COMMENT

**AUTHORITY** 

Excavations in the retentura of this large auxiliary fort, approximately half-way between the NE gate (porta decumana) and the N corner showed that ploughing had completely destroyed all archaeological deposits, if such had existed. A solitary post-hole and fragments of burnt daub at the base of the ploughsoil suggest the former existence of timber-framed buildings in the vicinity. No Romano-British artefacts were recovered.

rock-cut, with a square-cut cleaning out channel. The ditch at this post had been deliberately filled with a capped with burnt debris following relatively slight silting. A small group of coarse-ware vessels had be deposited concurrently with these backfilling deposits which presumal relate to the demolition of the defences upon the abandonment of the fort. These, however, do not prove

The examination of the innermost of the two ditches at the site of the chronology of the fort remains uncerporta decumana demonstrated the existence of an unexcavated causeway 9.25 modification to the defences noted in moving opposite the gate, traversed by the excavations of 1977 (Britannia, a shallow drain which emptied into the IX, 1978, 408) suggests an attenuated northern outer ditch-terminal. The latter was 2.5 m wide, 1.45 m deep;

rock-cut, with a square-cut cleaningout channel. The ditch at this point
had been deliberately filled with a
fine, turfy clay and stones, and
capped with burnt debris following
relatively slight silting. A small
group of coarse-ware vessels had been
deposited concurrently with these
backfilling deposits which presumably
relate to the demolition of the
defences upon the abandonment of the
fort. These, however, do not provide
a precise date for this event within
the period circa AD 75-120. The broad
chronology of the fort remains uncertain, but the apparent lack of any
modification to the defences noted in
the excavations of 1977 (Britannia,
IX, 1978, 408) suggests an attenuated
occupation.