

are also likely to be later because of the way they cross wide areas of heavy clay²¹.

The implication is that the laying out of London at the best point for a port, the building of a bridge aimed at the very centre of the planned area and the construction of the main roads engineered to go direct to it must all have been designed at the same time, presumably as part of a major exercise to make the most of the opportunities provided by the new province. Perhaps there was dredging too, to make a proper channel for sea-going vessels: the story of the Britons fording the Thames near the tidal pool following the battle on the river implies that such work would have been necessary. Martin Millett sees the start of London in terms of foundation as an entrepot, but prefers 'private' initiative²². It seems to me that there must have been some sort of 'official' input because of the clear evidence for overall control and action across a wide area (the road grid for the settlement, its new bridge, and the roads laid out to serve it).

It has been suggested that "we know from Dio that the British notables received credits from the emperor Claudius, also from Seneca, and the premature foreclosure on these debts was one of the causes of the revolt of Boudica. The inference is

that Roman capitalists during the first years of the conquest were investing in British development, and as the main urban colonisation was still to come, this must have meant chiefly agriculture"²³. Perhaps an alternative suggestion would be investment in the building of London (and Verulamium)²⁴. I have previously proposed the governorship of Didius Gallus (AD 52-57) as the most appropriate time for the foundation of London (given the date suggested by the archaeological evidence), because he was probably sent to settle things down after a period of heavy fighting under Ostorius Scapula²⁵.

I would suggest therefore that there is a need to rethink the traditional view of the role of Richborough. Indeed, it is always dangerous to argue from negative evidence, but if there was no London until about AD 50, then this rather strengthens Hind's suggestion²⁶ that the traditional invasion idea is wrong. Landing at the very edge of the country so as to walk all the way through Kent and then all the way back to Colchester would have tended to highlight the potential importance of the London crossing from the word go. Coming from the Chichester/Silchester direction makes the failure to develop the London site in any way until c AD 50 more understandable²⁷.

21. Magilton's suggestion that Stane Street was originally laid out to the Pulborough area strengthens rather than weakens this proposal (J Magilton 'Roman roads in the Manhood Peninsula' in *Southern Archaeology for Chichester District Council The Archaeology of Chichester and District 1995* (1996) 31-4). I owe this reference to John Mills.

22. M Millett 'Characterising Roman London' in Bird *et al op cit* fn 19, 34.

23. S H Applebaum 'Roman Britain' in H P R Finberg (ed) *The agrarian history of England and Wales 1.2 AD 43-1042* (1972) 223.

24. It might be worth adding that the land on which London was built may well have been Trinovantian, so adding to the sense of injury. Millett suggests that it could have belonged

to the Cantiaci (*op cit* fn 22, 36), but the Thames must have counted for something in this area, especially as the Trinovantes/Catuvellauni seem to have dominated Kent in the late Iron Age.

25. Bird *op cit* fn 1, 270.

26. Hind *op cit* fn 17.

27. The Richborough monumental arch is often said to be a commemoration of the point at which Britain was first invaded, but there is no evidence that this was the case. Donald Strong concluded that "there is little doubt that its chief purpose was to symbolise the *accessus Britanniae*" (i.e. to mark the entrance to (or exit from) the province (D E Strong 'The monument' in Cunliffe *op cit* fn 2, 72)).

Letters

Excavations in Field 410, Brockley Hill, 1972

I READ WITH great interest the article by Paul Tyers on 'Amphoras and the origins of the Brockley Hill Roman pottery industry' (vol. 8, no. 11, Winter 1998). It is gratifying to note that Paul has gleaned further useful information from the assemblage of mid-1st century pottery recovered from a pit, Trench 2, Site B, Field 410, on the east side of modern Watling Street in 1972.

These were trial excavations, carried out to determine the damage caused by ploughing in January 1972, and it must be stressed that Trench 2 was merely a section through part of the post-medieval field ditch, and indeed through only a part of the pit. Lack of time and a shortage of labour prevented the more

complete excavation of this pit, and we had to transfer our efforts to site C, where 2nd-century pottery kilns were located. This was most frustrating for our small team of excavators, for we realised only too well the significance of this assemblage of locally produced early Roman pottery! However, there seemed at the time to be every likelihood of our returning to the pit to do it justice. Yet equally pleasing was the decision in 1973, by the then Department of the Environment, to schedule the western half of Field 410 and the Hilltop Cafe site. This may help to explain the selective nature of the Site B pottery report in 1972. The Site B pit pottery assemblage is therefore best described as part of a group, and I would urge caution when comparing it with the group of pottery from the more adequately excavated Bricket Wood kiln site. Again, in view of the limited nature of the 1972 excavations, it may also follow that we are looking at the products of more than one potter.

Although I have lived in rural mid-Bedfordshire for a number of years, I am always more than interested to hear from people researching Brockley Hill pottery.

Stephen A. Castle
1 Park Leys
Harlington
Dunstable
Bedfordshire LU5 6LY

Cranford Park

I READ WITH interest the article in the autumn issue by Colin and Eileen Bowlst about the as yet unidentified brick structure discovered last year in Cranford Park, Middlesex. I am a member of the Friends of Cranford Park and of Hayes and Harlington Local History Society, and also an associate of Frank Wheaton who was mentioned.

I have been an amateur local historian for more than twenty years, having come from a very old Hayes family. However, for the past year I have been compiling a book entitled *The Manor of Cranford A Brief History*, which is now awaiting publication. This not only covers other outlying buildings within the former Parish, but also the Berkeley family, St. Dunstan's church and other buildings past and present within the park.

I first took an interest in the structure when I was asked by the park rangers and a colleague of Frank Wheaton to identify some of the fragments which had been found, some of which were on display and had been incorrectly marked up. Among the items mentioned there were also many earthenware fragments: bulk ink jars, ginger beer bottles, Brunswick black-stove blacking, preserve jars, Dye jars, Malling ware, Frank Coopers Marmalade and a near-complete Edward VII Coronation cup. There were also numerous fragments of china bearing the marks of John Ridgeway & Co. 1841-55, and Copeland Late Spode 1894-1900. There appeared to be nothing earlier than about 1840 and nothing later than 1910, which seems to tie in with the conclusion that it was filled in shortly after the First World War.

However, what the structure was remains a mystery, although while researching at the London Metropolitan Archives, I did come across what was named as a Parish Tithe Map of 1858. This is a very large cloth map on a wood roll; on it various buildings are shaded in pink but unfortunately none of them are named. However, in the approximate vicinity of the structure it clearly shows a small building of some type, although it is square, which may as was suggested have been a superstructure.

I have accumulated considerable detailed lists of the buildings at Cranford, but none of them mention the one shown on the Tithe Map. During many months of research it has become an obsession to try to find out what the structure may have been; my communications to date have taken me from the LMA and the VCH across to the Central Library Archives in Oxford, to Berkeley Castle, and to the PRO at Kew.

Although I am at present carrying out research on the former le-mote manor house site, I am still awaiting a reply to a recent enquiry relating to some documents of the Berkeley manor house, which I have not yet seen; if they throw any light on the structure I will let you know.

Barry Raymond
86 Beavers Lane
Hounslow
Middlesex TW4 6EL

More on Saxon Kingston

IT WAS unfortunate that the draft of my note on Anglo-Saxon Kingston¹ supplied to Kingston Museum and Heritage Service did not reach Tim Everson², as I would have been delighted to incorporate Tim's comments on my text. Tim is quite right that Ralph de Diceto places seven Anglo-Saxon coronations at

Kingston³. However, it is perhaps worth considering the sources used by Ralph de Diceto. Neither William of Malmesbury nor Florence of Worcester identifies this number of coronations with Kingston, and it appears that Ralph de Diceto is his own source for at least two (Edward the Elder and Edmund). The correlation between the list of coronations provided by Ralph de Diceto in the late 12th century and the identification of seven coronations in the 19th century is no coincidence, as it would appear that de Diceto's list was accepted uncritically by (amongst others) Lysons and Manning and Bray as though he were a contemporary source.

Shaan Butters may have independently come to the conclusion that the Kings Stone was part of the fabric of St. Mary's Chapel in her *The Book of Kingston* in 1995. However, in his 1861 lecture⁴ *The Antiquities of Kingston*, the Rev. H. P. Measor, MA, then vicar of Kingston, first raised this possibility:

"I am sorry to be obliged to confess that, against my own desires, I have come to the conclusion that the stone at Clattern Bridge is not a genuine relic of the Saxon coronations. There is no mention in historical records of such a stone having been preserved in St. Mary's Chapel, though we are told of the pictures & C., which it contained . . .

. . . no satisfactory proof can be given that the stone was ever in St. Mary's Chapel. It was for more than 100 years lying about in an Inn Yard, and though the age in which the chapel was pulled down was not remarkable for its archaeological interest, yet we can hardly believe that so curious a relic as this is said to be, should neither have been mentioned nor preserved. I do not doubt that the stone is the foundation of a pier in St. Mary's Chapel, stones were generally used for that purpose not shapen or squared."

Measor's views on the origins of the Kings Stone were repeated in the guide books to All Saints Parish Church until relatively recently.

I was not aware of Shaan Butters' article⁵ prior to Tim's letter. I have followed up the post-838 references to *Freorichburna* with John Blair, and understand from him that a charter of 866⁶ is dated at *Fregetburna* in Surrey (clearly the same place as *Freorichburna*), some twenty-three years after the first reference to *Cyningestun* in 838. This may well indicate that *Freorichburna*/*Fregetburna* is not the same place as *Cyningestun*. It is however possible that two names might be used in parallel for the same place, while clearly there were several Anglo-Saxon settlements scattered about the area now occupied by modern Kingston.

Shaan Butters' *The Book of Kingston* was not included in the footnotes of my own note as I did not use it as a source. Shaan's book is an excellent social history of Kingston, which I would recommend to anyone with an interest in the town, especially for the periods post-1086.

Duncan Hawkins
CGMs Consulting
7th floor, Newspaper House
8-16 Great New Street
London EC4A 3BN

1. D Hawkins 'Anglo-Saxon Kingston: a shifting pattern of settlement' *London Archaeol* 8 no. 10 (1998) 271-8.
2. See T Everson 'Anglo-Saxon Kingston' *London Archaeol* 8 no. 11 (1998) 308.
3. W. Stubbs (ed.) *Radulfi de Diceto Decani Lundoniensis Opera Historica* vol. 1 (1876) (Rolls Series) 140-8, 235-7.
4. Published text in the Kingston Local History Collections.
5. S Butters 'Was Kingston once Moreford?' *Surrey Hist* 5, no. 3 (1996) 135.
6. P Sawyer *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Charters* no. 330.