



THE BELLFRAME CHURCH OF HOLY TRINITY **RATCLIFFE-ON-SOAR** NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

SURVEY, RECORDING AND TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS



Alison Arnold, Robert Howard, & George Dawson

NGR: SK 49476 28911 SEPTEMBER 2015







NTRDL, 20 Hillcrest Grove, Sherwood, Nottinghamshire NG5 1FT Telephone 0115 960 3833 (Office); 07980 305583 (Mobile)

SURVEY, RECORDING, AND TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS FROM THE BELLFRAME OF THE CHURCH OF HOLY TRINITY, RATCLIFFE-ON-SOAR, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

ALISON ARNOLD ROBERT HOWARD GEORGE DAWSON

SUMMARY

Dendrochronological analysis undertaken on samples taken from timbers of the bellframe at this church resulted in the construction of a single site sequence. Site sequence NBFHSQ01, contains ten samples and spans the period AD 1357–1477. Interpretation of the sapwood suggests felling of all samples occurred in AD 1478–1501.

SURVEY, RECORDING, AND TREE-RING ANALYSIS OF TIMBERS FROM THE BELLFRAME OF THE CHURCH OF HOLY TRINITY RATCLIFFE-ON-SOAR, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

INTRODUCTION

The Church of Holy Trinity is located in the village of Ratcliffe-on-Soar, Nottinghamshire (Figs 1 & 2). There has been a church at Ratcliffe since at least AD 1086 when one is mentioned in Domesday. However, the present church is thought to date from the late-twelfth century with the chancel dating to c AD 1160. The tower and nave were added c AD 1220 with the nave aisles and spire c AD 1290. The south aisle was rebuilt and the porch added c AD 1320 with the north aisle altered later in the fourteenth century. In the first half of the nineteenth century the church, originally dedicated to St Mary, was rededicated to The Holy Trinity. Major restoration work was undertaken by AD 1886 (http://southwellchurches.nottingham.ac.uk/ratcliffe/hintro.php).

The Bell frame

This was originally a short headed frame with queen posts for three bells, (Pickford Group 3.E) and transoms. At a later date the two heads of the centre pit trusses were removed and long heads substituted which extend into the tower walls (Figs 3 & 4). This seems to have been an attempt to stabilise the frame and was possibly done when the treble bell was recast in AD 1788.

The frame shows the usual characteristics of a short headed frame, has stabilising transoms part of the way up the braces on each truss, and there is evidence, in the form of cut-outs on the braces, of transom braces.

The Bells

1(i). * G.HEDDERLY FECIT NOTTM * IOHN CHAMBERLAIN C WARDEN

- (ii). :TO HONOUR OF BOTH GOD & KING:OUR VOICES SHAL IN CONSORT RING
- (iii). [46]
- (iv). 1788

2(i). [+43] LAVD [+133] AND [+133] PRAYS [+133] TO [+133]GOD [+133] I [+133] SYNG [+133] AND [+133] SEND [+133] THEME [+133] HEVEN [+133] THAT [+133] HERYTH [+133] ME [+133] RENG [+133] MHSC

(ii). Line of 134 [40]

3. **IHS** [134] **BE** [134] **MI** [134] **SPED** [134] **MHS** [40] [134]

Badge numbers are taken from the Church Bells of Nottinghamshire.

The bells are now hung dead; this was undertaken by Taylors in 1939 at a cost of \pounds 79. All bells now hang in the centre pit of the old wooden frame, whereas formerly each bell hung in a separate pit.

The treble, as it indicates, is the work of George Hedderly of Nottingham. The second and tenor both have the badge used by Henry 1 Oldfield and the lettering is the small Gothic capitals set but the lion word stop is that seen on bells cast at Leicester. Thus these bells could possibly be a joint production by Henry Oldfield and William or Francis Watts in the 1580's. The inscription on the second would appear to be unique. The meaning of the letters MHSC on the second and MHS on the tenor is not known.

Physical data:						
	Diameter	Weight	Note			
		(Cwt.Qr.Lb)				
Treble.	25.5"	3.3.5	Eb+36 cents 1271 Hz			
2.	29"	4.1.0	C+44 cents 1074 Hz			

4.3.4

Tenor.

30"

The bells are not well in tune with each other, approximating to the front three of a ring of five bells in a major key, with the treble a whole semi-tone sharp.

B+42 cents 1012 Hz

PRINCIPLES OF TREE-RING DATING

Tree-ring dating relies on a few simple, but fundamental, principles. Firstly, as is commonly known, trees (particularly oak trees) grow by adding one, and only one, growth-ring to their circumference each, and every, year. Each new annual growth-ring is added to the outside of the previous year's growth just below the bark. The width of this annual growth-ring is largely, though not exclusively, determined by the weather conditions during the growth period (roughly March to September). In general, good conditions produce

wider rings and poor conditions produce narrower rings. Thus, over the lifetime of a tree, the annual growth-rings display a climatically determined pattern. Furthermore, and importantly, all trees growing in the same area at the same time will be influenced by the same growing conditions and the annual growth-rings of all of them will respond in a similar, though not identical, way.

Secondly, because the weather over any number of consecutive years is unique, so too is the growth pattern of the tree. The pattern of a short period of growth, 20 or 30 consecutive years, might conceivably be repeated two or even three times in the last one thousand years. A short pattern might also be repeated at different time periods in different parts of the country because of differences in regional micro-climates. It is less likely, however, that such problems would occur with the pattern of a longer period of growth, that is, anything in excess of 60 years or so. In essence, a short period of growth, anything less than 50 rings, is not reliable, and the longer the period of time under comparison the better.

The third principal of tree-ring dating is that, until the early-to mid-nineteenth century, builders of timber-framed houses usually obtained all the wood needed for a given structure by felling the necessary trees in a single operation from one patch of woodland or from closely adjacent woods. Furthermore, and contrary to popular belief, the timber was used "green" and without seasoning, and there was very little long-term storage as in timber-yards of today. This fact has been well established from a number of studies where tree-ring dating has been undertaken in conjunction with documentary studies. Thus, establishing the felling date for a group of timbers gives a very precise indication of the date of their use in a building.

Tree-ring dating relies on obtaining the growth pattern of trees from sample timbers of unknown date by measuring the width of the annual growth-rings. This is done to a tolerance of 1/100 of a millimetre. The growth patterns of these samples of unknown date are then compared with a series of reference patterns or chronologies, the date of each ring of which is known. When a sample "cross-matches" repeatedly at the same date against a series of different relevant reference chronologies the sample can be said to be dated. The degree of cross-matching, that is the measure of similarity between sample and reference is denoted by a "t-value"; the higher the value the greater the similarity. The greater the similarity the greater is the probability that the patterns of the same time. The statistically accepted fully reliable minimum t-value is 3.5.

However, rather than attempt to date each sample individually it is usual to first compare all the samples from a single building, or phases of a building, with one another, and attempt to cross-match each one with all the others from the same phase or building. When samples from the same phase do cross-match with each other they are combined at their matching positions to form what is known as a "site chronology". As with any set of data, this has the effect of reducing the anomalies of any one individual (brought about in the case of tree-rings by some non-climatic influence) and enhances the overall climatic signal. As stated above, it is the climate that gives the growth pattern its distinctive pattern. The greater the number of samples in a site chronology the greater is the climatic signal of the group and the weaker is the non-climatic input of any one individual.

Furthermore, combining samples in this way to make a site chronology usually has the effect of increasing the time-span that is under comparison. As also mentioned above, the longer the period of growth under consideration, the greater the certainty of the cross-match. Any site chronology with less than about 55 rings is generally too short for satisfactory analysis.

SAMPLING STRATEGY

A total of ten timbers were sampled with each sample being given the code NBF-H and numbered 01–10. The location of all samples was noted at the time of sampling and has been marked on Figures 5–8. Further details relating to the samples can be found in Table 1.

ANALYSIS & RESULTS

All ten samples were prepared by sanding and polishing and their growth ring widths measured. These measurements were then compared with each other by usual laboratory procedures where all ten samples matched each other.

All ten samples were then combined at the relevant offset position to form NBFHSQ01, a site sequence of 121 rings (Fig 9). This site sequence was then compared against a series of relevant reference chronologies for oak where it was found to match consistently and securely at a first-ring date of AD 1357 and a last-measured ring date of AD 1477. The evidence for this dating is given by the *t*-values in Table 2.

INTERPRETATION

All ten samples taken from this bellframe have been successfully dated. Seven of these have the heartwood/sapwood boundary ring which, although showing a variation of 21

years can still be said to be broadly contemporary and likely to suggest a single felling. The average heartwood/sapwood boundary ring date of these samples is AD 1461, allowing an estimated felling date to be calculated for the seven timbers to within the range AD 1478–1501. This range makes allowance for sample NBF-H01 having a last-measured ring date of AD 1477 with incomplete sapwood.

The remaining three dated samples do not have the heartwood/sapwood boundary ring date and so estimated felling dates cannot be calculated for them. However, with last-measured ring dates of 1441 (NBF-H09), 1451 (NBF-H06), and 1462 (NBF-H03) it is possible that these timbers were also felled in AD 1478–1501. Additionally, one of these samples (NBF-H03) matches sample NBF-H01 at the value of t=19.7, high enough to say that the two beams represented were almost certainly cut from the same tree and therefore have the same felling.

DISCUSSION

Short headed bellframes are generally thought of belong to the fourteenth, fifteenth, and early-sixteenth centuries. With the timbers associated with the primary construction of this frame now being known to have been felled in AD 1478–1501 it is likely that this bellframe belongs to the final quarter of the fifteenth century or possibly the first years of the sixteenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alcock, N W, Warwick University, Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, Nottingham University Tree-ring Dating Laboratory, and Miles, D H, 1989 Leverhulme Cruck Project Results: 1988, *Vernacular Architect*, **20**, 43–5

Arnold, A J, Howard, R E, and Litton, C D, 2008 Nottingham Tree-ring Dating Laboratory, *Vernacular Architect*, **39**, 119–28

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

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, Nottingham University Tree-ring Dating Laboratory, Hook R, Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, 1992 Nottingham University Tree-Ring Dating Laboratory: truncated principal trusses project, *Vernacular Architect*, **23**, 59–6

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, Nottingham University Tree-ring Dating Laboratory, and Jennings, N, 1997 Nottingham University Tree-ring Dating Laboratory Results: Dendrochronological survey of clay dabbings of the Solway Plain, *Vernacular Architect*, **28**, 133–4

Howard, R E, Laxton, R R, and Litton, C D, 2000 Tree-ring analysis of timbers from the buildings and living trees at Stoneleigh Abbey, Stoneleigh, Warwickshire, Anc Mon Lab Rep, **80/2000**

Ratcliffe-on-Soar, Holy Trinity, http://southwellchurches.nottingham.ac.uk/ratcliffe/hintro.php

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Laboratory and George Dawson would like to thank Ray State for facilitating access and, along with John Allen, Professor John Beckett, and Dr Chris Brooke, for the information on the Southwell and Nottingham Church History website. Thanks are also given to Dr Chris Brooke for his comments on early drafts of this report and for providing the photograph on the front page. The research was undertaken as part of the Southwell and Nottingham Church History Project and this element was joint funded by The Heritage Lottery Fund and Nottinghamshire County Council.

Sample	Sample location	Total rings	*Sapwood rings	First measured ring	Last heartwood ring	Last measured ring
number				date (AD)	date (AD)	date (AD)
NBF-H01	Headstock, truss A	73	04	1405	1473	1477
NBF-H02	West post, truss A	66	12	1404	1457	1469
NBF-H03	Bottom cill, truss B	65		1398		1462
NBF-H04	East post, truss B	61	h/s	1392	1452	1452
NBF-H05	West post, truss B	65	12	1404	1456	1468
NBF-H06	East post, truss C	54		1398		1451
NBF-H07	West post, truss C	64	h/s	1393	1456	1456
NBF-H08	Headstock, truss D	76	h/s	1389	1464	1464
NBF-H09	Bottom cill, truss D	85		1357		1441
NBF-H10	East post, truss D	63	h/s	1407	1469	1469

Table 1: Details of samples taken from the bellframe at the Church of Holy Trinity, Ratcliffe-on-Soar, Nottinghamshire

***h/s = the heartwood/sapwood boundary ring is the last-measured ring on the sample

Table 2: Results of the cross-matching of site sequence NBFHSQ01 and relevant reference chronologies when the first-measured ring date is1357 and the last-measured ring date is1477

Reference chronology	t-value	Span of chronology	Reference	
Stoneleigh Abbey, Stoneleigh, Warwickshire	7.8	AD 1398–1658	Howard et al 2000	
Thatched Cottage, Hill Wootton, Warwickshire	6.3	AD 1392–1469	Alcock et al 1989	
Durham Cathedral (choir roof), Durham,	5.7	AD 1346–1458	Howard et al 1992	
Crook Hall, Sidegate, Durham	5.6	AD 1354–1467	Howard et al 1992	
27 High Street, Lymington, Hampshire	5.6	AD 1378–1460	Esling et al 1990	
Hitchins Onset, Scaleby, Cumbria	5.5	AD 1364–1491	Howard et al 1997	
Wakelyn Old Hall, Hilton, Derbyshire	5.4	AD 1415–1573	Arnold et al 2008	



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



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



Figure 3: Truss D, photograph taken from the north-west



Figure 4: Plan of bellframe, showing truss labelling



Figure 5: Truss A, showing the location of samples NBF-H01 and NBF-H02



Figure 6: Truss B, showing the location of samples NBF-H03-05



Figure 7: Truss C, showing the location of samples NBF-H06 and NBF-H07



Figure 8: Truss D, showing the location of samples NBF-H08-10



Figure 9: Bar diagram of samples in site sequence NBFHSQ01

DATA OF MEASURED SAMPLES

Measurements in 0.01mm units

179 118 100 93 81 92 80 128 149 122 100 46 33 34 18 40 38 61 85 66

300 292 289 297 130 149 95 127 118 129 196 190 138 287 255 164 220 157 111 129 200 194 163 78 84 101 109 114 140 140 104 55 77 97 130 121 207 208 131 107 91 100 133 135 146 193 110 80 82 142 110 132 106 137 129 177 172 122 143 106 114 109 95

NBF-H10B 63

300 276 295 301 125 149 99 117 124 122 183 182 132 286 250 167 227 151 118 130 199 196 166 80 85 96 112 113 142 132 105 60 79 96 132 123 205 206 133 107 91 88 141 140 151 194 101 85 77 142 114 125 108 137 136 173 171 114 141 114 109 107 88