

Appendix One

Pottery from the footings of the Eastern Corner Turret by P V Webster

Hawkes mentions three sherds as being 'embedded in the footings of the turret S. Wall' (1930, 172). One is a sherd of 'cooking pot ware' by which he presumably means Black-burnished ware'. Unfortunately this piece does not seem to have survived. A glance at the finds shows clearly that, after the manner of the times, only rim sherds were retained and none of these appear to be the piece in question. All that can be said is that BB1 appears at Caerleon from the Flavian period onwards but that it is more plentiful from the Hadrianic period (cf. Greep 1986a, 57).

The remaining two sherds are samian and do survive. Both are listed by Hawkes but are not illustrated. In view of their significance, an expansion of the Hawkes comments seems justified:

D.15 Form 37, South Gaulish, showing an ovolo with triple ended tongue bent to the right. Over zoned decoration defined by wavy line borders. The upper frieze has been formed by repeated stamping of a stylised triple leaf. The lower zone was panelled with borders ending in rosette terminals. The only surviving piece of panel decoration on this piece contains an element of the Hercules and Hydra motif, Hawkes' fragment D.14, which is clearly from the same bowl shows the head of another figure. The general style of this piece is similar to some of the stylistically later pieces among the Pompeii hoard (e.g. Atkinson 1914, no. 53).

A similar scheme which also uses the Hercules can be seen in the work of Biragillus (Mees 1995, Taf. 13,1) which Mees would date after AD 90. A date c.AD 80-100 would, therefore, suit the Caerleon piece.

D.16 This piece poses a problem. Hawkes states that it, like D.15 above, had 'the same features as D.14'. However, the piece labelled D.16 in the museum collection and apparently labelled appropriately by Hawkes, does not really fit into this category. It is indeed a small fragment of form 37 and shows a fragment of ovolo. However, the fabric is different from that of D.14-5 and would appear to be Central Gaulish.

The ovolo, though broken is noticeably larger than that of the other pieces. The tongue barely survives but could be beaded. Cinnamus ovolo 1 (Stanfield and Simpson, 1958, fig. 47; 1990, fig. 47) is only one of several possibilities but an Antonine date seems more likely than earlier.

It will be seen that D.16 poses a number of problems of interpretation. Even if one assumes that it is correctly labelled and that, therefore, Hawkes was mistaken in identifying it as part of D.14-15, it is both broken and small. Not only is the decoration too fragmentary for absolute certainty in identification, but the small size of the piece makes it unwise to place too much weight on this one piece when considering the overall dating of the rampart structures. The same does not apply, however, to D.15 (and its associated piece D.14) and, provided that we are satisfied with their stratigraphic context, these may be regarded as providing a terminus for the structures.