north side of the road. Only the building to the west of Water Lane is in custodianship, being grade II* listed and a scheduled ancient monument, and it is this portion which is the subject of the current dendrochronological investigation.

The house is jettied on two sides, the north and the east. Within are two halls, one on the ground floor, the other upstairs. The upper hall has a good example of a king-post roof, a type widely used in south-eastern England from the early-fourteenth century until the middle of the sixteenth century. The coupled rafters are each joined by short collars toward the top and the collars of each couple are linked by a collar purlin. Plans of the building are provided in Figure 3

Sampling and analysis by tree-ring dating of timbers from Maison Dieu was commissioned by English Heritage. The purpose of sampling was to establish the construction date of the main building and to establish the date of fireplaces, which were believed to be insertions of the sixteenth century. A further purpose of analysis was to establish or confirm the date of a southern wing of the building and to confirm the dating of work currently believed to be of seventeenth-century date.

The Laboratory would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who assisted with the sampling of the timbers. In particular thanks are due to Mr and Mrs Friar, custodians of the site, who were most helpful and hospitable during sampling. We would also like to thank Paul Roberts of English Heritage who is recording this building and who assisted with the interpretation of the site prior to sampling.

Sampling

The timbers within this site were initially assessed with Mr Paul Roberts as to their suitability for tree-ring analysis in relation the phases of construction for which dating was required. All the timbers of the southern wing were quite unsuitable, having very wide, and thus relatively few, growth-rings. The timbers of the main part of Maison Dieu also had slightly wide rings but enough timbers had sufficient rings to make sampling worthwhile. Within the main part of the building various fireplace timbers were also available for sampling.

A total of twenty different oak timbers were sampled by coring. Each sample was given the code OSP-A (for Ospringe, site "A") and numbered 01–20. Five samples, OSP-A02-5 and OSP-A17, were obtained from timbers of fireplaces believed to have been inserted in the sixteenth century or to belong to seventeenth-century repairs. Fourteen samples, OSP-A06-16 and OSP-A18-20, were obtained from timbers that were believed to date from the original building. The date of the timber of the undercroft, sampled as OSP-A01, was uncertain.

The positions of these cores were recorded at the time of sampling on plans provided by English Heritage. The are reproduced here as Figure 4a/b. Details of the samples are given in Table 1. In this table the timbers have been identified and numbered from either east to west, or from north to south.

<u>Analysis</u>

Each sample was prepared by sanding and polishing. One sample, OSP-A19 was found to have too few rings for satisfactory analysis and it was not measured. The growth-ring widths of the remaining nineteen samples were measured (data provided at the end of this report) and compared with each other by the Litton/Zainodin grouping procedure (see appendix). At a minimum t-value of 4.5 two groups of samples formed.

The eight samples of the first group cross-matched with each other at relative positions as shown in the bar diagram Figure 5. The growth-ring widths of the nine samples were combined at these relative off-set positions to form OSPASQ01, a site chronology of 89 rings. Site chronology OSPASQ01 was compared with a series of relevant reference chronologies for oak, but there was no satisfactory cross-matching

The four samples of the second group cross-matched with each other at relative positions as shown in the bar diagram Figure 6. The growth-ring widths of these four samples were combined at these relative off-set positions to form OSPASQ02, a site chronology of 65 rings. Site chronology OSPASQ02 was compared with a series of relevant reference chronologies giving it a first ring date of AD 1388 and a last measured ring date of AD 1452. Evidence for this dating is given in the t-values of Table 2.

The two site chronologies were compared with each other, and with the remaining ungrouped samples. In neither case was there any satisfactory cross-matching. Each of the six remaining ungrouped samples was compared individually with a full range of reference chronologies, but again there was no satisfactory cross-matching.

Interpretation

Due to the lack of cross-matching it is not possible to give an estimated felling date range for the timbers represented by site chronology OSPASQ01. However, the cross-matching between the individual samples, and the relative position of the heartwood/sapwood boundary would suggest that all the timbers are of a single felling phase.

The average last heartwood ring date of the samples in site chronology OSPASQ02 is AD 1447. The usual 95% confidence limits for the amount of sapwood on mature oaks from Kent is in the range 15 - 35 rings. This would give this group of timbers estimated felling dates in the range AD 1462-1482.

The timbers in site chronology OSPASQ01 are mostly joist timbers. Not all these timbers are visible for their entire length, though those which are do not show any signs of reuse by way of redundant mortises etc. Two samples in this site chronology, OSP-A02 and A03, are from lintels. While not showing any evidence for reuse, it is quite possible that they are in secondary positions.

The timbers represented by site chronology OSPASQ02 are joists, a lintel and a doorpost. Again there is no evidence for reuse in any of these timbers, although in each case this is a possibility.

The lack of cross-matching between the two site chronologies might suggest that the timbers represented came from different sources. It is also possible that the timbers were felled at different times. It is possible the undated samples are from an area unrepresented by the existing reference chronologies for Kent.

Conclusion

In this instance tree-ring analysis has failed to achieve most of its stated purposes. It was not possible to analyse timbers from the southern gallery, nor to date a large number of samples from the main phase of construction, nor confirm or disprove the date of the supposed seventeenth-century work.

However, it is possible to show that one, undated, group of timbers are contemporaneous with each other, all of them probably being felled at the same time. This is the case with some of the jetty joists from the north and east sides and two of the fireplace lintels.

A second, dated, group of timbers, two other jetty joists from the north side, a doorpost and a fireplace lintel, are also contemporary with each other. These timbers have an estimated felling in the later fifteenth century, a date slightly at odds with that expected on stylistic and documentary ground.

It is impossible to say whether or not the two groups of timbers are contemporary with each other. The lack of cross-matching between the two groups does not necessarily mean that the timbers are of different dates.

The lack of dating for site chronology OSPASQ01may in part be due to the fact that the sampled timbers have relatively few rings and show a rather erratic growth pattern. It is also a possibility that *if* the timbers were felled from the mid-sixteenth century onwards, there is very little reference material from Kent available for that time.

The cross-matching and dating for the samples of site chronology OSPASQ02 is highly localised; all the satisfactory cross-matches are against reference chronologies from Kent. The t-values dating the four samples are relatively low and may be due to the site chronology having only 65 rings.

Bibliography

Bridge, M, 1988 The Dendrochronological Dating of Buildings in Southern England, Medieval Archaeol, 32, 166-74

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

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Pearson, S, 1988 List 28 nos 3, 10 - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results: Kent, Vernacular Architect, 19, 48-9

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1994 List 57 no 6a/b - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results: General List, Vernacular Architect, 25, 36-40

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, Litton, C D, and Simpson, W G, 1995 List 60 no 5c - Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory Results: General List, Vernacular Architect, 26, 47-53

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

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

Rigold, S E, and Dunning, G C, 1985 Maison Dieu, Ospringe, Kent The Medieval Hospital and a note on Faversham Stone Chapel, Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England

Table 1: Details of samples from Maison Dieu, Ospringe, Kent

| Sample no | Sample location | Total rings | *Sapwood rings | First measured ring date | Last heartwood ring date | Last measured ring date |
|-----------|---|----------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| OSP-A01 | Undercroft bridging beam | 76 | 21C | | | |
| OSP-A02 | Lintel to ground floor fireplace | 67 | h/s | | **** | |
| OSP-A03 | Lintel to first floor fireplace | 85 | h/s | | | |
| OSP-A04 | Lintel to Great Chamber fireplace | 61 | 5 | AD 1388 | 1443 | 1448 |
| OSP-A05 | Lintel to stairs/parlour door | 71 | h/s | | | |
| OSP-A06 | Doorpost by ground floor fireplace | 57 | h/s | AD 1392 | 1448 | 1448 |
| OSP-A07 | North jetty joist 6 | 54 | 2 | | | |
| OSP-A08 | North jetty joist 8 | 54 | h/s | مقله مقلة فقله مقله | anto anto anto any any | |
| OSP-A09 | North jetty joist 11 | 84 | h/s | **==== | | |
| OSP-A10 | North jetty joist 12 | 65 | 5 | AD 1388 | 1447 | 1452 |
| OSP-A11 | North jetty joist 13 | 55 | no h/s | | | ***** |
| OSP-A12 | North jetty joist 14 | 58 | 2 | AD 1394 | 1449 | 1451 |
| OSP-A13 | North jetty joist 9 | 85 | h/s | ***** | | |
| OSP-A14 | North jetty joist 15 | 77 | h/s | | | 444 kite sina san dan san |
| OSP-A15 | East jetty joist 5 | 64 | h/s | | ***** | |
| OSP-A16 | North jetty joist 18 | 54 | 3 | ~~~~ | | |
| OSP-A17 | North sidebeam to grnd floor hall fireplace | 50 | no h/s | | (P) = (P) = (W 10) | |
| OSP-A18 | Tie to central truss, Great Chamber | 52 | 2 | | | |
| OSP-A19 | East jetty joist 2 | nm | | | 174 600 kill alle and sun | ****** |
| OSP-A20 | North jetty joist 22 | 83 | h/s | | <u></u> | |

*h/s = the heartwood/sapwood boundary is the last ring on the sample nm = sample not measured C = complete sapwood retained on sample

Table 2: Results of the cross-matching of site chronology OSPASQ02 and relevant reference chronologies when first ring date is AD 1388 and last ring date is AD 1452

| Span of chronology | t-value | |
|--------------------|---|---|
| AD 882-1981 | 3.0 | (Laxton and Litton 1988) |
| AD 1158-1540 | 4.7 | (Laxton and Litton 1989) |
| AD 1386 – 1585 | 3.6 | (Fletcher 1978 unpubl) |
| AD 1379 - 1534 | 3.9 | (Bridge 1988) |
| AD 1293 – 1461 | 3.5 | (Howard et al 1988) |
| AD 1375 – 1491 | 5.3 | (Howard et al 1988) |
| AD 1394 – 1465 | 3.8 | (Howard et al 1994) |
| AD 1393 - 1468 | 4.5 | (Howard et al 1995) |
| AD 1392 – 1463 | 4.2 | (Howard et al 1994) |
| | Span of chronology AD 882 - 1981 AD 1158 - 1540 AD 1386 - 1585 AD 1379 - 1534 AD 1293 - 1461 AD 1375 - 1491 AD 1394 - 1465 AD 1393 - 1468 AD 1392 - 1463 | $\begin{array}{cccc} \text{Span of chronology} & \text{t-value} \\ \text{AD} & 882 - 1981 & 3.0 \\ \text{AD} & 1158 - 1540 & 4.7 \\ \text{AD} & 1386 - 1585 & 3.6 \\ \text{AD} & 1379 - 1534 & 3.9 \\ \text{AD} & 1293 - 1461 & 3.5 \\ \text{AD} & 1375 - 1491 & 5.3 \\ \text{AD} & 1394 - 1465 & 3.8 \\ \text{AD} & 1393 - 1468 & 4.5 \\ \text{AD} & 1392 - 1463 & 4.2 \\ \end{array}$ |



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



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



Figure 3: Plan and cross-sections of Maison Dieu

Figure 4a: Plan of ground floor to show sample locations



Figure 4b: Plan of first floor to show sample locations





Figure 5: Bar diagram of samples in site chronology OSPASQ01

Figure 6: Bar diagram of samples in site chronology OSPASQ02



White bars = heartwood rings, shaded area = sapwood rings h/s = heartwood/sapwood boundary is last ring on sample

Data of measured samples - measurements in 0.01mm units

409 228 243 260 298 206 143 103 195 179 195

176 249 181 232 330

255 309 262 198

120 113 117 103 77 70 80

97 137 105 155 176 145 180 125 103 102 87 137 118 161 127 86 91 107 106 159

149 139

APPENDIX

Tree-Ring Dating

The Principles of Tree-Ring Dating

Tree-ring dating, or *dendrochronology* as it is known, is discussed in some detail in the Laboratory's Monograph, 'An East Midlands Master Tree-Ring Chronology and its uses for dating Vernacular Buildings' (Laxton and Litton 1988b) and, for example, in Tree-Ring Dating and Archaeology (Baillie 1982) or A Slice Through Time (Baillie 1995). Here we will give the bare outlines. Each year an oak tree grows an extra ring on the outside of its trunk and all its branches just inside its bark. The width of this annual ring depends largely on the weather during the growing season, about April to October, and possibly also on the weather during the previous year. Good growing seasons give rise to relatively wide rings, poor ones to very narrow rings and average ones to relatively average ring widths. Since the climate is so variable from year to year, almost random-like, the widths of these rings will also appear random-like in sequence, reflecting the seasons. This is illustrated in Figure1 where, for example, the widest rings appear at irregular intervals. This is the key to dating by tree rings, or rather, by their widths. Records of the average ring widths, one for each year for the last 1000 years or more, are available for different areas. These are called master chronologies. Because of the random-like nature of these sequences of widths, there is usually only one position at which a sequence of ring widths from a sample of timber with at least 70 rings will match a master. This will date the timber and, in particular, the last ring ...

If the bark is still on the sample, as in Figure 1, then the date of the last ring will be the date of felling of the oak from which it was cut. There is much evidence that in medieval times oaks cut down for building purposes were used almost immediately, usually within the year or so (Rackham 1976). Hence if bark is present on several main timbers in a building, none of which appear reused or are later insertions, and if they all have the same date for their last ring, then we can be quite confident that this is the date of construction. If there is no bark on the sample, then we have to make an estimate of the felling date; how this is done is explained below.

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

1. Inspecting the Building and Sampling the Timbers. Together with a building historian we inspect the timbers in a building to try to ensure that those sampled are not reused or later insertions. Sampling is almost always done by coring into the timber, which has the great advantage that we can sample *in situ* timbers and those judged best to give the date of construction, or phase of construction if there is more than one in the building. The timbers to be sampled are also inspected to see how many rings they have. We normally look for timbers with at least 70 rings, and preferably more. With fewer rings than this, 50 for example, sequences of widths become difficult to match to a unique position within a master sequence of ring widths and so are difficult to date (Litton and Zainodin 1991). The cross-section of the rafter shown in Figure 2 has about 120 rings; about 20 of which are sapwood rings. Similarly the core has just over 100 rings.

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



Fig 1. A wedge of oak from a tree felled in 1976. It shows the annual growth rings, one for each year from the innermost ring to the last ring on the outside just inside the bark. The year of each ring can be determined by counting back from the outside ring, which grew in 1976.



Fig 2. Cross-section of a rafter showing the presence of sapwood rings in the corners; the arrow is pointing to the heartwood/sapwood boundary (H/S). Also a core with sapwood; again the arrow is pointing to the H/S. The core is about the size of a pencil.

Sampling is done by coring into the timber with a hollow corer attached to an electric drill and usually from its outer rings inwards towards where the centre of the tree, the pith, is judged to be. An illustration of a core is shown in Figure 2; it is about 15cm long and 1cm diameter. Great care has to be taken to ensure that as few as possible of the outer rings are lost. This can be difficult as these outer rings are often very soft (see below on sapwood). Each sample is given a code which identifies uniquely which timber it comes from, which building it is from and where the building is located. For example, CRO-A06 is the sixth core taken from the first building (A) sampled by the Laboratory in Cropwell Bishop. Where it came from in that building will be shown in the sampling records and drawings. No structural damage is done to any timbers by coring, nor does it weaken them.

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

All sampling by the Laboratory is undertaken according to current Health and Safety Standards. The Laboratory is insured with the CBA.

- 2. Measuring Ring Widths. Each core is sanded down with a belt sander using medium-grit paper and then finished by hand with flourgrade-grit paper. The rings are then clearly visible and differentiated from each other with a result very much like that shown in Figure 2. The core is then mounted on a movable table below a microscope and the ring-widths measured individually from the innermost ring to the outermost. The widths are automatically recorded in a computer file as they are measured (see Fig 3).
- 3. Cross-matching and Dating the Samples. Because of the factors besides the local climate which may determine the annual widths of a tree's rings, no two sequences of ring widths from different oaks growing at the same time are exactly alike (Fig 4). Indeed, the sequences may not be exactly alike even when the trees are growing near to each other. Consequently, in the Laboratory we do not attempt to match two sequences of ring widths by eye, or graphically, or by any other subjective method. Instead, it is done objectively (ie statistically) on a computer by a process called cross-matching. The output from the computer tells us the extent of correlation between two sample sequences of widths or, if we are dating, between a sample sequence of widths and the master, at each relative position of one to the other (offsets). The extent of the correlation at an offset is determined by the *t-value* (defined in almost any introductory book on statistics). That offset with the maximum t-value among the t-values at all the offsets will be the best candidate for dating one sequence relative to the other. If one of these is a master chronology, then this will date the other. Experiments carried out in the past with sequences from oaks of known date suggest that a t-value of at least 4.5, and preferably 5.0, is usually adequate for the dating to be accepted with reasonable confidence (Laxton *et al* 1988a,b; Howard *et al* 1984 1995).

This is illustrated in Fig 5 with timbers from one of the roofs of Lincoln Cathedral. Here four sequences of ring widths, LIN- C04, 05, 08, and 45, have been cross-matched with each other. The ring widths themselves have been omitted in the *bar-diagram*, as is usual, but the offsets at which they best cross-match each other are shown; eg. C08 matches C45 best when it is at a position starting 20 rings after the first ring of 45, and similarly for the others. The actual t-values between the four at these offsets of best correlations are in the matrix. Thus at the offset of +20 rings, the t-value between C45 and C08 is 5.6 and is the maximum between these two whatever the position of one sequence relative to the other.

It is standard practice in our Laboratory first to cross-match as many as possible of the sequences of the samples in a building and then to form an average from them. This average is called a site sequence of the building being dated and is illustrated in Fig 5. The fifth bar at the bottom is a site sequence for a roof at Lincoln Cathedral and is constructed from the matching sequences from four timbers. The site sequence width for each year is the average of the widths in each of the sample sequences which has a width for that year. The actual sequence of widths of this site sequence is stored on the computer. The reason for creating site sequences is that it is usually easier to date an average sequence of ring widths with a master sequence than it is to date the individual component sample sequences separately.

average sequence of ring widths with a master sequence than it is to date the individual component sample sequences separately.

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

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

Quite often some, though not all, of the original outer rings are missing on a timber. The outer rings on an oak, called sapwood rings, are usually lighter than the inner rings, the heartwood, and so are relatively easy to identify. For example, they can be seen in two upper corners of the rafter and at the outer end of the core in Figure 2. More importantly for dendrochronology, the sapwood is relatively soft and so liable to insect attack and wear and tear. The builder, therefore, may remove some of the sapwood for precisely for these reasons. Nevertheless, if at least some of the sapwood rings are left on a sample, we will know that not too many rings have been lost since felling. Thus in these circumstances the date of the present last ring is at least close to the date of the original last ring on the tree, and so to the date of felling.

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

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

More precise estimates of the felling date and range can often be obtained using knowledge of a particular case and information gathered at the time of sampling. For example, at the time of sampling the dendrochronologist may have noted that the timber from which the core of Figure 2 was taken still had complete sapwood. Sapwood rings were only lost in coring, because of their softness. By measuring in the timber the depth of sapwood lost, say 2 cm., a reasonable estimate can be made of the number of sapwood rings missing from the core, say 12 to 15 rings in this case. By adding on 12 to 15 years to the date of the last ring on the sample a good tight estimate for the range of the felling date can be obtained, which is often better than the 15 to 40 years later we would have estimated without this observation.

T-value/Offset Matrix

| | C45 | C08 | C05 | C04 |
|-----|--------|------|-----|-----|
| C45 | \sum | +20 | +37 | +47 |
| C08 | 5.6 | | +17 | +27 |
| C05 | 5.2 | 10.4 | | +10 |
| C04 | 5.9 | 3.7 | 5.1 | |

Bar Diagram



Fig 5. Cross-matching of four sequences from a Lincoln Cathedral roof and the formation of a site sequence from them.

The *bar diagram* represents these sequences without the rings themselves. The length of the bar is proportional to the number of rings in the sequence. Here the four sequences are set at relative positions (*offsets*) to each other at which they have maximum correlation as measured by the *t*-values.

The *t-value/offset* matrix contains the maximum t-values below the diagonal and the offsets above it. Thus, the maximum t-value between C08 and C45 occurs at the offset of +20 rings and the t-value is then 5.6.

The site sequence is composed of the average of the corresponding widths, as illustrated with one width.

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

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

- 5. Estimating the Date of Construction. There is a considerable body of evidence in the data collected by the Laboratory that the oak timbers used in vernacular buildings, at least, were used 'green' (see also Rackham (1976)). Hence provided the samples are taken in situ, and several dated with the same estimated common felling date, then this felling date will give an estimated date for the construction of the building, or for the phase of construction. If for some reason or other we are rather restricted in what samples we can take, then an estimated common felling date may not be such a precise estimate of the date of construction. More sampling may be needed for this.
- 6. Master Chronological Sequences. Ultimately, to date a sequence of ring widths, or a site sequence, we need a master sequence of dated ring widths with which to cross-match it, a Master Chronology. To construct such a sequence we have to start with a sequence of widths whose dates are known and this means beginning with a sequence from an oak tree whose date of felling is known. In Fig 6 such a sequence is SHE-T, which came from a tree in Sherwood Forest which was blown down in a recent gale. After this other sequences which cross-match with it are added and gradually the sequence is 'pushed back in time' as far as the age of samples will allow. This process is illustrated in Fig 6. We have a master chronological sequence of widths for Nottinghamshire and East Midlands oak for each year from AD 882 to 1981. It is described in great detail in Laxton and Litton 1988b, but the components it contains are shown here in the form of a bar diagram. As can be seen, it is well replicated in that for each year in this period there are several sample sequences having widths for that year. The master is the average of these. This master can now be used to date oak from this area and from the surrounding areas where the climate is very similar to that in the East Midlands. The Laboratory has also constructed a master for Kent (Laxton and Litton 1989). The method the Laboratory uses to construct a master sequence, such as the East Midlands and Kent, is completely objective and uses the Litton-Zainodin grouping procedure (Laxton et al 1988a). Other laboratories and individuals have constructed masters for other areas and have made them available. As well as these masters, local (dated) site chronologies can be used to date other buildings from nearby. The Laboratory has hundreds of these site sequences from many parts of England and Wales covering many short periods.
- 7. Ring-width Indices. Tree-ring dating can be done by cross-matching the ring widths themselves, as described above. However, it is advantageous to modify the widths first. Because different trees grow at different rates and because a young oak grows in a different way from an older oak, irrespective of the climate, the widths are first standardized before any matching between them is attempted. These standard widths are known as ring-width indices and were first used in dendrochronology by Baillie and Pilcher (1973). The exact form they take is explained in this paper and in the appendix of Laxton and Litton (1988b) and is illustrated in the graphs in Fig 7. Here ringwidths are plotted vertically, one for each year of growth. In the upper sequence (a), the generally large early growth after 1810 is very apparent as is the smaller generally later growth from about 1900 onwards. A similar difference can be observed in the lower sequence starting in 1835. In both the widths are also changing rapidly from year to year. The peaks are the wide rings and the troughs are the narrow rings, hopefully corresponding to good and poor growing seasons, respectively. The two corresponding sequences of Baillie-Pilcher indices are plotted in (b) where the differences in the early and late growths have been removed and only the rapidly changing peaks and troughs remain. only associated with the common climatic signal and so make cross-matching easier.



Fig 6. Bar diagram showing the relative positions and dates of the first rings of the component site sequences in the East Midlands Master Dendrochronological Sequence, EM08/87.



Fig 7. (a) The raw ring-widths of two samples, THO-A01 and THO-B05, whose felling dates are known. Here the ring widths are plotted vertically, one for each year, so that peaks represent wide rings and troughs narrow ones. Notice the growth-trends in each; on average the earlier rings of the young tree are wider than the later ones of the older tree in both sequences.

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

REFERENCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 1989 Construction of a Kent Master Dendrochronological Sequence for Oak, A.D. 1158 to 1540, *Medieval Archaeol*, 33, 90-8

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

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

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