

yon's *Glass Industry in the Weald* is also included. Bound in with the volume are the annual report and accounts for 1967.

Archaeologia Cantiana is rather a heavier volume. It is issued bound in hard covers with just over 300 pages including the index and is well illustrated with plates and text figures, but having far too many folders for the bindings' comfort. The wide range of subjects in *Archaeologia Cantiana* is always impressive and its regular appearance each spring is an equally impressive performance. In this eighty-third volume Stuart Rigold's discussion of the medieval court halls of Kent is one of several papers on architectural subjects which also cover the recently dismantled Winkhurst Farm near Edenbridge, a late Norman upper hall house at Eastwell and the Old Mill, Bexley.

The several excavation reports range over Roman, Saxon and medieval sites. A. P. Detsicas provides a further report (1967) on his work at the Romano-British villa at Eccles in the lower Medway Valley and provides interesting parallels with Surrey's Rapsley. Of rather a different nature is the account of excavations between 1960 and 1966 made to determine the complex evolution of the Roman and medieval defensive walls at Rochester. These revise to some extent previously held opinions and provide a series of Romano-British and medieval pottery and small finds. Two papers refer to recent work at Springhead, the Roman settlement on Watling Street near Gravesend; one discusses a deposit of 1st and 2nd century Samian. The interim report by P. J. Tester on the mixed cremation and inhumation Saxon cemetery at Poverest Road, Orpington, provides interesting parallels with east Kent and Surrey. The pottery vessels and metal objects are fully illustrated.

The amount of active historical research within Kent is shown by several papers. R. H. Hiscock's detailed description of the 18th and 19th century developments of roads in the area of the Gravesend deviation of Watling Street between Dartford and Strood may be contrasted with studies of an early Kent antiquary and a 17th century independent devine. The volume also contains excellent annual reports and notes from local secretaries and the museums at Canterbury and Maidstone. The Society's annual report for 1968 with accounts, rules and a list of members is placed at the front of the volume.

The reasons for joining a county society can be numerous. A chance to join an excavation, hear lectures, take part in visits to monuments or just to keep in touch may influence many. Others, more distantly situated or less actively inclined, will judge a society by its publications. In these both Surrey and Kent serve their members well. If you live in either county and wish to receive the journal and know more about subscriptions and benefits of membership, the addresses of their Honorary Secretaries are given below together with those from the other county organisations in the London region.

JOHN ASHDOWN

SOCIETIES

List of Hon. Secretaries addresses

Essex Archaeological and Historical Congress: 3 Pardon House, Valley Hill, Loughton, Essex.

Kent Archaeological Society: The Gate House, Lullington Castle, Eynsford, Kent.

Hertfordshire Archaeological Society: 44 The Street, Braughing, Hertfordshire.

London and Middlesex Archaeological Society: 49 Mayford Road, S.W.12.

Surrey Archaeological Society: Castle Arch, Guildford, Surrey.

Letters

STANE STREET

I THINK that my friend, Charles Titford, in his statement of the case for Ewell having been the site of a Roman posting station on Stane Street, has underestimated the positive archaeological evidence for Romano-British settlement at Merton. I have argued elsewhere against the Priory site, but there was well attested R-B occupation further south on an area now occupied by factories and since dug away as a gravel pit. This site was dry as it was on gravel, not on London clay or alluvium.

My own work, which led to the suggestion that Stane Street diverted slightly here to facilitate the crossing of the meandering Wandle, suggested also that Stane Street crossed this known settlement site. A posting station here would have defended the Wandle crossing in a similar way

to that in which the Hardham and Alfoldean stations defended crossings. The hinterland of the Merton settlement could hardly have been more inhospitable than that of the Alfoldean station and, in fact, was probably considerably less so.

None of this is conclusive. Mr. Titford's argument from distances is reasonable but also not conclusive. It is worth noting that the hard stage from Chichester to Hardham is also a 'long' one (if, indeed, the downland stages really were hard). It is also necessary to remember that we have no evidence about how the journey was organised. There is no reason why one of the terminal stages should not be a short one, allowing a late start or an early arrival.

Unfortunately this can never be tested archaeologically. The Merton site has gone for ever and little, if any, can remain at the most probable site at Ewell.

21 Evesham Road,
Reigate,
Surrey.

DENNIS TURNER