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Introduction

This is the final report on the dendrochronological analysis of the Abraham & Maria LeFevre House, located on Forest Glen Road, Gardiner, Ulster County, New York. In an effort to confirm the construction history of this house, architectural historian Neil Larson of Larson Fisher Associates, PO Box 1394, Woodstock, NY, 12489, tele: 845-679-5054, requested that dendrochronologists William Callahan and Dr. Edward Cook perform a tree-ring analysis of its structural timbers. Neil Larson was working on behalf of the present owners of the house, Raymond and Johanna Sokolov. Together with Mr. Larson, Callahan visited the house on 16 November, 2005, and collected wood core samples for the dendrochronological analysis of the timbers. Of the 12 samples acquired and analyzed, 8 were oak (Quercus sp.), 2 were tulip poplar - also known as yellow poplar - (Liriodendron sp.) and 2 were pine (Pinus sp.). Every effort was made on site to locate bark or waney edges on the sampled timbers in order to ascertain an absolute cutting date, or dates, of the trees used in the construction.

Dendrochronological Analysis

Dendrochronology is the science of analyzing and dating annual growth rings in trees. Its first significant application was in the dating of ancient Indian pueblos of the southwestern United States (Douglass 1921, 1929). Andrew E. Douglass is considered the “father” of dendrochronology, and his numerous early publications concentrated on the application of tree-ring data to archaeological dating. Douglass established the connection between annual ring width variability and annual climate variability which allows for the precise dating of wood material (Douglass 1909, 1920, 1928; Stokes and Smiley 1968; Fritts 1976; Cook and Kariukstis 1990). The dendrochronological methods first developed by Douglass have evolved and been employed throughout North America, Europe, and much of the temperate forest zones of the globe (Edwards 1982; Holmes 1983; Stahle and Wolman 1985; Cook and Callahan 1992, Krusic and Cook 2001). In Europe, where the dendrochronological dating of buildings and artifacts has long been a routine professional support activity, the success of tree-ring dating in historical contexts is noteworthy (Baillie 1982; Eckstein 1978; Bartholin 1979; Eckstein 1984).

The wood samples collected from the Abraham & Maria LeFevre House were processed in the Tree-Ring Laboratory by Dr. Edward Cook, following well-established dendrochronological methods. The samples were carefully glued onto grooved mounts and sanded to a high polish to reveal the annual tree rings clearly. The rings widths were measured under a microscope to a precision of ±0.001 mm. The cross-dating of the obtained measurements utilized the COFECHA computer program (Holmes 1983), which employs a sliding correlation to identify probable cross-dates between tree-ring series. In all cases, the robust non-parametric Spearman rank correlation coefficient was used for determining cross-dating. Experience has shown that for trees growing in the northeastern United States, this method of cross-dating is superior to the traditional skeleton plot technique (Stokes and Smiley 1968). It is also very similar to the highly successful CROS program employed by, for instance, Irish dendrochronologists to cross-date European tree-ring series (Baillie 1982).

COFECHA is used to first establish internal, or relative, cross-dating amongst the individual timbers from the site. This step is critically important because it locks in the relative positions of the timbers to each other, and indicates whether or not the dates of those specimens with outer bark rings are consistent. Subsequently, the internally cross-dated series are each
compared with independently established tree-ring master chronologies compiled from living
trees and dated historical tree-ring material. All of the “master chronologies” are based on
completely independent tree-ring samples.

In the Abraham & Maria LeFevre House study, a regional composite master dating
chronology from living trees and historical structures in the Hudson Valley region of New York
state was referenced primarily. All dating results were verified finally by comparison with
independent dating masters from surrounding areas in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts and
central Pennsylvania. In each case, the datings as reported here were verified as correct.

Results and Conclusions

The results of the dendrochronological dating of the Abraham & Maria LeFevre House
timbers are summarized in Table 1 and Figure 1. A total of 8 oak, 2 tulip poplar and 2 pine
samples were analyzed in the laboratory, with 7 of the 8 oak samples providing firm
dendrochronological dates. None of the pine or tulip poplar samples was successfully dated, nor
was the 8th oak sample.

To achieve these datings required attention during analysis to the previously recorded
structural context of the samples (see Table 1). The contextual association of samples from
within the house, the redundancy of the indicated relative cross-datings, and the eventual
existence of sapwood and bark/waney edges demonstrating cutting year, provides the essential
constraints necessary for establishing cross-dating both within a site and with absolute
chronological masters.

The strength of the cross-dating of the oak samples is indicated by the Spearman rank
correlations in the seventh column (“CORREL”) of Table 1. These statistical correlations,
produced by the COFECHA program, indicate how well each sample cross-dates with the mean
of the others in the group. The individual correlations vary slightly in statistical strength, but all
are in the range that is expected for correctly cross-dated timbers from buildings in the eastern
United States. Of the 7 oak samples that cross-dated well between themselves, and also dated
well against the local oak historical dating master (see Table 1, column 6), all had absolutely
verifiable bark edge at the time of sampling.

From the datings that were achieved, there emerged evidence of (at least two) intrinsic
construction periods that produced the Abraham & Maria LeFevre House. The dated samples, all
of oak, indicate likely construction phases shortly after the end of the year 1758 - with very
strong redundant evidence - and, much less evidentially, shortly after 1794. Furthermore, two
oak samples from the so-called “west cellar” produced absolute dates of 1740 and 1767, but
these contrasting datings within the same structural context makes analysis of their chronological
import speculative. Perhaps they are re-used timbers, and/or perhaps they represent renovations
or repairs in the building.

Of the remaining samples: the undated oak timber gave an indication of a cross-date, but
with so few rings and a weak t-correlation with the master chronologies this result is statistically
unsustainable and therefore is ignored. The two coniferous samples (Pinus sp., likely “white
pine”) also remain undated. Although the physical integrity of the cores was good and they had a
sufficient number of rings for dating they did not produce any cross-date with local masters or
more southerly pine master chronologies. The two tulip poplar (Liriodendron sp.) samples from
the first floor had too few rings to date. The wood anatomy of tulip poplar makes it notoriously
difficult to measure and cross-date reliably even under the best of circumstances.
Table 1. Dendrochronological dating results for all samples taken from the Abraham & Maria LeFevre House, Gardiner, Ulster County, New York. For WANEY, +BE means the bark edge was present and thought to be recovered at the time of sampling; -BE means that the bark edge was not recovered or was completely missing on the timber. All correlations are Spearman rank correlations of each series against the mean of all of the others of the same species. If the outermost recovered +BE ring is completely formed, it is indicated as “comp”, meaning that the tree was felled in the dormant season following that last year of growth. For example, +BE 1758 means cutting took place during the winter period of 1758 or into the pre-spring period of 1759.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>SPECIES</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>WANEY</th>
<th>RINGS</th>
<th>DATING</th>
<th>CORREL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALHGNY 01</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>East cellar, cellar joist, 2nd from east wall</td>
<td>+BE</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1585 1758 comp</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALHGNY 02</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>East cellar, cellar joist, 3rd from east wall</td>
<td>+BE</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1550 1758 comp</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALHGNY 03</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>Lintel over doorway through wall between east and west cellars</td>
<td>+BE</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1637 1758 comp</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALHGNY 04</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>West cellar, cellar joist, 1st from west wall</td>
<td>+BE</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>-.--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALHGNY 05</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>West cellar, cellar joist, 1st from west wall</td>
<td>+BE</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1617 1740 comp</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALHGNY 06</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>Kitchen, joist, 3rd from west wall, fireplace</td>
<td>+BE</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1689 1794 comp</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALHGNY 07</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Stairwell to 2nd floor, floor joist, west side of stairs</td>
<td>-BE</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>-.--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALHGNY 08</td>
<td>Pine</td>
<td>Stairwell to 2nd floor, floor joist, east side of stairs</td>
<td>-BE</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>-.--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALHGNY 09</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>2nd floor bedroom closet, south side, roof plate, south side</td>
<td>+BE</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1655 1758 comp</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALHGNY 10</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>East section, 1st floor, living room, ceiling joist, 6th from east wall</td>
<td>-BE</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>-.--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALHGNY 11</td>
<td>Tulip Poplar</td>
<td>East section, 1st floor, living room, joist/lintel over doorway to mid-section</td>
<td>-BE</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>No Date</td>
<td>-.--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALHGNY 12</td>
<td>Oak</td>
<td>West cellar, cellar joist, 2nd from west wall</td>
<td>+BE</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1635 1767</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Comparison of the cross-dated oak master chronology for the Abraham & Maria LeFevre House with a locally derived historical oak dating master from the lower Hudson Valley, New York. The Spearman rank correlation between the series (r=0.74) is highly significant (p<<0.001) with an overlap of 245 years and a t-statistic of 16.9. Two apparent periods of construction are noted based on these analyses: 1758 and 1794. An absolute date of 1740 from the west cellar is more historically speculative, as is the 1767 date from the same structural unit within the house.

The "r-factor" is the Spearman rank correlation coefficient, a measure of relative agreement between two groups of measurements or data. It can range from -1 (perfect opposite agreement) to +1 (perfect direct agreement). The "t-value" is Student's distribution test for determining the unique probability distribution for “r”, i.e. the likelihood of its value occurring by chance alone. As a rule, a t=3.5 has a probability of about 1 in 1000, or 0.001, of being invalid. Higher “t” values indicate increasingly stronger statistical certitude.
The t-statistic (t=7.1) associated with the correlation between these two series (r=0.54) is highly significant (p<<0.001) for a 245-year overlap. For that reason, there can be no doubt that the dates presented here are very strongly valid, and that the statistical chance of the cross-dates being incorrect is much, much less than 1 in 1000.
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