

Corrections to HE paper.

1. On page 272, line 10, an endnote 1 is announced, however, the text of that endnote is missing at the end of the paper. It should read as follows:

¹. English versions of the content of our reports in Dutch will appear in:

Constandse-Westermann, T.S. & W.H.M. Bouts, in press. The prevalence of dental pathology in two Dutch skeletal samples from the early 19th century. In: M. Schulz (ed.), Proceedings of the Xth European Meeting of the Paleopathology Association, Göttingen, August 29th - September 3rd, 1994. (*vide* paper 3)

Constandse-Westermann, T.S., W.H.M. Bouts & Tj.Pot, in prep. The scoring, interpretation and prevalence of dental pathology in a Dutch skeletal sample from the early 19th century. (*vide* paper 5)

2. On page 272 lines 11, 12 and 13 should read as follows:

(The) results were subdivided into three, age-related, groups, *i.e.* I: Differences on the basis of second molars with a degree of attrition $\leq 2+$; II: on the basis of second molars in the attrition classes 3- to 3+ and III: those in the attrition classes ≥ 4 . The results are presented as averages in Table 1.²

The accompanying endnote should read:

²The differences between the first and the second molars have been calculated per individual and per quadrant. Attrition values of *e.g.* 2+ have been inserted into the calculations as 2.25, 3- as 2.75, *etc.* Negative differences (M2 being less worn than M1) have been ignored, being anomalous in relation to the proces we wanted to measure, *i.e.* the rate of attrition per time unit. Excessively large differences, completely beyond the distribution of the other values in the dental sample in which they occurred, have also been ignored. For the majority of such differences it was clear that the attrition process in that area of the dentition had been influenced by other factors than time and regular use.

3. On page 274, line 15, an endnote 2 is announced. This should actually be endnote 3:

³. One of these was the dentition of a 72-year old woman of which 12 of the 25 alveoles to be inspected were affected by periapical lesions. The other two were the mandible of a man of 85 and the maxilla of a woman of 39 years. In the male dentition the jawbone was incomplete. There were five elements present and six elements lost *ante mortem*. In the female dentition two elements were present while eight were lost *ante mortem*. In both these dentitions the degree of alveolar resorption was of dubious interpretative value.

4. On page 281, in footnote ** (under Table 1) the column headings have been misplaced. The correct version is:

**	Mann-Whitney U-tests I/II (Siegel 1956: 116-127; two-tailed probabilities)	Komolgorov-Smirnov two-sample tests I/II (Siegel 1956: 127-136; two-tailed probabilities)
Jobsgasthuis	Z = 1.475, $p = .142$	D = .313, $.005 > p > .001$
De Engk	Z = 2.846, $p = .004$	D = .302, $p < .001$
Nijmegen-O	Z = 5.295, $p = .000$	D = .539, $p < .001$