AN EXCAVATION ON BOKERLY DYKE, 1958

By Philip A. Rahtz

This report describes a rescue excavation of part of Bokerly Dyke and the Woodyates settlement in Dorset; sections through the Dyke are consistent with earlier observations by Pitt-Rivers and Hawkes, except for certain anomalies which have suggested a revised chronological sequence for the development of the earthwork.

The excavation was done in advance of road straightening operations; these destroyed part of the Dyke and a strip some 500 ft. by 100 ft. on its S. side. It is impossible to discuss the results of the excavations without considerable recapitulation of the evidence recovered in the large-scale excavations of General Pitt-Rivers in 1890-91, and of the masterly re-interpretation of his work by Professor Hawkes in 1948. Such a restatement is necessary both for the purpose of this report, and because the dating evidence for the Dyke seems to be so little known: it is referred to as a Saxon earthwork in two books published in 1959, though only one extension of it (the Fore Dyke) is likely to be of post-Roman date on the basis of the published evidence. The greater part of the earthwork visible today is apparently of late Roman date, and there is no reason to question the validity of Hawkes' reasons for assigning even the Fore Dyke to the closing years of the Roman occupation.

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS EVIDENCE

Bokerly Dyke (Figs. 1 and 7) is a linear earthwork lying in a general direction of from S.E. to N.W. with a ditch on the N.E. side. The word Dyke includes both the rampart and the ditch; these extend nearly four miles across a broad gap or pass between two high chalk areas in the N.E. part of Cranborne Chase. In each stage of its development it probably ended in places which were formerly woodland, and its course ran through fairly open country. The greater part of its course is militarily defensible; only in one place does it bend forward to less advantageous ground, possibly to include a spring. Hawkes has suggested that the Dyke had three phases of development, A, B, and C. 'A' is the south-easterly part of the Dyke, which, Pitt-Rivers suggested, originally ended in a turned-back hook (his Epaulement).

1 The site lies on Upper Chalk. Extensive deposits of Clay-with-Flints, trending N.E.--S.W., pass about one mile to the N.W., and also occur as an outlier at Penbury Knoll. In the valleys 'Valley Gravel' occurs, confined and not economically useful. To the S. there is a capping of Reading Beds, here a yellow-brown sand, and further south (Bowlesbury Wood) — trending in the same way as the Clay-with-Flints — the usual Hampshire Basin Eocene Sequence is met as one approaches the Avon Valley. We are grateful to Mr. T. R. W. Hawkins, of the Geological Survey and Museum, for valuable discussion.

2 '1 inch' O.S. map 179 (SU/034197); scheduled Dorset 72. The excavation was arranged by the Ancient Monuments Inspectorate of the Ministry of Works; five men were employed for four weeks in July, 1958; the subsequent mechanical operations were watched by Lawrence Butler; I should like to thank him for acting also as assistant in the hand excavation: the present report is an amalgamation of our joint observations and deliberations. I should like to thank Professor Jocelyn Toynbee and Mr. George Boon for their contributions to this report; Margaret Gray for drawing the pottery; Peter Glover for drawing the finds; Mr. K. J. Barton for cleaning the finds of metal; Miss Rosemary Powers of the British Museum of Natural History for the report on skeletal material; Mr. Collin Bowen and Mr. Raymond Farrar of the R.C.H.M., and Professor C. F. C. Hawkes for many helpful suggestions and criticism. The Dorset County Council gave us every facility for excavation, and have deposited the finds in Dorchester Museum.

3 Excavations in Bokerly Dyke and Wansdyke, vol. III of the 'Excavations' by Lt.-General Pitt-Rivers; hereafter referred to as 'Pitt-Rivers'.

4 C. F. C. Hawkes, 'Britons, Romans and Saxons round Salisbury and in Cranborne Chase', Arch. J. civ (1948), 62-78 (referred to as 'Hawkes').

5 Pitt-Rivers 10, 57-8; Hawkes 64.

6 The rampart of this is 180 feet long, the ditch 272 feet.
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about a quarter of a mile E. of the Salisbury-Blandford road; the 'A' work was dated to c. A.D. 325-30 by Hawkes on the basis of a sherd of imitation Samian found by Pitt-Rivers in the buried soil below the rampart, and because of the depth of silt which had accumulated in the 'A' work ditch before the 'B' work was constructed. The 'A' work was interpreted by Hawkes as a 'protective but not altogether military work' defending an Imperial estate or ranch.

The 'B' work bridged the ditch of the hooked end of the 'A' work, the bridge being known as the Traverse, and extended the line of the Dyke to nearly twice its former length; at the same time part of the 'A' work ditch was re-cut and its rampart re-faced. Hawkes' 'B' work survives as far as the Salisbury road as rampart and ditch; beyond this it had been levelled in Roman times. This extension was only found by Pitt-Rivers during his excavation, when he named it the Rear Dyke. Isolated parts of what is probably the Rear Dyke survive further to the W. The 'B' work, including the Rear Dyke, was dated by Hawkes to A.D. 367-8; a coin of Magnentius (A.D. 350-3) was found 2.4 ft. beneath the summit of the Traverse and one of Valens (A.D. 364-78) was deep in the filling of the Rear Dyke.

The Rear Dyke ditch cut through the Roman road from Old Sarum to Badbury Rings, but the road metalling was re-laid across the ditch soon afterwards. This clear evidence of an emergency which passed, and the dating of the two coins, led Hawkes to relate the work to the widespread crises of A.D. 367-8, to 'turn what had been simply a protective area-boundary — the A work — into a military barrier across a four-mile pass'.

Finally, the 'C' work consists of a separate length of ditch and rampart thrown forward on a more defensible line to the N.W. of the present road, and named the Fore Dyke by Pitt-Rivers; at the same time the 'B' work ditch E. of the road was re-cut and its rampart

1 Hawkes, 68, 70, and Fig. 16a. The General noted that the pottery from his Epaulement cuttings was "coarser and earlier" than that further west (Pitt-Rivers, 22).
2 Pitt-Rivers, 22.
3 Hawkes, 73. The rampart between these two points is also dated to later than A.D. 308 by a coin of Maximin II (A.D. 308-313) found on the old ground surface below the rampart in Pitt-Rivers' Section I extension (p. 72 and elsewhere).
re-faced. The ‘C’ work ditch also cut through the Roman road, but this time the metalling was never replaced. The ‘C’ work is dated to later than A.D. 393–5, by numerous coins sealed under the Fore Dyke rampart in Pitt-Rivers’ Section II, and Hawkes suggests⁴ that the ‘C’ work belongs to the early years of the 5th century, and is to be associated with defensive campaigns of the closing years of the Roman occupation; his grounds for thinking that the ‘C’ work was of this date rather than post-Roman was its continuity in style and scale with its predecessors, and the interment of three extended skeletons in the deep silt of the Fore Dyke ditch, in the Roman manner.

The area where Bokerly Dyke splits into two (the Rear Dyke and the Fore Dyke), where both of these cut the Roman road, and where both are overlaid by the present road, was named by Pitt-Rivers ‘Bokerly Junction’. The manner of the junction of the Fore Dyke and Rear Dyke, as excavated and interpreted by Pitt-Rivers, is shown in Fig. 2. The Fore Dyke crosses

⁴ Hawkes, 78.
the 'B' work ditch and is equated with the inner or southerly member of a double ditch in front of the cut-back 'B' work rampart, the outer or northerly member being the original 'B' work ditch. Pitt-Rivers assumed that before it was cut by the Fore Dyke ditch, the 'B' work ditch continued as the Rear Dyke ditch, as shown in his cuttings P, Q, and R. The link between the two was largely masked by the present road, but he did not doubt that the 'B' work ditch was continuous with the Rear Dyke ditch, which he describes as 35 ft. wide and 10 to 11 ft. deep, with a pointed bottom.¹

In a big cutting (his Section I) N.E. of Bokerly Junction, Pitt-Rivers found the outer ditch filled with silt, black in the top² with finds which should have been deposited in the years after A.D. 367–8, on Hawkes' dating; but, as Hawkes pointed out,³ they included no post-Constantinian coins among the fourteen found within and over the occupation layers.⁴

Pitt-Rivers also excavated large areas to the N. of Bokerly Junction, and found the settlement (known as Woodyates), the occupation of which accounted for the finds made in the Dyke cuttings. He found ditches, dividing the site into rectilinear enclosures, hearths, pits, burials, and a corn-drying furnace. There were no obvious buildings; traces of timber structures may have remained undiscovered,⁵ or they may have been ploughed away or destroyed by chalk erosion. Indeed, the settlement was similar to those he had excavated at Woodcuts and Rotherley, except for one important difference; there were twelve coins at Rotherley, 200 at Woodcuts, but over 1,200 at Bokerly. Such divergence might be accounted for by Bokerly being partly a roadside settlement rather than a 'native farmstead'. Pitt-Rivers identified the site with the Roman VINDOGLADIA; Hawkes suggested⁶ that the settlement might have been the headquarters of the 'imperial estate' defended by the 'A' work of Bokerly Dyke, but cut through by and left outside the area defended by the 'B' and 'C' works.

The settlement began in early Roman times, but did not develop until the later 3rd century⁷; its maximum prosperity was in Constantinian times, to judge by the coin finds, but there is a marked decline in the latter half of the 4th century, and although the coin list extends to Honorius⁸ the volume of coins and distinctively late pottery types is small by comparison with that of the first half of the century.

The limits of the settlement were not found by Pitt-Rivers; finds were, however, more numerous nearer to Bokerly Junction than in the more northerly part of the area, and Pitt-Rivers suggested⁹ and Hawkes re-affirmed¹⁰ that the important part of the settlement should lie S. of the Dyke, where the General did not dig.

THE 1958 EXCAVATION

The evidence from the 1958 work may be considered in two parts: the area S. of the Dyke and E. of the present road, and the cuttings across the rampart and ditch of the Dyke.

The Settlement.

Fig. 5 shows the cuttings made S. of the Dyke, with details of features discovered, the concentration of sherds, the position of coins, and the depth

¹ 12 feet deep where first cut by Cross Drain (p. 69); 11 feet deep in General Section, Pl. CLXXI.
² Pitt-Rivers, Pl. CLXIII.
³ Hawkes, 74.
⁴ There were also some finds in the Fore Dyke (inner) part of the double ditch, and we must allow for some percolation of finds in a ditch filling as a result of erosion and spreading of surrounding layers. In general confirmation of the slight occupation after the construction of the Fore Dyke, note that in Sections 7 and W, across the Fore Dyke (see Pitt-Rivers, Relic Tables between pp. 52 and 53), only thirty-one sherds were found in two 10 ft. wide cuttings (apart from skeletons).
⁵ Note probable post-holes in elevations of counterscarp in Pitt-Rivers, Pl. CLXV.
⁶ Hawkes, 74.
⁷ Ibid., 67.
⁸ Ibid., 76.
⁹ Pitt-Rivers, 67.
¹⁰ Hawkes, 68.
of undisturbed chalk. The N.W. part of this area, between the long trench and the old road, was stripped mechanically for the new road; the features shown outside the hand-excavated cuttings were found by Mr. Butler during this stripping, and there can have been no other major features here. Apart from this area, which is now destroyed, the opportunity was taken to dig test-holes at intervals further to the S.E.

The features found are no more than an extension of the same kind of occupation found by Pitt-Rivers N. of the Dyke; there were pits, ditches, hearths, a grave, and a corn-drying oven, with a similar density of sherds and coins. The dating range is similar to that of the features excavated by Pitt-Rivers; most features contained New Forest sherds except pits 102 and 103; 104–108 were not datable; thus all this group of pits except 101 may be early Roman (p. 83); of the fifteen coins found, four are pre-Constantinian, five are Constantinian, and six post-Constantinian. The proportion of post-Constantinian coins is high by comparison with that in the total coin list from the site, but the number of coins found in 1958 is too small for this to be significant; no distinctively late 4th-century sherds were among those found S. of the Dyke.

It seems probable, from the evidence of the test-holes, that the density of occupation shown in the totally stripped area continued for some distance to the S. and E.; but the depth of soil over the weathered chalk and the density of sherds both decrease towards the limits of the tested area (fig. 5), and it is reasonable to suppose that the limits of the settlement to S. and E. have been found in the 1958 excavation.

1 Nos. 1–4, 10, 14, 18, 19, 24, 27, 29–33, on p. 85.
The Dyke

Fig. 5 shows the position of the cuttings made in the rampart and ditch in relation to the area S. of the Dyke and to the Dyke earthwork; fig. 4 shows the same cuttings in more detail with the positions of the coins found; and
Fig. 5

Area to South-East not destroyed

1. 2. 3. = Numbers of cuttings
4. 5. 6. = Numbers of features
7. 8. 9. = Numbers of coins
C.G.S. = Depth of natural chalk
F.S. = Few sherds
M.S. = Many sherds
N.S. = No sherds
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fig. 6 shows sections 1 and 2. The area excavated here included the end of the Dyke rampart at the point where the main Dyke splits in two, the Fore Dyke and Rear Dyke, the junction of Hawkes’ B and C works. The visible rampart ended short of the modern road, to be resumed further to the N.W. as the Fore Dyke rampart. The cuttings included the ditch of the B work S.W. of the point where it is crossed by the ditch of the C work (Fore Dyke ditch), which goes through it to become the inner member of the double ditch in front of the main B work, as described above (p. 68). The ditch at this point was assumed to have originally linked with the outer member of the double ditch (as the original B work ditch) and also with the Rear Dyke to W. of the modern road. The cuttings by which Pitt-Rivers traced these connections were his P, Q, and R; the last two of these were located in the 1958 excavation and part of Q was re-excavated. It will be seen in fig. 4 that there are two levels of cut-away of the chalk. The outer or southerly one, our F21, is only 2–3 ft. deep; it is shown by Pitt-Rivers in the plan of his cuttings P and Q, but not in his R, which included the base of it and our F23, a slightly deeper cut-away; it is not mentioned or recorded elsewhere in his text. The inner or northerly cut-away is shown in Pitt-Rivers’ plans of cuttings P, Q and R, and is interpreted by him as the S.E. edge of the Rear Dyke ditch, or rather as the S.E. side of the link by which he traced a direct connection between the Rear Dyke and the outer member of the double ditch further to the N.E. This inner cut-away was excavated as far as possible in our cuttings 30, 40, and 50, between Pitt-Rivers’ Q and R, and was found to be levelling off at a depth of only 5 ft. below the general ground level. His cutting Q was re-excavated, where it lay within our cutting 40, and the depth was the same there. There is thus a discrepancy between the depth of the Rear Dyke link at this point, and the depth of its supposed continuation further to the W. and N.E. It has already been mentioned that Pitt-Rivers described the Rear Dyke as 10 to 11 feet deep; it seems therefore, that the evidence from his cutting Q went unrecorded or unnoticed. The discrepancy between the depths throws doubt on the assumption that this is a link between the Rear Dyke and the outer member of the double ditch, or that these two are in fact continuous and contemporary, as the ditch of Hawkes’ B work. Such a doubt is reinforced by the indirect route by which the link is made, with a twist which would be quite unnecessary if the B work as it exists on the E. side of the road was in fact continuous and contemporary with the Rear Dyke W. of the road.

The cuttings were made just to the S.W. of the ditch junction and at a point where the ditch found should be that of the B work, but where the rampart should be not only the rampart of the B work behind its ditch, but

---

1 Hawkes, Fig. 13, facing p. 67, and Pitt-Rivers, Pls. CLXII and CLXVI.
2 It was not possible to superimpose the plan of the General's cuttings onto our plan, because of the discrepancy in their relative positions, and their position in relation to the road, as between his Pls. CLXII and CLXVI (though the latter is probably the correct one). They are shown in Figs. 4 and 5 as they were found in the 1958 excavation, the outline in Fig. 4 being the outer edges of the cutting.
3 Pitt-Rivers, Pls. CLXII and CLXVI.
4 It is shown clearly in the model in the Pitt-Rivers Museum at Farnham, Dorset.
5 The link can still be excavated; the relevant part of the old road has been preserved as a lay-by, or parking place, alongside the new road.
Key to layers

A Dark brown turf and topsoil
B Chalky brown topsoil
B1 Chalky, mellow
B2 Chalky with fine road gravel
B3 Grey-brown dusty, gritty
C Loose chalky till
D Large chalky rubble and buff chalky soil
E Dark chalky barren soil
F Buff compact chalk washed, I more chalk
G Dark grey-brown, slightly chalky, sherds etc.
G1 Grey-brown, chalky, seams, turf line on top
G2 Grey soil fine chalk
H Brown slightly chalky
J Buff soil, chalk lumps, charcoal
K Small chalk rubble some brown soil
L Chalk rubble, buff, white at top
M Compact chalk rubble
N Dark reddish-brown compact soil, small chalk
O Very fine buff soil, grit, patchy turf line on top
P Fine chalk rubble
Y Weathered chalk natural
Z Hard chalk

Fig. 6.
also the Fore Dyke rampart, which should originally have turned to the N.W. at this point, behind the Fore Dyke ditch.

Section 1 (fig. 6) shows the combined rampart; the buried soil (layer N) was clean and contained only a few scraps of early Roman or Iron Age pottery in a large area of it examined both in these cuttings and in the mechanical excavation that followed. On this surface was built the primary rampart (M and L); the cut-aways F21 and F23 have probably cut into this at the foot of its inner slope; F23 is probably secondary to F21; they have silted up (K, J, H) and are both overlaid by dark occupation soil (G) which contained coins, pottery and other objects. F is probably a soil-wash off the rampart and E appears to be a buried soil (old turf line) which formed over the rampart and silted cut-aways. On all these was heaped layer D, interpreted as a secondary rampart thrown over the previous one; this will presumably be the Fore Dyke rampart, consisting of material excavated from the Fore Dyke ditch, which, crossing the B work ditch, cut into the inner edge of the old rampart; its spoil was thrown over its outer slopes, but in our cuttings the Fore Dyke rampart is beginning to swing away to the N.W., so we find it overlying the whole of the earlier rampart and its cut-aways. Section 1 is in line with Pitt-Rivers’ cutting R (see layer C on left) and, as we have noted above, the cut-aways shown in our Section 1 were not recorded by him; in his Pls. CLXII and CLXVI the edge of the Rear Dyke is shown further to the N.N.W.

Section 2 is through the end of the rampart where it finished short of the modern road. The rampart had probably been truncated by the first version of the present road; it may at one time have ended near here, as discussed later (p. 78). The evidence of the stratification is not conclusive: the buried soil (N) is slightly thinner; M remained similar in bulk though more spread; L sloped down with no clear indication of having been cut away; D diminished rapidly, leaving only a trace; all of these are capped by a new layer F1, developing on the slope, and probably the result of erosion of the denuded slope, after the rampart had been truncated. Pit 20 may have been contemporary with the primary rampart; it could have held a large timber at the inner edge of the rampart slope. The outer cut-away F21 is more shallow in slope, and the natural chalk dips away more sharply on the line of the inner cut-away shown by Pitt-Rivers in his cutting Q as the inner edge of the Rear Dyke. Layer P is the primary silting of this and O a secondary silting with traces of turf forming on it; both inner and outer cut-aways are cut into by the pit, F18. All these features are again overlaid by the thick occupation layer G. Above this are only layers of road-dust and chalk-wash (B3 and F) capped by a modern dusty soil. The secondary rampart of the Fore Dyke swinging away to the N.W. should originally have been built over layer G at this point, but only a trace of it remained; it is probable that it was wholly removed when the modern

1 In the General’s wide (60 ft.) cutting, there were only 66 sherds in the buried soil; the General took this as evidence (p. 72) that the ‘spot was but little occupied at the time the rampart was thrown up’.
2 See Hawkes, Fig. 15 no. 1.
road was made, together with the surface of layer G, along the line represented by the base of layers B3 and F.

The dark soil layer G, together with Pit F18, yielded a large quantity of pottery, and many small finds, including styli and a bronze statuette of Venus (Pl. III, and p. 87); with these were eighteen coins,\(^1\) of which fifteen were Constantinian, and one (no. 28) post-Constantinian, of A.D. 375-8. Of the fourteen coins found by Pitt-Rivers in and above this silting, all were of Constantinian or earlier date\(^2\). The whole assemblage of 32 coins, pottery, and other finds should, on Hawkes' dating for the B work, be later in deposition than A.D. 367-8. Only one of the 32 is a recognizable issue of the years after 367 (No. 28). This was found in cutting 30, towards the base of layer G; its occurrence is consistent with such a dating for layer G, though it is hardly in a sealed level. The proportion of pre-367 coins is however abnormally high for such a dating; a study of the pottery suggests (pp. 87-96) that there is no reason to think that more than a small amount of it is necessarily of later 4th-century date. Indeed, as Hawkes has pointed out,\(^3\) the volume of late 4th-century coins and pottery is very small, there being for instance only eight sherds of the characteristically late rosette-stamped ware\(^4\), to which may be added one more from the 1958 cuttings (no. 73, p. 93). There is little reason to think that either the coins and other finds, or the occupation dirt with which they are associated were the result wholly of occupation after A.D. 367-8. The only explanation for their occurrence in a layer of post-367 date is that they were the result of large-scale clearance of rubbish and occupation dirt from another part of the site; moreover from some distance away\(^5\), since the soil under the rampart at this point is so devoid of late material which it should have contained if it were not covered by a rampart until A.D. 367-8.

An alternative explanation is that the dating of this part of the Dyke is wrong; to challenge its dating involves a re-examination of the basis of Hawkes' dating for the B work, and the construction of a fresh hypothesis which will account for these anomalies, as well as for the evidence already known; it is this which comprises the final section in this report.

The mechanical destruction

The rampart E. of our cuttings was bulldozed away to a level below that of the undisturbed chalk; about one foot was removed from the ditch top.

---

\(^1\) Nos. 5-9, 11-13, 15-17, 20-25, 26, 28.
\(^2\) See Hawkes, 74; to these may be added twelve coins found in 1942-3 by Aubrey Parke; he carried out a small excavation (a trench 30 X 6 ft.) in the Rear Dyke ditch some 170 ft. N.W. of the Roman road, and obtained a partial section before war-time exigencies curtailed the work. In the deep primary silting were about 100 sherds (incl. twenty samian and three N.F.). In a dark ashy layer and in a thin chalky level above this were some 200 sherds (incl. one samian and six N.F.) and a coin of Trajan; and in the deep secondary silting in the upper part of the ditch were about 1,000 sherds (incl. five samian and thirty-two N.F.) and eleven coins, of which one was Nero, seven were 3rd-century or derivatives, and three were Valentinian. The evidence such as it is does not help the present discussion, though the absence of Constantinian coins is surprising. I am indebted to Mr. Farrar for this information; some notes and a drawing will be deposited in Dorchester Museum.

\(^3\) Hawkes, 74-5.
\(^4\) For the distribution of these, see Hawkes, 75.
\(^5\) The General thought the occupation debris came from traces of habitations in the counterscarps, where there were pits, etc.; note also the ? post-holes shown in the elevations in his Plate CLXV.
Bronze figurine of Venus (x2)

(Photographs: R. Coles)
Under these difficult conditions Mr. Butler observed what he could. All the buried soil under the rampart was trowelled, but no finds were made other than two small scraps of early Roman or Iron Age pottery. As the rampart was cut back, oblique sections were visible for short periods; as the ditch junction was passed, the secondary rampart layers were seen to lie more and more towards the back of the primary rampart until a section was seen that approximated to Pitt-Rivers’ Section I (Hawkes, fig. 15 no. 1). No further coins or significant sherds were found.

Discussion

The Settlement

It is possible that the limits of the settlement have now been found to the S. and E., in the area to the S. of the Dyke and E. of the present road; but no more evidence has been found to show that it was anything more than a ‘native’ settlement or ‘Romano-British village’ with a loosely-knit agricultural economy; there are no clear indications of any buildings or structures which would suggest a roadside settlement, such as Camerton on the Fosse Way; yet the finds, and particularly the coin density, suggest that something more substantial may lie in the neighbourhood of Bokerly Junction; even within the area of the General’s excavation much ground remained unexplored, and there remains what must still be regarded as the potential nucleus of the settlement, the area S. of the Dyke and W. of the present road; either in the triangle formed by the Roman road, the present road, and the Rear Dyke; or more probably W. of the Roman road but still in the Dyke area. Local information both as communicated to the General and to us in 1958, suggests that this is the place where coins are found in abundance during ploughing and other disturbances of the ground. Here too the Roman road makes a change of direction, for which it is difficult to find a reason; it would almost seem to be because of the existence of Bokerly Dyke without its Fore Dyke and Rear Dyke, but current opinion holds the road to be early Roman and therefore perhaps Bokerly Dyke is on the line of some earlier boundary, such as Grim’s Ditch.

To the N. of the Dyke, the General did not reach the limits of the settlement; Mr. Collin Bowen has suggested to the writer that it does extend much further either to N. or E. or both; to the E. air-photographs show rectilinear features of the kind delineated by the General’s ditches, and beyond these again, towards Martin Down, are suggestions of what Mr. Bowen believes to be Roman fields overlying ‘Celtic’ ones. The General also found considerable amounts of Roman material in his Martin Down excavations. On the other hand the more easterly sections cut in the Dyke, such as the Epaulement

1 At first it was seen to lie so far over as to give the appearance of two separate ramparts, but these gradually merged into one.
2 Pitt-Rivers, 67.
3 Perhaps in some lesser form as a boundary; even the core of the rampart is dated by a coin of Claudius II in Pitt-Rivers’ Section I (Pl. CLXIII, no. 1).
4 Though it was certainly re-made later at Bokerly; the General found New Forest sherds in the agger (p. 74).
5 “Excavations,” Vol. IV, 189; (such as a pit with 206 Roman sherds).
cuttings and those to the E. were notably deficient in Roman material by comparison with those nearer to Bokerly Junction.

The extent to which the settlement was connected with, defended by, or left undefended outside, the Dyke is still an open question, but is relevant to the second part of this discussion.

The Dyke

The continuity and contemporaneity of the Rear Dyke with the ‘link’ E. of the road, and thence with the outer member of the double ditch, has been questioned above on the grounds of its disparate depths and its irrational course. The dating of the ‘link’ and of the original B rampart E. of the road has been questioned on the grounds of the absence of Constantinian material from the buried soil under a rampart, said to have been thrown up in A.D. 367–8, in an area prolific in occupational debris of that period; and because of an accumulation of mostly Constantinian coins and pottery in the silting of its ditch. Indeed, if Bokerly Dyke had not been dug before, we should have suggested a pre-4th-century date for the rampart at this point, with debris accumulating in its silting up to the later 4th century, and the construction of a secondary rampart after A.D. 367. If we added to this data that from the nearby Pitt-Rivers’ cuttings, particularly his Section I, we should be able to say: that the primary rampart was constructed after A.D. 308, because of the coin of Maximinus II sealed beneath it in the buried soil; that the ditch silted up in the next half century; that the secondary rampart was confirmed in its dating to later than c. A.D. 367 by the coin of Valens found on the tail of the original rampart and sealed by the addition; that the secondary rampart was derived from the cutting of a new inner ditch and the cutting back of the face of the original rampart; and that the new ditch contained some occupation debris in its silting.

Such a dating sequence for the rampart at this point is not consistent with the dating of the B work postulated by Hawkes, which is based on the following evidence: the coin of Magnentius found 2.4 ft. below the surface of the Traverse; a coin of Valens deep in the refilled Rear Dyke ditch W. of the road; and another coin of Valens from Section I, which he interprets as having been dropped soon after the construction of the rampart. The dating depends on two assumptions: firstly that the Rear Dyke W. of the road is to be equated with the Dyke E. of the road, which we have suggested is at least an open question; and secondly that the Traverse is indeed the E. end of the B work rampart. Pitt-Rivers assumed the latter in the absence of contrary evidence, and it may seem rash to question it now without further excavation, but it is at least possible that the A work did not in fact end at the Epaulement, but continued to Bokerly Junction; also that its turned-back end represents one

---

1 Pitt-Rivers, 86–95.
2 Hawkes, 70, 73, 75.
3 See footnote 3 p. 66; the General was inclined to date the rampart here to the time of this coin (p. 71).
4 Hawkes, fig. 15, no. 1.
5 See footnote 4 p. 68.
6 Pitt-Rivers, 22.
7 Hawkes, 75–6.
side of an entrance, gap or check-point, the other side of which was the E. end of the length of rampart extending westwards to the present road. Such a gap could be sealed quickly in an emergency such as that of A.D. 367-8, and was perhaps so bridged by the Traverse at that time, at any rate after A.D. 350, because of the coin of Magnentius found beneath it.

The dating of the Dyke in Pitt-Rivers’ Section I to a date later than the coin of Maximinus II, and the Constantinian coins in the ditch silting, would accord well with Hawkes’ dating for the A work E. of the Epaulement of c. A.D. 325–330; it remains only to suggest that the Rear Dyke proper is secondary to that part of the Dyke E. of the road, and that it may very properly be attributed to the crisis of A.D. 367–8, perhaps at the same time as the Traverse bridged the gap in the A work.

![Diagram](image)

Fig. 7.

A revised hypothesis for Bokerly Dyke may thus be suggested as follows, and as indicated in fig. 7. The A, B, and C division of Hawkes has been retained for convenience.

1 Note that both the Boundary Drain and E. Drain stop short of this part of the Dyke, suggesting it to be earlier than the main life of the settlement.
The A work comprises the whole of the Dyke E. of the present road, and probably finished just short of the Roman road; there was a gap, entrance or check-point guarded by cross-fire from a turned-back spur on its eastern side (the Epaulement). The work is dated in its construction to later than A.D. 308, in the sector W. of the gap, by a coin of Maximinus II sealed beneath the rampart in Pitt-Rivers' Section I, and to the 4th century or later in the sector E. of the gap by a sherd of imitation Samian sealed in the rampart. A dating of c. A.D. 325–330 is suggested by Hawkes for the eastern sector (his A work) because of the depth of its ditch silting\(^1\) and this may be applied to the whole of the A work; the ditch gradually silted up, the rampart and ditch were dug into by pits, and considerable occupation debris accumulated around and over them extending down to the end of the third quarter of the 4th century; the proportion of Constantinian to Valentinian material in this silting reflects that from the site as a whole.

The B work comprises the Traverse, which bridged the gap in the A work, and the Rear Dyke. The material for the Traverse was obtained from its own ditch;\(^2\) at the same time perhaps, at least 200 ft. of the eastern sector ditch was re-cut and its rampart re-faced.\(^3\) The Rear Dyke was added to the A work at its western end to extend the line of Dyke right across the settlement and beyond, cutting the Roman road; the extension ditch was deeper than the end of the A work ditch. The B work is dated to later than A.D. 350 by the coin of Magnentius found beneath the Traverse, and to after A.D. 364, by the coin of Valens deep in the silting or filling of the Rear Dyke. The evidence of a crisis which passed suggested to Hawkes the years A.D. 367–8 for this episode. The Roman road was soon relaid, and the rampart was probably cleared away from the area of the settlement W. of the road; the Dyke was left as it had been in the A phase, but its gap was left closed by the Traverse.

The C work comprises the Fore Dyke, again extending the line of the old A work across the settlement, but on a better defensive line; it cut the Roman road, but this time the latter was not replaced. The old A work ditch was re-cut and its rampart refaced for at least 100 ft. E. of the road; the new ditch was

---

1 Hawkes, 70.
2 There is some confusion about the Traverse ditch; Pitt-Rivers and Hawkes assumed that it cut obliquely across the old A work ditch just before it turned back following the Epaulement, and became the inner member of the double ditch seen in Pitt-Rivers' sections 9 and 10 (Pl. clxxii) E. of this point — and there is no reason to doubt this. This would seem to show that the A work E. of the Traverse had not been refaced before; yet in Pitt-Rivers Section 11 in Pl. clxxi which shows the relationship between the Traverse rampart and the old A ditch turning beneath it, the old rampart has apparently already been refaced to judge by the way its seams outcrop on the exterior slope (or had the front of the now unnecessary Epaulement bank simply been pushed back partially filling the ditch? — R.F.). Furthermore, Pitt-Rivers assumed (p. 88) that the Traverse ditch was a continuation of the Fore Dyke, and that the Traverse and its continuation westwards had been re-cut by the Fore Dyke operation, in the same way as the rampart nearer to the road had been. No double ditch was in fact found in front of the Traverse, but Pitt-Rivers thought (p. 89) that it should exist, and would be found if his cuttings had been extended further outwards. If this were indeed the case, where did the first or outer Traverse ditch join or cross the old A work ditch?
3 Pitt-Rivers Sections 9 and 10, Pl. clxxii; Hawkes Fig. 14. Mr. Farrar suggested that the Traverse, with the recutting of the E. sector ditch and refacing of the rampart, might equally be part of the C work; the greater lapse of time between the A and C constructions would render such renovations more necessary. On this hypothesis only the Rear Dyke with the shallow and erratic 'Link Ditch' would be the B work, with perhaps a temporary blocking of the Epaulement gap; and all the subsequent work, including the Traverse, Fore Dyke, and all the recutting, would be the C work. This is simpler than my own hypothesis and is perhaps to be preferred.
joined to that of the Fore Dyke. The C work is dated to later than A.D. 393–5 by numerous coins sealed beneath its rampart in Pitt-Rivers' Section 2. Hawkes suggests that it belongs to the early years of the 5th century rather than later, on the grounds of its continuity in style and scale with the A and B works, and because of the interment in its deep silt of extended skeletons in the Roman manner.

There is nothing in this revised hypothesis that need alter Hawkes’ suggestions as to the purposes for which each phase of the Dyke was constructed; the relationship of the A, B and C works to the settlement remains the same; the work extended to the settlement proper in normal times, but was extended across it in times of danger; the extension was not needed when the first crisis passed, and occupation on a much reduced scale continued; the second crisis did not pass and the settlement was largely abandoned.
THE FINDS

LIST OF FEATURES

Abbreviations:

- **F** = Ferruginous sandstone
- **NF** = New Forest
- **B** = Bone fragments
- **CHI** = Chilmark stone
- **OY** = Oyster shell
- **TI** = Tile fragments
- **D** = Ditch
- **SP** = Silage pit
- **P** = Pit
- **H** = Hearth
- **SWC** = Surface of weathered or ploughed chalk
- **C1, C2, C3, C4 shs.** = sherds of 1st-4th centuries A.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Area of Cutting</th>
<th>Type of Feature</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Filling if not chalky brown soil</th>
<th>Finds</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Depth from SWC</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>NF shs.</td>
<td>7&quot; base</td>
<td>12&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F, B, OY, C4 shs. (NF)</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>Darker</td>
<td>F, B (burnt) TI, CHI, C4 shs. (NF)</td>
<td>4&quot;+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shallow U</td>
<td>Chalky base</td>
<td>Coins 27, 32; late shs. (NF)</td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>Coin 32 in dark soil pocket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D?</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>End only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>U, steep S.W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8&quot;</td>
<td>Rising to S.E. side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8&quot;—13&quot;</td>
<td>Draining to W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Very steep sides</td>
<td>Tight flints and greensand</td>
<td>Large late sherd in flints (NF)</td>
<td>6&quot;—12&quot;</td>
<td>Timber-slot? but slopes up to N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Area of Cutting</td>
<td>Type of Feature</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Filling if not chalky brown soil</td>
<td>Finds</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Depth from SWC</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Scoop</td>
<td>Base red and pale blue; greensand edging in filling?</td>
<td></td>
<td>14&quot; into chalk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slopes up to S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>Many sherds in vicinity</td>
<td></td>
<td>(22&quot; T) 3&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plough-soil deep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>D?</td>
<td>Shallow U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doubtful; mole?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Scoop</td>
<td>Base red and pale blue; fill loose orange-brown chalky and little ash</td>
<td>Sherds in vicinity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shallow U</td>
<td>Sherds in vicinity</td>
<td></td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Shallow V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>D &amp; P</td>
<td>D — shallow U</td>
<td>3 C4 shs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>D — 4&quot; P — 36&quot;</td>
<td>Probably tree-hole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>D?</td>
<td>D — shallow U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4&quot;</td>
<td>Doubtful; mole?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Corn-drying oven</td>
<td>see later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Area of Cutting</td>
<td>Type of Feature</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Filling if not chalky brown soil</td>
<td>Finds</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Depth from SWC</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>30/50</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>See Section 2</td>
<td>Several sherds including Nos. 38 and 39.</td>
<td>See section, and plan fig. 4</td>
<td>Most 16&quot; (33° T) Deeper 25&quot; (42° T)</td>
<td>Sides not weathered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>22 P</td>
<td>Steep sides to 2 levels</td>
<td>2' chalky soil 18&quot; brown soil, 8&quot; flints and stiff chalky soil</td>
<td>Coins 3, 24, 30, many shs. incl. NF</td>
<td>See Section, and plan fig. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-cut?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30/50 Pit or large post-hole</td>
<td>See Section 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possibly for palisade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>30/40/50 Cut-away of chalk</td>
<td>See Sections 1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Section, and plan fig. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shown in Pitt-Rivers cuttings P and Q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>27 P</td>
<td>Dark brown to 30&quot;, light brown below, flints in base</td>
<td>CHI, coins 4, 14; F, TI, many shs. incl. NF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39°—48° T</td>
<td>Floor sloping up to W. and N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>50 Cut-away or pit</td>
<td>See Section 1</td>
<td>Few sherds (incl. No. 5), bracelet (fig. 13 no. 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Section, and plan fig. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Partly in Pitt-Rivers cutting R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>S. of SP Pit</td>
<td>Flat-based</td>
<td>Dark brown</td>
<td>6 Sherds, incl. NF red-painted</td>
<td></td>
<td>40° × 44&quot;</td>
<td>9&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Area of Cutting</td>
<td>Type of Feature</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Filling if not chalky brown soil</td>
<td>Finds</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>Depth from SWC</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>S.E. of SP</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Flat-based</td>
<td>Loose brown</td>
<td>3 C2 shs.</td>
<td>40&quot; x 28&quot;</td>
<td>14&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(p. 88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>S.E. of SP</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Flat-based</td>
<td>F and flints at 14&quot;, burnt soil at 21&quot;</td>
<td>Pot-boilers, oyster shell, 100+ C2 shs.</td>
<td>48&quot; x 45&quot;</td>
<td>28&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sloping</td>
<td></td>
<td>top; 24&quot; x 24&quot; base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>S.E. of SP</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24&quot; diam.</td>
<td>5&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>S.E. of SP</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Circ. W. side vertical</td>
<td>Light brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>32&quot; diam.</td>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>S.E. of SP</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Flat base</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oyster shell, bone</td>
<td>42&quot; x 36&quot;</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>S. of SP</td>
<td>Pit</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>Medium red-brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>48&quot; x 30&quot;</td>
<td>24&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>S.W. of SP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grave: inhumation extended, in shallow cut in chalk; on back with left forearm folded across stomach; head to N.; sandal nails at feet (see p. 99 for report on bones).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>S. of plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patch of dense flints and some chalk seen in mechanical destruction; possibly trace of field-bank.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The corn-drying oven (Fig. 8) lay towards the S. end of the area excavated (Fig. 1); it consisted of an oven at the N. end, into which led a flue, fired from a square stoking-pit at the S. end. The oven was roughly circular, 6 ft. in diameter, with an additional cut-away at a higher level; the floor which sloped down towards the flue was mostly burnt bluish-grey, more burnt towards the flue. The flue varied in width from 19 to 24 inches; its floor was burnt black through most of its length, but bluish-grey towards the oven; the sides were black in their lower 2 ins., and reddish brown from 2 to 14 inches; the entrance from the flue to the oven was between edging stones of flint and ferruginous sandstone. The stoking-pit was 4 ft. square on the floor with sloping sides; there were slight depressions 2 ins. in diameter, and 2 to 3 ins. deep in the N.E. and N.W. corners which, with a larger depression in each of the other corners and the centre, may have held timber uprights supporting a roof (though no tiles were found); the sides near the flue were burnt red-orange in their lower 4 inches.

The whole structure was filled with domestic debris after it had gone out of use; this included a Constantinian coin (No. 19), a weighted hook or bell-clapper (Fig. 13, no. 4), many burnt quern fragments (p. 87) near the N. end of the stoking pit, burnt ferruginous sandstone, many ox and other bones, and 220 sherds of pottery with a dark chalky soil matrix (including New Forest painted ware and earlier sherds).

The structure is interpreted as a corn-drying oven on the analogy of numerous similar examples. The flue was probably roofed with heathstone or Chilmark slabs which probably extended over the oven and served as a floor on which the corn was dried in the
sheaf. No burnt grain was found in the oven, and there is the possibility that it was used for
drying some other material.
The oven is simple, and may be regarded as a ‘domestic’ one, in contrast to the larger
examples associated with farms, such as the double-flued example at Downton1. Another
smaller T-shaped example was found by Pitt-Rivers in the N. part of the settlement2.

THE COINS

By George C. Boon

LRBC, I and II: Carson, Hill and Kent, Late Roman Bronze Coinage, A.D. 324–498 (1960),
pts. I and II. RIC: The Roman Imperial Coinage.
State of wear: w (worn) v (very) m (much) s (slightly) u (unworn).

A. Pre-Constantinian
   1. Tetricus II Caes., radiate, overstruck.
   2. Allectus, RIC v, ii, 22, vsw.
   3. Radiate, barbarous, mw.
   4. do., 9 mm.

B. Constantinian
   5. LRBC I 33 (324–30) vsw.
   6–9. LRBC I 49, 68, 386; fragment (Lyons, Constantine II); (330–35) sw–w.
   10–11. VRBS ROMA (330–35) mw, w.
   14–16. CONSTANTINOPOLIS copies, 2: ‘Trier’, 16, 14 mm., 1:12 mm., sw, w.
   17. LRBC I 234 (335–37) sw.
   18. GLORIA EXERCITVS (one st.) vsw.
   24. LRBC II 230 var. (with column, no s p) (351–53) vsw.
   25. Barbarous copy, 4th cent., 10 mm.
   26. do., VRBS ROMA type, fragment, 7 mm. sw?

C. Post-Constantinian
   27–28. RIC ix, Lyons 20a, xxvib–xxviib (367–75); Arles, 18, xva (375–78) mw.
   29. RIC ix, Lyons 21a, xia (367–75) vsw.
   30. SECVRITAS REIPVBLCAE type, vsw.
   31. RIC ix, Arles 15 (367–75) vsw.
   32. RIC ix, Lyons 44/7 (388/92/93) u, or vsw.
   33. Theodosian AE 4?

1 Excavated by the writer 1955; Wilt. Arch. Mag., forthcoming.
2 Pitt-Rivers (1892), p. 82, Pls. clxvii and clxviii; thought at that time to be a hypocaust, as were those
   at Woodcuts and Rotherley.
List of Provenances of Coins
(Positions shown on plans, figs. 4 and 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Depth from: Turf (T)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plough-soil</td>
<td>15&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plough-soil</td>
<td>17&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F19</td>
<td>G — middle</td>
<td>6&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F22</td>
<td>G — middle</td>
<td>17&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>G — middle</td>
<td>1&quot; above natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>N. edge of layer N.</td>
<td>1&quot; above natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>G — base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>G — middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>G — middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plough-soil</td>
<td>3&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>G — middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>G — base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>J — top</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F22</td>
<td>G — middle</td>
<td>19&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>G — middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>G — base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>G — middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plough-soil</td>
<td>9&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Corn-drying oven</td>
<td>Plough-soil</td>
<td>3&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>G — top</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>G — base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>G — middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>G1 over F20</td>
<td>16&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F19</td>
<td>G — middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>G — middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>G — middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>G — base</td>
<td>9&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plough-soil</td>
<td>12&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Silage pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plough-soil</td>
<td>3&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F19</td>
<td>Plough-soil</td>
<td>3&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plough-soil</td>
<td>3&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Plough-soil</td>
<td>9&quot; T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plough-soil</td>
<td>18&quot; T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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QUERNs

In the filling of the corn-drying oven were found fourteen quern fragments. Three querns are represented: A, an upper stone with radial handle socket, 18 inches diameter, 2 inches thick, with a 2 inch central hole; of greensand, blackened. B, another upper stone of similar type and dimensions, but of yellowish brown micaceous sandstone. C, a lower stone, 2½ inches thick, of shelly greensand.

In cut 50, layer L, Section 1, was a fragment of a lower stone 18 inches diameter and 3 inches thick, of yellow-brown micaceous sandstone.

THE BRONZE FIGURINE OF VENUS

By J. M. C. Toynbee

Bokerly Dyke is a somewhat unexpected find-spot for a miniature bronze figurine of Venus, 2 to 2½ inches high (PI. III). It may be surmised that it was lost there by someone who carried it about on his person as a charm or amulet. It came to light in a 4th-century level, 320 to 360, or even later; and it could well be of the 4th century itself. On the other hand, it might equally well be earlier, since such bronzes could be in circulation for several generations and it is notoriously difficult to date, on purely stylistic grounds, objects of provincial workmanship. For provincial the little Venus most certainly is — the production either of a British, or of a N.W. continental craftsman. This is a coarse-featured goddess, with a square, heavy fleshy jowl, wedge-shaped nose, round eyes, and pursed-up mouth. The body is ill-proportioned, with flat chest and slender waist on top of bulging hips and clumsy thighs. Yet there is a certain sensitivity in the modelling of back and buttocks. The right leg carries the main weight; and the tiny depressions in the pupils of the eyes and nipples may once have held minute drops of silver or enamel.

Nevertheless, crude as the goddess is, she stems from classical tradition and illustrates the well-known type of Venus Anadyomene, rising naked from the sea and binding up her hair, which in this case forms a thick frame round the face, while behind it is partly gathered in a knot and partly falls in two heavy, rope-like tresses. One of these, the left-hand tress, is grasped by the left hand, but most of the right-hand tress and all but the stumps of the fingers of the right-hand are missing. A crescent-shaped diadem crowns the head. Five other bronzes of Venus Anadyomene from Roman Britain are known to me, three from Colchester,1 one from Silchester,2 and one from London.3

Apart from the losses already mentioned and a crack across the left knee, the figurine is well preserved, and it now displays a very fine green patina.

THE ROMAN POTTERY

The pottery from the area S. of the Dyke is not here described in detail. The dating given for the sherds from each feature is based on the presence or absence of New Forest pottery, which has been used to determine whether the features are 2nd–3rd century or late 3rd–4th;4 no closer dating seems necessary in this context, in view of the coin evidence and the large amount of pottery already recorded from the site by Pitt-Rivers. Complete lists of the pottery from every trench and feature have however been deposited with the finds themselves for future reference. The incidence of pottery of various periods on the site has been briefly discussed by Hawkes5; the preponderance of coins of the first half of the 4th century is matched by the ubiquity of New Forest ware on the site. The General noticed that the coarse

2 Reading Museum, No. 01648.
4 There has been no further dating evidence for this industry since Hawkes, Linwood.
5 Hawkes, pp. 67, 75.
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pottery, taken as a whole, was noticeably different from that found at Woodcuts and Rotherley; the features he found to be characteristic of Bokerly we now recognize as late Roman ones, but there is little material from the site which may be dated to the later 4th century, as the coin proportions would suggest. Hawkes has noted the rarity of red-slipped rosette-stamped ware.

In the area S. of the Dyke, only two groups did not contain New Forest pottery; these were from two of the pits found near to the road, F102 and F103; the other pits in this group (not 101) contained no sherds, and may all have been of early Roman date, in contrast to all other features in the area.

The pottery from these two pits is as follows:—

F102. Three sherds: a pink sandy ring-base; a sherd of very abraded decorated samian; and a heavy grey sherd.

F103. Over 100 sherds, including amphora fragments, a fragment of plain samian, fragments of plain flanged pie-dishes of 2nd–3rd century type, fragment of red sandy flagon-neck (white-slipped), sherds of acute-lattice cooking jars, a rim of a small bead-rim jar, and coarse porridgy red/grey ware (early Roman storage jar).

The pottery from the Dyke silting and associated features is described and illustrated in detail, because of its value as evidence in considering the dating of the layer in which it was found, and indirectly in dating this section of the Dyke. If Hawkes' dating of the different parts of the Dyke (p. 66) is accepted, then all this pottery should have been deposited later than A.D. 367–8. The associated coins are mostly Constantinian, and this would suggest that even if this pottery was deposited after 367–8, it was probably in use much earlier and was moved with the coins from elsewhere. On the revised hypothesis suggested above (pp. 77–79) this pottery will have accumulated in the ditch after A.D. 308 and probably in the half-century following c. 325–330 A.D.

In all the ditch layers about 5,000 sherds were found, of which only two were of samian, and about 300 of fine wares such as New Forest painted and colour-coated ware; there were no significant differences between the main bulk of the sherds from the black layer (G in Fig. 6), and those from the other layers above and below; all are treated together as a homogeneous group, though each piece illustrated is given its own provenance. Much of the pottery is in large pieces but, with a few exceptions, only part of each pot was represented. It seems therefore more likely that the pottery was in rubbish thrown into the ditch rather than that it was broken close by, as would have been the case if the associated pits were part of some occupation in the shelter of the rampart.

In assessing the probability of part or whole of this group being of the later 4th century, we should note the virtual absence of rosette-stamped wares elsewhere attributable to this period (the single piece of 'half-rosette' stamped ware, no. 73, makes only the ninth from the site), and the small amount of red-coated wares generally.

The groups may be usefully compared with the pottery from the Downton Roman Villa, six miles to the E, which is mostly associated with a few coins of the first quarter of the 4th century, and is, on the grounds of the general dating of the Downton villa, wholly attributed to the late 3rd/mid-4th century.

The pottery from Downton is a considerably smaller group, but varies in fabric and form, and is mostly from groups directly related to nearby occupation. Taking the groups as a whole there are certain differences which may reflect changing pottery styles between the first and second halves of the 4th century, and which may therefore at Bokerly be used as datable characteristics with more confidence than those which are present also at Downton; or the ones present only at Bokerly may be 3rd-century or earlier types.

The most obvious differences are the presence at Bokerly of three kinds of pottery which are not represented at all at Downton: incised-decorated and burnished-decorated dark grey wares, and decorated painted coarse sandy wares. These three may be late features, though the first two

1 Pitt-Rivers, p. 17.
2 Hawkes, p. 75.
3 Layers below: 56 sherds, including nos. 8, 9, 16, 24, 42, 65, 71 and 74. Layers above: c. 150 sherds including nos. 11 and 64.
may be related to the 'scribed' ware of the 'early' phase of the New Forest industry,\(^1\) and might therefore be too early to be represented at Downton\(^2\). There is another class of ware, a coarse gritty, semi-handmade ware, which occurred at Clausentum mostly in the 4th century with a few in earlier levels\(^3\), at Downton (fabric B\(_5\)), and in the New Forest\(^4\), but is absent from this group; a rim sherd of a similar vessel was however found in the top of Pit F22, S. of the Dyke, associated with a coin of Constantinople type (no. 14).

The Bokerly pottery has been classed below in five main groups A–F, corresponding to groups similarly named at Downton. The illustrated series includes all the fine decorated wares, with representative examples of all the coarse wares.

In conclusion it may be said that although some of the pottery might have been current in the years after A.D. 367–8, most of it could equally have been in use in Constantinian times, and there is no reason to think that the proportion of Constantinian to later pottery is very different from the proportion of coins of the two periods found in the same deposit.

**Fabrics in Ditch Silt**

| A  | Grey | A\(_1\) | White-slipped or painted
|    |      | A\(_2\) | Plain grey
|    |      | A\(_3\) | Coarse grey

| B  | Dark grey to black | —
|    | B\(_1\) | Dark grey, incised decorated
|    | B\(_2\) | Dark grey, burnished decorated
|    | B\(_3\) | Dark grey, smooth-surface micaceous\(^5\)
|    | B\(_4\) | Black burnished ware
|    | B\(_5\) | Pale burnished grey (probably B\(_4\) burnt)

| D  | Hard colour-coated\(^6\) | —
|    | D\(_1\) | Very hard metallic, dull purple surface
|    | D\(_2\) | Hard, dark-coated surface

| E  | Coarse sandy | —
|    | E\(_1\) | Incised decoration
|    | E\(_2\) | Painted decoration near E\(_3\)\(^7\)

| F  | Soft colour-coated | —
|    | F\(_1\) | Brown or buff-coated
|    | F\(_2\) | Red-coated

**Illustrated Sherds (Figs. 9–12)**

*(See Fig. 6 Sections 1 and 2 for Provenances)*

Group A\(_1\)

1. Rim sherd; fine sandy, patchy white slip on exterior; lightly-incised decoration through slip on shoulder. Cut 50, layer G.

2. Rim and shoulder sherd, fabric as 1, probably of jug, flanged rim and sharp shoulder-angle. Cut 50, layer G.

3. Rim sherd, channelled, beginning of groove on shoulder; fabric as 1. Cut 50, layer G.

---

\(^1\) Hawkes, Linwood, p. 115.

\(^2\) But see Clausentum 1937–8, p. 170, for deeply-scribed wares, perhaps not New Forest.

\(^3\) 1951–4: 'Storage jars in Burnished Gritted Ware', type JSG ti, p. 78, no. 11, figs. 26, no. 22 and fig. 29, nos. 23–24.

\(^4\) Sumner, Old Sloden Wood, Pl. X\(V\), 10–11, where Sumner thought it to be native and early.

\(^5\) Found also in Somerset: Chew Valley Lake, CVL fabric B, in unusual forms.

\(^6\) The difference between D\(_1\) and D\(_2\) is due to varying firing conditions (see Clausentum 1951–4, p. 94; both are represented at Crock Hill).

\(^7\) Downton E\(_3\) is painted black, but not decorated; cf. also Clausentum 1951–4, p. 90 'Salopian' and 'New Forest Painted Ware'.
Fig. 10. Roman Pottery nos. 28-48 (pp. 89, 91); (1)
4. Rim sherd with wider channel, groove on shoulder; fabric as 1. Cut 50 layer G.
5. Rim and handle sherd of jug; may be single or double-handled; faintly-incised decoration on shoulder and probably obliquely round neck as in nos. 6 and 7; fabric as 1. F23, Section 1, layer J.
6. Shoulder sherd of jug; fabric as 1; patchy white slip, left blank on drawing, cut through by faintly-incised decoration. Cut 50, layer G.

Group A2
7. Rim sherd with lid recess; fine hard grey. Cut 50, layer G.
8. Rim sherd, lid recess; fabric as 7. Cut 50, Section 1, layer H.
9. Rim sherd, lid recess; hard red-brown, grey surfaces. Cut 50, Section 1, layer H.
10. Rim sherds of bowl; fabric as 7. Cf. Downton no. 18 (late 3rd/mid-4th cent.). Cuts 30 and 40, layer G.
11. Rim sherd of small jar, fabric as 7. Cut 40, Section 2, layers B3 and F.
12. Pedestal base; medium coarse grey. Cut 30, layer G.

Group A3
13. Rim sherd of storage jar, surface roughly worked; coarse sandy grey, reddish-grey core; perforated below rim. Cut 50, layer G.
14. Rim sherd as 13, coarse sandy grey, slight moulding at base of rim. Cut 50, layer G.
16. Base and side of perforated storage jar, fabric as 14. Cut 50, Section 1, layer H.

Group B1
17. Rim sherd, dark grey sandy; four-tooth combed decoration on shoulder. Cut 50, layer G. Cf. Jordan Hill, p. 274, class VI.
18. Body sherd, grey, dark burnished surfaces over area of deep girth-grooves. Cut 50, layer G.
19–21. Body sherds, dark grey; decoration done with sharp tool in technique similar to 'cut-glass'. Cuts 30 and 50, layer G.
22, 23. As nos. 19–21, but a dark-surfaces micaceous grey ware similar to fabric B3. Cut 30, layer G.
24. Body sherd from carination; dark grey sandy, considerable abrasion or carination; faintly-incised decoration. Cut 50, Section 1, layer H.
25. Body sherd, grey gritty; some slip survives in the shallow fluting. Cut 50, layer G.
26. Body sherd, soft grey, dark surfaces; sharply-cut girth ridging. Cut 50, layer G.
27. Base sherd, coarse dark grey, heavily channelled with sharp tool rather irregularly as if on slow wheel. Cut 30, layer G.

Group B2
28. Rim and shoulder sherds of bowl; dark grey; the girth decoration is done by smoothing the surface with a tool leaving it with a burnished appearance and a darker grey colour. Cut 50, layer G.
29. Neck and shoulder sherd, probably of jug, light grey, dark burnished surface, darker and more shiny in decoration. Cut 50, layer G.
30, 31. Body sherds, dark grey, darker smoother decoration. Cuts 30 and 50, layer G.

Group B3
32. Rim sherd of bead-rim jar with trace of stub of handle(s); soft grey micaceous ware, reddish core, dark surface, faint burnished decoration round handle. Cut 50, layer G.
33, 34. Rim sherds of jars; soft grey micaceous black slip or pitchumen on inside of rims. Cut 50, layer G.

Group B4 — all dark grey-black, sandy.
35, 36. Rim sherds of bowls; exterior of 36 very roughly finished and ridged. Cut 30, layer G.
37. Part of handled oval 'fish-dish' c. 8" x 5"; burnished decoration is on inside of base. Cut 30, layer G. Cf. Downton no. 47 (late 3rd/mid-4th cent.); Scarborough
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Fig. 10. Roman Pottery nos. 28-48 (pp. 91, 93); (4)
on the base of a collared shallow bowl from the late 4th-century signal station on Castle Hill.

38. Section of circular plate. Fl8, Section 2, layer J.

39-42. Parts of flanged bowls; narrow burnished decoration on 40 and 41. Cuts 40 and 50, layer G; 42 from layer H.

43-46. Parts of cooking-pots with variations in lattice; 44 has rough burnished tooling under rim, apparently done on a slow wheel. Cuts 40 and 50, layer G.

47. Base, light incised decoration on base and wall. Cut 50, layer G.

48. Handled jar, incised strokes either side of handle, and some vertical tooling in lower part. Cut 40, layer G.

Group D1

49-50. Rim sherds of indented beakers; very hard fine grey, dull purple gloss external, brown internal. Cuts 30 and 50, layer G.


Group D2

54. Rim and body sherds of indented beaker, hard reddish-brown, dark brown slip on surfaces. Cut 30, layer G.

55. Base of large beaker, hard cream-grey; dark brown slip all over outside and over part of inside only with a definite line of delineation, showing that the dark surface is indeed a slip. Cut 30, layer G.

56. Most of small jar, fabric as 55, decoration in white paint. Cut 30, layer G.

57. Rim of beaker, fabric as 55; white paint decoration inside rim. Cut 40, layer G.

58. Rim sherd of bowl; fabric as 55; the brown slip is slightly metallic-looking; the white paint decoration on interior. Cut 50, layer G.

59-67. Body sherds of similar fabric decorated in white paint. All from layer G, except 64 (Cut 40, layers B3 and F) and 65 (Cut 30, layer O).

69-70. Two body sherds of similar fabric; with faint rouletting under decoration. Cut 30, layer G.

71. Sherd of hard grey with brown surfaces, pulled into scale or pine-cone surface in high relief. Cf. Downton no. 71 (See note after no. 73). Cut 40, Section 2, layer O.

72. Body sherd with multiple rouletting and white paint bands. Cut 30, layer G.

73. Body sherd, cream ware, brown slip, ‘half-rosette’ stamps. Cut 50, layer G. Cf. Downton no. 49, though this was not closely associated with coin-dated groups of late 3rd/mid-4th cent. and could be later there.

74. Rim and neck of handled flagon, cream fabric, reddish-brown slip. Cut 50, Section 1, layer H.

75. Rim sherd of mortarium, cream, dark brown slip. Cut 50, layer G.

Group E1

76. Rim sherd of coarse off-white sandy, purplish brown slip, combed decoration. Cut 30, layer G.

Group E2

77. Rim sherd of flanged bowl, coarse off-white sandy. Cut 50, layer G.

78-82. Rim sherds of bowls or platters in similar fabric with reddish-brown to brown painted decoration. All from layer G.

83. Base sherd of similar vessel. Cut 50, layer G.

84. Part of bowl in reddish sandy fabric, not so coarse as the preceding pieces; decoration in reddish paint. Cut 50, layer G.

Group F1

85. Rim of flanged bowl, fine cream with smooth matt reddish-brown slip. Cut 30, layer G.

86. Rim sherd, fine cream-pink micaceous, pink-brown slip, white paint decoration. Cut 40, layer G.

87. Part of mortarium, fine cream, pink-brown slip. Cut 50, layer G.
Fig. 11. Roman Pottery nos. 49-75 (p. 93); (§)
Fig. 12. Roman Pottery nos. 76-90 (pp. 93, 96); (4)
Grave 1

The skeleton received for examination was generally well preserved, but with some patches of erosion and breakage. Most of the bones of the skeleton are present, although a number of phalanges are missing.

Skull

The skull is that of an adult, probably female. The left side of cranial vault and face show recent damage, and much of the parietal and frontal bones on this side are missing. The sagittal, lambdoid and coronal sutures are obliterated but can still be traced externally. The fronto-malar contact and the squamous sutures are open. The spheno-parietal and maxillary-malar sutures are obliterated.

The cranial vault is considerably thicker than normal whereas the cranial base is not. This is mainly due to a thickening of the diploic (inner spongy) tissue. On the inner table of the frontal there is some irregularity especially at the midline where it has a lobulated appearance. Thickness measurements were as follows:

Maximum frontal thickness at midline
(approximately 1 in. above glabella) = 13 mm.

Maximum thickness at the right parietal boss = 12.5 mm.

Thickness at bregma = 10 mm.

Minimum thickness on temporals
(just above auditory meatus) = 2.5 mm.

This conforms to the usual pattern found in thickened skulls, in which the greatest thickening occurs in the parietal and frontal bones while the temporals and cranial base remain normal. This thickening may be due to a variety of causes including senility and anaemia.

The craniometric measurements which could be taken are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glab.Occip. L. (L)</td>
<td>184 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Horiz. B. (B)</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basio-Breg. Ht. (H')</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nas-Breg. arc. (Si)</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breg. Lambda arc. (S2)</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambda-opisthion arc. (S3)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nas-Breg. chord (S'1)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breg-Lambda chord (S'2)</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambda-opisthion chord (S'3)</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biasterionic B. (BiB.)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nas-Alveolar pt. (G'H)</td>
<td>74 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max B. Pyriform Ap. (NB)</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nas-Bas, Nas spine (NH')</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Condylar width (W1)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-gonal width (GoGo)</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Foram B. (ZZ)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least ramus B. (RB)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagit. Ht. Mandib. (H1)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ht at 2nd Molar (MzH)</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Approximate measurement only (owing to the defective nature of the specimen.)

Both mandible and palate are well preserved and are partly edentulous. Only three molars remain, two on the lower left and one on the upper right. In consequence of the lack of sound occlusion the front teeth, especially the upper incisors and left upper canine, show abnormal wear. Additional cementum apposition is visible on the roots of the remaining molars. The upper premolars were also lost in life, with the exception of the root of the first right upper premolar. This and both lower second premolars show complete loss of the crown with exposure of the pulp cavity and abscess formation at the root.

No enamel hypoplasia is present except for a slight degree on the lower canines. Evidence of caries was noted on the upper right first premolar, the lower right second premolar, and on the lower left first and second molars. It is probable that the third molars never developed.
Thus, the dental condition may be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>? NP</td>
<td>7 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? NP</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 = abscess
X = tooth lost in life.
M3s may never have erupted.

NP. Congenital absence.

cementum
apposition
at roots.

Post Cranial Skeleton: As in the skull, features of the pelvis and long bones showed the individual to have been an adult female. The vertebral column is almost complete, and all areas show some degree of osteo-arthritis, being severe in the cervical and lumbar regions. There is some new periosteal bone growth on the anterior surfaces of the bodies of the last two lumbar vertebrae. There is some evidence of slight inflammation. Arthritic changes were noted in the hands, and especially the left thumb. The proximal and probably the distal end of the right humerus, the proximal ends of both ulnae, both femora, the one remaining patella, and the proximal ends of both tibiae also displayed arthritic changes.

Measurements which could be taken on the long bones were as follows:

**Femur**
Max. L. (FeL1) = 409 mm. (R)

**Tibia**
Max. L. (TiL1) = 340 mm. (L)
Ant-Post. Diameter (TiD1) = 32.5 mm. (L)
Transverse Diameter (TiD2) = 26.0 mm. (L).

**Humerus**
Max. L. (HuL1) = 301.5 mm. (R)

**Radius**
Max. L. (RaL1) = 216 mm. (L).

Employing the maximum length of the right femur, a stature estimate of 5’ 1” was obtained (after referring to Table 13, appendix 3, in Trotter, M. and Gleser, G. C., *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* (1952), 10, pp. 465–514).

Grave 2

Foot bones from a second skeleton (found in a road cutting). Buried with iron hobnails. These are fragmentary bones of an adult, probably male. The bones are:

**Left foot.**
- os calcis (imperfect), 3rd metatarsal, proximal phalanx of the great toe.

**Right foot.**
- Astragalus, first three metatarsals, proximal phalanx of the great toe.

**Uncertain**
- Part of a tarsal bone, 3 imperfect metatarsals, 3 proximal and one medial phalange.
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