and the danger zone in front of the Blue Anchor postern from three. The dead ground close to the wall could be easily defended from the wall-walk, the parapet crenellations being most suitably arranged for this purpose. A score of men could hold this critical front, defending a hundred yards of quayside out of range of the castle.

If these suggestions are correct, the Southampton Arcade affords an unparalleled example of a medieval defensive battery, a masterpiece of conversion by a designer skilled in both architecture and military engineering. There is other evidence of such a genius at work in southern England at this time. Many castles and town walls have towers with ‘keyhole’ gunports facing forward, left and right, but this simple layout was elaborated at the west gate of Canterbury, which was begun shortly before 1380 (probably in 1378) and may therefore be closely contemporary with the Arcade. The twin-towered gatehouse has openings at three levels, each with a vertical slit above a round hole 10 in. across. On plan the axes of the openings are inclined at 45° to each other, and the elevation may be developed diagrammatically thus:

```
I   I
I   I   GATEWAY   I   I   I
I   I   I   I   I   I   I   I
```

This design presents certain problems of analysis. The two innermost ‘keyholes’ face each other at a distance of only three yards, but they control access to the entrance itself. Again, the two backward-facing openings on the S. tower look at the line of the city wall at point-blank range, but the wall may have been raked back there, or there may have been another reason for the extra defence. The weapons employed could have been larger than those at Southampton, but the same idea of overlapping fields of fire was planned for at Canterbury in terms of different levels. The name of Henry Yevele is associated with both the Arcade and the Canterbury west gate. O’Neil pointed out the close resemblance between the ‘keyhole’ gunports in the Winchester west gate and those of Dr. Molaine’s tower on the Canterbury town wall, both of the early 1390s, and Yevele was involved in both these rebuildings. The conclusion that he was the designer of these advanced fortifications seems inescapable.

D. F. RENN

THE CAEN CONFERENCE, 1963

The sixth annual Conference of the Society was held at Caen from 6–9 April 1963 and had as its theme ‘England and Normandy, 911–1204’. More than a hundred people attended. The Conference was organized by Professor M. de Bouard, to whom and to his local helpers, as well as to the University of Caen, the Society owes a great debt.

On 6 April delegates visited Brionne, Bernay, Jumièges and Vatteville. In the evening of the same day Professor D. C. Douglas lectured on ‘The political-historical background of Anglo-Norman relations 911–1204’, after which a reception was given by the University of Caen. On 7 April the following lectures were delivered: M. Adigard des Gautries, ‘La toponymie et l’anthroponymie de l’Angleterre et de la Normandie du 10ème au 13ème siècles’; A. J. Taylor, ‘Military architecture in England and Normandy to 1204—affinities, divergences and problems’; M. P. Hélot, ‘La rôle de la Normandie et de l’Angleterre dans l’élaboration du style gothique’ and Prof. M. de Bouard, ‘Remarques sur quelques “earthworks” normands’. On 8 April there was an excursion to Bayeux, Cerisy la Forêt and Lessay. On 9 April there was an excursion to various churches in Caen and to Rouen.

D. M. WILSON