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Denise Silvester-Carr

We are sad to announce the death on 6 September of Denise Silvester-Carr, author and journalist. Denise was a longstanding Council member of the LTS and a former editor of the Newsletter. There will be an obituary in the next issue of the London Topographical Record.

Notes and News

The 115th AGM of the Society was held on 6 July in the splendid setting of the Great Hall of St Bartholomew's Hospital. Minutes will be circulated in the next Newsletter. Officers and Council members elected are listed on the back of this newsletter. A large audience heard a fascinating talk by Dorian Gerhold on his searches in a variety of archives for early plans of London buildings, which resulted in the Society's publication this year of London Plotted, Plans of London buildings up to 1720. It was interesting to hear that his interest in urban plans had been sparked by Ralph Treswell’s Tudor and Jacobean surveys, the subject of the Society’s publication No.135 in 1987.

The magnificent London Plotted is the first volume to be edited by Sheila O’Connell, who has bravely taken on the task following her retirement from the Prints and Drawings Department of the British Museum. Work is now in hand on next year’s publication, jointly with the Bodleian Library, a selection of London views from the collections of the eighteenth century antiquary Richard Gough, introduced by Bernard Nurse.

Browsing through the Treswell volume, where over three-quarters of the plans are reproduced in black and white, and comparing it with the colourful London Plotted, makes one aware how much one gains from the use of colour. And so we have applied the same principle to our newsletter, and hope the new look will meet with members’ approval. We are very grateful to Ludo Press for their constructive assistance over this.

You should now be in possession of London Plotted, a book in a dark blue dustjacket, weighing about 2lb. If not, please contact the Treasurer, preferably by email.

You might like to give a copy of the book as a Christmas present. Send £30 (special offer for Christmas, expires 20 December) to the Treasurer who will post it off to your donee within the UK with any message you like to supply.

Subscriptions are due on 1 January. £20 for UK addresses, £30 abroad. With the ‘improved’ service from our bank it is difficult to distinguish between standing order payments and individual payments made using the BACS bank transfer, so if there is no invoice attached to your newsletter you may still need to take action to renew your membership. If you are not sure, ask the Treasurer, again preferably by email. Your January 2016 bank statement may tell you how you paid this year.

Our volunteer project on parish maps, masterminded by Simon Morris, is making good progress. The increasing number of requests for help from LTS members from other organisations and individuals demonstrates the respect in which our membership is held. In a previous issue the British Film Institute asked for help in identifying London film locations. Their report on the first year of their project ‘London on Film’ acknowledges our financial help in cataloguing and digitising nine diverse archival films on London, which formed a centrepiece of their summer programme at BFI southbank. For more details see bfi.org.uk/Britain-on-film.

In this issue you are invited to contribute information on research projects which range from medieval London mayors to eighteenth century prizefighting locations, and to participate in the Survey of London’s interactive research on Whitechapel. Those interested in geo-referencing and website testing will be welcomed by the ‘Layers of London’ project of the Institute of Historical Research.

Members may like to know that our retired editor Ann Saunders has successfully achieved her long-planned move. Ann and Bruce’s address is now The Barn, Mimm’s Lane, Shenley, Herts WD7 9AP, tel. 01923 857359. Ann writes that ‘members who feel curious can come out to see me, but telephone first.’ We wish Ann and Bruce well in their new home.

Next year’s AGM will take place on Wednesday 5 July at Queen Mary College, Mile End Road. Details will be in the May Newsletter.

Anniversaries; Events; Exhibitions

London during the Great Fire, seen from across the Thames, from B. Lambert, History and Survey of London and its Environs, 1806

The autumn anniversary which has achieved much publicity was 4 September, 350 years since the Great Fire of London. Our illustration on p.1 is from the Museum of London which is commemorating 1666 with an ambitious interactive display and a series of activities both on the ground and online. For details see Museumof London.org.uk/fire. The handsome accompanying book by Hazel Forsyth, senior curator at the Museum, Butcher, Baker, Candlestickmaker: surviving the Great Fire will be reviewed in our next
issue. There have been related events elsewhere. A week of imaginative spectacles, organised by the arts group Artichoke, included giant dominoes falling along the paths of the Fire, fiery light projections on to St Paul’s and poetry readings from the top of the Monument. The finale, managed by Artichoke with the American burn artist David Best, was the burning of ‘an artistic impression of the seventeenth-century City’ on two 50ft barges on the Thames. Its development involved numerous projects in local schools, with the practical work of creating the rather beautiful timber evocation of old London being carried out by young unemployed Londoners. If you missed this you can watch a video with commentary on the Artichoke website. For more on what really happened in the Great Fire see Ian Doolittle’s article on p.4.

John Gibson. A British Sculptor in Rome, in the private rooms of the Royal Academy, is where to go if you are looking for a quiet corner in Burlington House. This is a small exhibition of sculpture and drawings recognising an almost forgotten figure, a once eminent neo-classical sculptor of the early nineteenth century who died 150 years ago. It is accompanied by an attractive booklet with essays by Anna Frasca-Rath and Annette Wickham (Royal Academy, £9.95). Gibson was born in North Wales in 1790 and trained as a cabinet-maker. Thanks to the patronage of the banker William Roscoe and his circle, he travelled to Rome, studied with Canova and set up his studio there, which became a well-known attraction for British grand tourists. He exhibited at the Great Exhibition of 1851; Prince Albert was among his admirers and it was due to him that Gibson created the idealised sculpture of Queen Victoria with figures of Justice and Clemency in the Palace of Westminster. When Gibson died in 1866 he left the contents of his Rome studio to the Royal Academy. But Albert was dead and taste had changed. Gibson’s plaster casts were damaged in transit and badly repaired; the rather feeble ‘Gibson gallery’ which eventually opened in 1876 in Burlington House was never popular, and was dismantled in the 1960s. The exhibition brings together his delicate drawings and some of the sculpture, providing a context for his rather forlorn works surviving outside the Sackler rooms on the top floor. www.Gibson-trail.uk has a map and details of his other works in London.

Robert Adam’s London is the subject of an exhibition at Sir John Soane’s Museum, 13 Lincoln’s Inn Fields, from 30 November to 11 March. London Parks and Garden Trust has a winter lecture season with much to interest London topographers. Lectures take place on Monday evenings at 70-77 Cowcross Street EC1M 6EL; 7pm. 14 November: Brompton Cemetery by Sally Prothero; 12 December: Capability Brown in London by Steffie Shields; 9 January: New Jerusalem, the Good City and the Good Society by Ken Worpole; 13 February: Post-war Sculpture by Roger Bowdler; 13 March: the London Skyline campaign by Barbara Weiss. For season tickets see lectureseasonticket.eventbrite.co.uk and for more about the LPGT see their excellent website Londongardenstrust.org

A special offer from the London Society
Save 20% off membership and get a free copy of the London Society Journal.

Founded in 1912, the London Society exists to help promote the debate on the sort of city we want to live and work in.

It arranges events and visits for its members to a variety of places, buildings and institutions, some not generally open to the public; holds debates and lectures, including the annual Sir Banister Fletcher Lecture, addressed by distinguished speakers, and twice a year, the Society’s Journal, containing writing and photo essays about different aspects of the city, is sent free of charge to all members.

The Society’s motto is ‘antiqua tegenda, pulchra petenda, futura rolenda’: ‘Protect the best of the past; Strive for quality today; Plan properly for the future’ – a mission that the Society still promotes through its publications, events and lobbying.

London Topographical Society members can get 12 months’ membership of the London Society for just £20 (it’s usually £25) and will also receive a free copy of a recent Journal when they join. For full details visit www.londonsociety.org.uk/society

Queen Victoria supported by Justice and Clemency, Palace of Westminster, by John Gibson
How many houses were destroyed in the Great Fire of London?

Our member Ian Doolittle explores the source of some much repeated statements.

To readers familiar with the history of the Great Fire this will seem an odd question to ask. The total of 13,200 is inscribed on the Monument. It is firmly set in all the histories, whether popular or academic, and invariably features in descriptions of the destruction. The most detailed account appears in W. G. Bell’s *Great Fire of London*:

“373 acres burnt within the walls, and
63 acres 3 roods without the walls.
89 parish churches, besides chapels burnt.
13,200 houses burnt in over 400 streets and courts.
75 acres 3 roods still standing within the walls unburnt.
11 parishes without the walls yet standing.”

Apart from attributing them to the surveyors Jonas Moore and Ralph Gratrix (now usually Greatorex), Bell gives no source for the figures and given their importance I thought I would trace their origin. As far as I could tell, subsequent historians have simply taken the figures as fact. So I looked further.

I thought I had found the key clue in the scholarly biography of Moore by Frances Willmoth, who states that the survey only appears in Hollar’s *Exact Survey*. That rehearses some but not all of the analysis given in Bell and I thought that perhaps Bell had simply embellished the figures. Then I came across a fuller version in the controversial pamphlet which purported to give *A True and Faithful* [i.e. anti-Catholic] *Account of the Several Informations exhibited to the ... Committee appointed ... to inquire into the late dreadful burning of the City of London* (1667). This included the details in Bell’s list (albeit in a different order) save for the reference to 400 streets and courts. Perhaps that detail was an addition by Bell? No: it was included in the Monument inscription (i.e. in 1677). And then I found the same certificate (with minor differences), in manuscript, in the Verney archives:

“Upon the second of September 1666 the fire began in London, at one Farriner’s house, a baker in Pudding Lane, between the hours of one and two in the morning, and continued burning until the sixth of September following; consuming, as by the surveyors appears in print, three hundred [and] seventy three acres within the walls of the City of London, and sixty three acres three roods without the walls. There remains seventy five acres three roods yet standing within the walls un-burnt: eighty nine parish churches, besides chapels, burnt: eleven parishes within the walls yet standing: houses burnt, thirteen thousand two hundred.

(Jonas Moore )
per (                     ) Surveyors
(Ralph Gatrix)”

The phrasing and indeed the meaning is odd: what in particular does the phrase about appearing in print signify? Was there an earlier fuller version – the one Bell might have been using? But these two ‘certificates’ at least made it clear that there was indeed a contemporary survey which ‘produced’ the 13,200 figure. So I then investigated how the survey was carried out.

Moore and Greatorex together and separately had successful surveying careers. Moore was also a scientific instrument-maker and Greatorex an engineer. The figures in their certificate have a precision which suggests they are derived from systematic, professional work.

Who then appointed them? They are described as certifying their figures as simply ‘surveyors’. They certainly do not appear to have been commissioned by the City itself. Many historians follow Bell in calling them Corporation Surveyors, but Dr Willmoth found no record of their appointment in the City’s archives; and T. F. Reddaway, who studied the post-Fire City records more closely than anyone else, makes no mention of them at all. He refers to 13,200 as a fact requiring no attribution.

It is more likely that Moore and Greatorex were appointed by the Crown. They had already worked for the Navy/Ordnance Board and had recently worked together surveying the new fortified colony of Tangier. It was this work that prompted Evelyn to recommend Moore as a surveyor of the destroyed City. I have not, however, found any reference to the appointment in what I assume are the likeliest
sources – the Privy Council Registers and the State Papers. Perhaps the plain designation ‘surveyors’ indicates an informal appointment?

And when was the work carried out? No date is attached to the Verney certificate, but a few of the figures appear in the famous London Gazette for 3-10 September. In a ‘list of buildings destroyed in this terrible disaster [which] hath been taken’ there appeared ‘13,200 houses’, ‘87 [not 89] churches’, ‘6 chapels’ and various public buildings and such like.

My current surmise is that immediately after the Fire Moore and Greatorex were commissioned by the King to give a basic assessment of the damage. Some of their figures were reported straightaway in the London Gazette. The full printed version was as Bell rehearses (as witness its stilted phrasing), while somewhat tailored versions were circulated first in manuscript. The latter version for some reason became the one reproduced in post-Fire publications, though for the Monument the full version was consulted. But this is only my best guess from my findings so far and much turns on Bell’s missing source. Can a reader point me to it? I hope it’s not obvious.

Of course, the final step is to ‘test’ the 13,200 figure itself. What does it mean? Properties in the City were then so sub-divided and intermingled that the term ‘house’ had different meanings. I am looking into the number of ‘houses’ in the City in 1666. I am planning to say something about it in the next LTS Record.

– Ian Doolittle

1. C. Welch, History of the Monument (1893), 29-30. The use of Roman numerals for 13,200 went wrong!
2. (1920), 174. I have ignored Bell’s (entirely justified) correction of 89 to 87.
4. Together with some new/different figures, referring to wards not parishes.
5. Sue Baxter, archivist to the Claydon House Trust, has been most helpful.
6. I have modernised spelling etc. but for obvious reasons kept the odd phrasing. The signatures are in the same (copyist’s) hand.
7. Rebuilding of London (1940), 26, (73), (75) and 270.
9. There is no clue in the document or the archive. The fact that it is included in its natural chronological place in Memoirs of the Verney Family, eds. F. P. and M. M. Verney (2 vols., 3rd edn, 1925), ii. 259 evidently does not signify.
11. The total of 12,000 given in Rege Sincera’s Observations (1667), 13, is unlikely to be an early estimate, before the Moore and Greatorex figures appeared (as Bell surmised: Fire, 223). In fact, it may have been a total for houses within the walls: W. Maitland, The History and Survey of London (2 vols, 1756), li. 837. The figure appears also in a foreigner’s account dated 20 September: Bell, Fire, 330.
12. i.e. it includes the 400 streets; but in other respects it departs from Moore and Greatorex.

Changing London

If you explore the confusion around the Crossrail works near Tottenham Court Road, you may arrive at the once quiet corner where Flitcroft’s elegant Georgian church stands as successor to the medieval leper hospital of St Giles-in-the-Fields. Across the road some battered eighteenth-century houses have been allowed to survive in Denmark Street; round the corner there are only shored-up façades facing the blocky forms of the lower parts of Centrepoint (you can see the great hole behind from Charing Cross Road). But press on south, past the west front of St Giles down a little passageway, and there is a surprising sight of greenery. The Phoenix Garden (taking its appropriate name from the Phoenix theatre in Charing Cross Road) was created here in 1984 on a carpark made on a bombsite. It is now the only survival from seven community gardens established with the help of the Covent Garden Open Spaces committee. After many struggles the garden acquired a new 20 year lease in 2015, and relandscaping is in progress, with a smart new garden building at the southern end. For more information see www.thephoenixgarden.org where there is an excellently researched history of the site by Jane Palm-Gold.

Circumspice

What is the subject of this sculpture and where is it? For the answer see p.15.
The Park Villages and HS2

Geoffrey Tyack, whose books include studies of the architects John Nash and James Pennethorne, tells the story of Nash’s influential Park Villages on the edge of Regent’s Park, and their decline due to the coming of the railways. He highlights how the planned fast railway line from Euston will further undermine the character of Park Village East.

Park Village West has long been recognised as an almost perfectly preserved prototype of the nineteenth-century planned middle-class suburb. Leafy, secluded and architecturally highly eclectic, this attractive enclave was first conceived by Nash in 1823 as part of a plan for developing a seven-acre tract of Crown land beyond the north-eastern corner of Regent’s Park, and was built in 1832-7 under the supervision of his pupil James Pennethorne, who inherited the older architect’s practice following his semi-retirement to the Isle of Wight. Nash’s original project, designed ‘more for amusement than profit’ (National Archives, Cres 2/778; MPE 911), envisaged the creation of a ‘village’ of picturesque cottages on either side of a branch of the Regent’s Canal, completed in 1820, of which he was a major promoter. One group of houses would be built around the loop that now constitutes Park Village West, leading off Albany Street. Another, larger, group would be strung out along a sinuous ‘village road’ (now Park Village East) leading south-east from the present Parkway to the canal basin and Cumberland Market, laid out by Nash as the economic hub of a planned new artisan quarter, now entirely redeveloped for council flats. The first houses were built along the canal side of the ‘village road’ in 1824-6, and were illustrated in a pair of engravings by T. H. Shepherd in James Elmes’s Metropolitan Improvements (1827), one of them showing the curving street with the York and Albany pub at the far end, almost as it is today, the other the backs of the houses with their gardens sloping down to the canal with its traffic of barges. More houses followed in the late 1820s, most of them semi-detached but some detached, their disparate architectural styles contributing to the sense of ‘variety’ which was an essential characteristic of the Picturesque aesthetic. By 1829, when Philip Hardwick surveyed the land (National Archives, MPE 907), Nos 1 to 28 had all been built on the canal side of the street, as had a group on the far end of the other side, bounded by a ‘Serpentine Road’.

It is highly unlikely that Nash, preoccupied at the end of his career with the building of Buckingham Palace, devoted much time or effort to the detailed design of the Park Village East houses, but their stuccoed exteriors (e.g. the Neo-Tudor Nos 2-4, and No. 36 with its octagonal tower) echo the earlier country houses and villas with which he had made his reputation as an architect. Some were built by William Smith, builder of Sussex Place, one of the terraces on the western side of Regent’s Park; others may have been designed by Charles James Mathews, a pupil of Augustus Pugin, one of Nash’s most important early collaborators, who later retired from architectural practice to become an actor. The leases were bought as investments by businessmen and shopkeepers, some of them based in Regent Street, completed to Nash’s designs in 1823. They sub-let the houses to middle-class occupants who included the brother of the future Cardinal Newman, a Professor of Latin at the newly-founded University College, London; he lived at No. 14, a three-bay detached villa with a projecting slate roof on eaves-brackets.
The far side of Park Village East, away from the canal, was less attractive to investors and tenants, and it became even less so when the London and Birmingham Railway was driven through a cutting at the bottom of the gardens in 1836–8 on its approach to Euston Station. Building nevertheless continued, and nearly all of the available plots were shown as occupied in a rate-book of July 1837 (St Pancras parish, London Borough of Camden archives). But in 1900–6 the houses on the far (eastern) side of the street were all demolished to make way for new railway tracks, now hidden behind a brick retaining wall (see the map above). This led to the loss of the ‘Serpentine Road’ at the southern end of the street, along with the attractive round-towered Italianate villa at its northern end shown in a watercolour of c.1840 (Camden archives, Heal Collection). In 1941 a bomb hit Nos 18–20, a pretty Tudor-Gothic pair in the canal side of the street, the site of which is now occupied by a block of flats called Nash House, and the canal itself was filled in with rubble after the end of the Second World War. Since then the remaining houses in both Park Village East and West have been well-preserved by the Crown Estate and cherished by their occupants, but the future of those in the eastern part of Nash’s ‘village’ has now been thrown into question. Under plans for the approach of HS2 into Euston the roadway of Park Village East will be dug up in order to construct a steel and concrete structure for the high-speed trains, a new retaining wall erected opposite the houses, and, most damaging, ‘ground anchors’ inserted underneath the houses, potentially damaging their foundations (see www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cmhs2/petitions/0834.pdf.). Not only will the residents’ lives be disrupted by up to seven years of engineering works; the very existence of an integral part of one of the most significant urban developments of the nineteenth century – the ancestor of countless planned suburbs throughout the world – may, assuming the project goes ahead, be threatened. All lovers of London’s urban landscape should hasten to see and enjoy it while they still have the opportunity.

– Geoffrey Tyack

The Survey of London in Whitechapel

Peter Guillery introduces a new approach to research by The Survey of London – in which your participation is invited – (see the website mentioned below) – and sets it in the context of the Survey’s past history.

East London is the Survey of London’s spiritual home. C. R. Ashbee launched the project in 1894–6 for a monograph about Trinity Hospital on the Mile End Road, followed up with the first Survey of London parish volume, devoted to Bromley by Bow and published in 1900. Since then eastern dalliances have been at best occasional. It is 60 years since the Survey covered Spitalfields (volume 27, 1957), and 30 since we last embarked on the study of an East End district – that was Poplar, Blackwall and the Isle of Dogs, where work began in 1986 (volumes 43 and 44, 1994). In recent years the Survey has turned to south London, previously long neglected, to investigate Woolwich and Battersea (volumes 48 to 50, 2012 and 2013), and to the West End for what we are calling South-East Marylebone (volumes 51 and 52, forthcoming 2017), and Oxford Street (volume 53, forthcoming 2019). So it seems timely and appropriate that the Survey is now beginning work on the parish of Whitechapel, an East End place of great historical interest in the throes of major change.

This will lead in due course and in the traditional way to a book in the parish series (volume 54). However, we are keen to make it known that the Survey is following a new path to that end. Now that we are housed within a university, in the Bartlett School of Architecture at University College London since 2013, the Survey is eligible to receive research-council funding. This is important because the kinds of innovations that we have long wanted to introduce to the Survey’s methods have not been possible heretofore for want of money. We are delighted and fortunate that the Arts and Humanities Research Council has approved a grant proposal for a three-year experimental project to try out in Whitechapel a reshaping of the way the Survey conducts its research.
In collaboration with the Bartlett’s Centre for Advanced Spatial Analysis we have been able to create a website – Survey of London, Histories of Whitechapel (surveyoflondon.org), launched in September 2016. This functions as a research base as we accumulate information about Whitechapel. Crucially, the map-based website will be participative up to the end of 2018, enabling any and all with an interest in or experiences of Whitechapel’s places and buildings (that very much includes you, dear Top Soc newsletter reader) to contribute knowledge, ranging from research findings to reminiscences to photographs or drawings. We are keen not only to engage our existing readership, but also to extend it, both locally and globally, and to widen our sources in a way that we feel would have pleased Ashbee, for whom the recording of London’s built fabric was what would now be called a public-engagement mission. The grant has also made possible the cataloguing of Whitechapel archives (mainly deeds) held by Tower Hamlets Local History Library and Archives, material that will soon be accessible through their online catalogue, the commissioning of new photographs and drawings, and the hosting of events, such as workshops, walks and exhibitions (see the website).

**Whitechapel’s history: a story of immigration**

Whitechapel has a rich and complicated history in which immigration has a central place. As Elizabethan London expanded, many came from the English countryside and John Stow famously found Whitechapel ‘pestered with Cottages and Allies’. There followed Irish, Huguenot and German arrivals in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Sugar baking, based on Caribbean imports into the Port of London, was a significant local industry, largely handled by German immigrants who possessed the secrets of the trade – Whitechapel retains Lutheran and Catholic German churches, though the former is no longer in use as such. It is better known that large-scale Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe followed pogroms in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Then in the post-war period there was another major shift in the area’s population as Bengali immigrants, largely Muslim, settled in Whitechapel. The majority of the district’s population now is of Bangladeshi origin, albeit many at one or two generations remove, and there are numerous other smaller groups of recent immigrants. There is also much new purpose-built student housing, and gentrification has taken hold in the area’s remaining pre-Victorian houses and in a slew of new tower blocks across the parts of the parish nearest the City. This area is bisected by Whitechapel High Street on which stands the Whitechapel Gallery, though ‘placemakers’ are spinning vigorously to re-designate it Aldgate – Whitechapel evidently has undesirable connotations. On Commercial Street, directly opposite Toynbee Hall, new apartment blocks place-make with yet more absurd naming – Kensington Apartments, Ladbroke House and Sloane Apartments; they evidently do not expect prospective purchasers to be local. Whatever it is called, this inner district has been transformed in the last few years by cliffs of glass.

Further east on Whitechapel Road the former churchyard of St Mary Maletown, the parish church that replaced the eponymous medieval ‘white chapel’, is now Altab Ali Park, renamed in memory of a young man murdered in a racist attack in 1978. The park has a Shaheed Minar (martyrs’ monument) of 1999, a secular memorial copied from a larger monument in Dhaka that commemorates those who died fighting for Bangladeshi independence. Beyond is the Whitechapel Bell Foundry, an extraordinary survival of manufacturing given its central location, which retains front buildings from when it moved to this site in the 1740s from the then densely built-up inner part of the parish. Further along is the East London Mosque, London’s most used mosque and a major local presence. It moved here from the Commercial Road in the 1970s and into its present main building in the early 1980s. The mosque has expanded gradually since on to a larger site that now
comprehends the former Great Synagogue on Fieldgate Street, the last of many dozens of synagogues in the parish, now fallen redundant and possibly destined for use as a heritage centre to encourage links between faiths.

Whitechapel highlights
The east end of Whitechapel Road is what all would agree is Whitechapel. Here the tube station (stations are the latter-day anchors for place names more than high streets or parish churches) has mutating entrances while it is reconstructed for Crossrail, a change that will have a further transformative effect. Across the road is another landmark, the Royal London Hospital. Since 2012 the hospital has occupied new buildings, set back from the road. The former roadside hospital, which traces its origins to the 1750s, is to be converted to be a civic centre for Tower Hamlets Council. That seems an enlightened and hearteningly appropriate reuse of an historic public building.

The parish of Whitechapel also extends south to take in places not normally associated with the place-name. Allie Street, Leman Street, Mansell Street and Prescott Street form a near-square on the map that was laid out around 1700 with good houses, a handful of which survive. Also here are notable reminders of the scale of the co-operative movement in Co-operative Wholesale Society’s buildings, now largely converted to residential use. Finally, there is Wellclose Square, laid out by Nicholas Barbon at the end of the seventeenth century. A Danish church at its centre was replaced by a charming Victorian school and early houses were all cleared in the 1960s, while close by Wilton’s Music Hall has been preserved.

The Survey of London has long since moved on from cherry-picking major sites, so perhaps mentioning these highlights is misleading as to the nature of our work. There is a great deal else to be investigated, mostly of a more quotidian character. Our interest is in everything on the ground and, within reason, governed by pragmatism, what has gone. Our interactive map is made up of 1,395 vectorised polygons, each representing a building, behind which there are historic maps for help in reconstructing vanished topographies. Clicking on any site opens the possibility of reading content already present (in many cases there is as yet no more than an address and a rough identifying snapshot), and of contributing stories, facts, images – anything historical about Whitechapel’s buildings (though not too much please by way of Jack the Ripper-ology, amply housed elsewhere on the internet). Please do contribute. We are eagerly looking forward to compiling this Survey of London volume together with our readers.

Hidden in the corner of the map…: town vignettes on early maps and charts

Peter Barber, formerly head of the Map Department in the British Library, reflects on how the views of towns and buildings which can be discovered on early maps may reveal the interests and priorities of patrons or mapmakers.

Modern maps, whether digital or hard copy, are generally intended to answer predictable questions in a standardised way. Since the location of features is considered a prime requirement, the locations of towns and cities on small to medium-scale maps are indicated by signs that have become immediately recognisable to most users through centuries of repetition.

This has not always been so, however. While signs – of varying degrees of elaboration but lacking individualised features – are to be seen on maps from earliest times (for instance on medieval copies of Roman maps of their empire, or on the ‘Gough’ map of the Great Britain now dated to about 1400 in the Bodleian Library), early maps and sea charts often contain minimised views and, later, plans of town ultimately derived from
direct observation or survey. ‘Ultimately’ is the key word. While none seem to have been the product of direct observation, neither are the vignettes on maps necessarily unthinking copies of their prototypes. Certain features may be exaggerated, or specific buildings added in ways which throw light on the values of the mapmaker or their patron.

As has often been pointed out, the Hereford World Map of about 1300 contains a realistic depiction of Lincoln cathedral on top of a hill – a feature which almost certainly appeared on the map’s model, (which was created at Lincoln), while the importance of Hereford is acknowledged on the map through the depiction of nearby Clee Hill rather than the town itself. The same map – and most medieval world maps influenced by the theories of an early twelfth-century German theologian, Hugh, who taught in the Abbey of St Victor near Paris – also has a realistic map of Paris as an island in the Seine. The years that saw the creation of the Hereford map, witnessed very different, and more utilitarian sea charts being created in Catalonia and Italy. The only decoration on the Italian-style charts – mostly made in Venice – are vignettes of Venice and its rival republic, Genoa, as seen from the sea.

As Catherine Delano Smith has demonstrated in the most thorough recent discussion of the evolution of map signs in early modern Europe, the years between 1530 and 1560 were the golden age of the town vignette on European maps. England at that time had no map trade of its own and virtually no maps were printed here either. However it was close to Antwerp, which was becoming a European mapping centre, and the English were becoming increasingly adept at mapmaking – most of which appeared in manuscript. As a result, views of London appear as vignettes on a number of these early maps, such as one of the manuscript maps used by Henry VIII in planning the journey to England of Anne of Cleves in 1539 (British Library Cotton MS Augustus I.i.64), the map of the British Isles by George Lily that was published in Rome in 1546 or an anonymous woodcut map of the British Isles printed in the Netherlands in 1548-9, the unique surviving example of which is now in a private American collection.

Such vignette views are of particular importance to people with an interest in London history because so few other views of medieval and early modern London are now known. It is generally assumed that only a minuscule fraction of this early material – perhaps as little as 5% – now survives. So the historian has to clutch at straws – and these vignettes are one of them. As I have argued elsewhere, though they are not original works in themselves, they give as close an idea as is now possible of the lost and much larger prototype. These are likely to have been much copied and well-known in their time and to have formed the accepted image of early Tudor London.

After 1560 the percentage of non-individualised settlement signs on printed maps increased, and from about 1590 the miniaturised views and town plans tended to appear in the borders of printed maps – particularly those published in Amsterdam. But the particularised vignette on a map did not disappear. There is, by way of an example, an attractive miniature view of London on John Norden’s map of Middlesex in the Middlesex volume of his Speculum Britanniae, published in 1593. Moreover, in this respect manuscript maps followed their own trajectory. Some may have been no more than rough sketches on paper or parchment, but many – and a high percentage of those that survive – were objects of exquisite draftsmanship commissioned by or intended for presentation to the great and the good, including the monarch. They often contain details which, while of little relevance to the theme of the map, repay detailed study.
There is, for instance, in the British Library a fine manuscript chart of the seas surrounding South-East England, dateable to 1596, by the celebrated English hydrographer, William Borough (British Library Cotton Augustus I.i.17). Intended for presentation to Elizabeth I herself, it is primarily geared to assisting in planning for the defence of England, and the coast of Kent in particular, from a Spanish invasion. Yet, almost lost in the top left-hand corner, there is a fascinating vignette of London. It was probably intended to intrigue the Queen and seduce her into looking at the whole map, rather than handing it over, unseen, to a minister as seems to have been her way: contrary to the popular perception, Elizabeth was not much interested in maps. If this was Borough’s motivation, we are the ultimate beneficiaries, as I hope to explain in an article that is due to appear in the next Record.

But, in the meanwhile, I would advise readers to take a close look at early maps covering the London area, however irrelevant their subject matter may at first glance appear to be!

– Peter Barber


An appeal for help! Medieval and sixteenth-century Mayors of London missing from the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography

London’s first known mayor was in office no later than 1194. Of the men who held the mayoralty in the centuries down to the death of Elizabeth I, just over 400 years, 77 are the subjects of articles in Oxford DNB. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries it was common for a man to be mayor more than once, sometimes for several years in a row. But even when that is taken into account, the number of mayors not in the Dictionary is considerably larger than that of mayors who are thus commemorated. Given the importance of their office in a national, as well as a purely civic context, this seems regrettable, and I would like to invite contributions to fill at least some of the gaps. On the LTS website is a list with the names of mayors. Those who are the subjects, or co-subjects, of Oxford DNB articles have been italicised (underlining indicates that articles have been commissioned, but have yet to appear in one of the Dictionary’s online releases). Of the rest, some – especially among the early mayors – may prove too obscure or ill-documented to qualify for inclusion: as a broad generalisation, we would expect a worthwhile entry to contain at least 500 words. Anyone wishing to contribute an article is invited to contact me at henry.summerson@tiscali.co.uk – I look forward to hearing from you, and will be happy to provide information or advice.

– Dr Henry Summerson, Associate Research Editor (pre-1600), Oxford DNB

STOP PRESS
21st Century Media!

The Society now has a Twitter account: @LondonTopSoc. You can follow it up via the link from the homepage on the LTS website.
Prizefighting in London – a request for help

I am a boxing historian (and author of the book on the London prize ring: Up to Scratch). I am seeking information of the locations of London sporting venues in the first half of the eighteenth century, when pugilism, to a greater or lesser degree, first became a regular entertainment in the metropolis. Fistic contents were then usually billed as ‘trials of manhood’ as opposed to the initially more prevalent ‘trials of skill’ (encounters with weapons such as the backsword and quarterstaff). Contrary to some popular beliefs, participants did not contend with both weapons and fists in the same contest, and indeed very few combatants were adept at fighting competitively with both (the formidable Elizabeth Stokes was a rare example of a fighter of either sex skilful enough to excel at two separate disciplines).

James Figg, now generally regarded as England’s first pugilistic champion, although at the time celebrated as a trials of skill combatant, showcased some of the best early exponents of regular boxing at his establishment in the 1720s and early 1730s. James Stokes, husband of Elizabeth and a rival of Figg, likewise was renowned as a weapons fighter but during this period also promoted pugilistic matches at his amphitheatre. Both Figg and Stokes, though, understandably showed a preference for featuring trials of skill. However, by the 1740s, fistic events were predominating, the premier venues being the Great Booth and then John (Jack) Broughton’s amphitheatre (the proprietor of the latter being considered the finest pugilist of his age).

Secondary sources tend to vary as to the exact locations of these venues (if giving them at all). At the time they were usually advertised as follows:

James Figg’s amphitheatre ‘joyning to his House, the Sign of the City of Oxford, in Oxford Road, Marybone Fields’
James Stokes’s amphitheatre ‘in Islington Road near Sadler’s-Wells’
Great Booth ‘at Tottenham Court’
Jack Broughton’s amphitheatre ‘in Oxford Road, the back of the late Mr Figg’s’.

I would be very grateful if anyone could advise me of reliable information giving the exact locations of these establishments, or indeed any descriptions of the buildings themselves from topographical sources (the earlier the better).

Thanking you for any help you may be able to provide.

Tony Gee
29 Wellesley Crescent, Potters Bar, Herts EN6 2DG lezah@uwclub.net

Layers of London

An appeal to website-minded topographers to assist with an ambitious new research project.

Layers of London is a project currently being developed by the University of London’s Institute of Historical Research along with Historic England, The National Archives, The British Library, London Metropolitan Archives and the Museum of London Archaeology and a wide range of other partners and community groups.

It will create a ground-breaking interactive online map through an extensive programme of public engagement and crowd-sourcing, resulting in a dynamic website allowing users to explore and
engage with London’s history. No comparable website exists. It will involve digitising most of the key historic maps of London to create an online palimpsest. Imagine being able to peel back the layers of London’s history, all the way to the Roman period, and exploring interactively – wherever you are – the story of London’s remarkable, diverse and sometimes turbulent history over 2,000 years and its evolution into the city it is today.

The website will enable users to interact with it in different ways: Somebody with a collection of photographs of a particular street in London could upload them on the Layers of London website, and add comments about when they were taken. Or one could see what a street looked like in the 1940s through detailed aerial photographs taken by the Royal Air Force after World War II, or trace the development of a neighbourhood over several centuries. Users could create trails of themes that interest them, and develop an online community around that theme.

The pilot phase of the project focuses on the London Borough of Barking and Dagenham. We chose it because it is an area with a strong sense of community identity and an interesting history, and has gone through a great deal of change over the past century – and still is. We plan to work with a wide range of groups in the borough to use the website as a tool to create publically accessible layers of information, and to contribute to building the website. We’d like the Barking and Dagenham pilot to form a model that London’s 31 other boroughs can follow. To do so, we need to create several fascinating layers that demonstrate the scope of the project, and the ways in which it can act as a platform for a wide range of groups to use.

For example, the volunteers at Eastbury Manor House are currently collecting oral histories about the house as it was in previous decades, while the Gascoigne Estate is documenting the memories of local residents before the area is redeveloped and the current residents relocated. The outcomes of these projects (both in Barking) could create layers on the website, thereby becoming accessible to all, and a resource to which others could contribute and develop over time.

We also intend to work with local schools to involve them in the georeferencing process itself. In many respects this project is ideal from an educational perspective because it links both history and geography, and makes people think about places they know, seeing them in a new light, and showing how they have changed.

Our website developers, Error Agency, are currently creating a wireframes version of the website for users to test, to make sure that it functions efficiently and will serve its many purposes. The website needs to be versatile enough to host a wide range of data – including images, audio files and video, and to be straightforward enough for remote users without extensive computer skills to feel comfortable using it.

To order to verify the user-friendliness of our website, we need to test it on a wide range of volunteers. Members of the London Topographical Society would make a great testing group, given their interest in maps, and their understanding of how a website like this one needs to function. We would be very grateful to receive assistance from those willing to dedicate a few hours of their time to try it out and tell us what they think.

We also need people to help with the georeferencing process (connecting the maps together to create the layers). It is an activity that anyone can do, and we would provide training, of course. Interested volunteers could also take on an advisory role, instructing others on how to georeference information.

Finally, we would like people to start adding content, or to help others add content. If any of these activities interest you please get in touch with us at layersoflondon@sas.ac.uk or through our blog layersoflondon.blogs.sas.ac.uk. We would love you to get involved.
LTS funds the conservation and preservation John Tallis’s 
London Street Views

If you were a member of the Society in 2002 you will no doubt be the owner of publication no. 160, John Tallis’s London Street Views 1838 – 40. It remains one of the most popular of the LTS’s publications and was itself a second edition of a volume published by the LTS in 1969. The source for most of that reproduction was Guildhall Library’s complete set of the views in individual parts: an apparently unique set retaining original coloured wrappers to each part. You will remember that a facsimile of an individual part was bound into the Society’s 2002 edition of the Street Views. However, the condition of the original set and of other Tallis publications held at the library were becoming a cause for concern and, without the funds to carry out the conservation work, access to them was severely limited by the fragile nature of the publication. Therefore an appeal was made to the LTS for a grant to fund a paper conservator for a period of three months to work specifically on the Tallis publications. The Society generously agreed to cover the full cost of the work, which was carried out by two conservators under the guidance of London Metropolitan Archive’s head conservator Caroline De Stefani.

Description of the conservation work needed

The main aim of the project was not only to ensure the long term preservation of the collection, but also to return the individual parts to a condition where they could be handled more easily and could be exhibited either in the library or on loan to other institutions. The work would therefore consolidate areas of damage which could worsen during handling and provide a good packaging solution to mitigate risks caused by environmental factors.

Each individual part of Tallis’s street views is made up of three sheets of very thin machine made paper, folded and pasted together down the spine folds, creating six pages in total. The outermost pages are printed on pink, green, blue or buff coloured paper. The most common type of damage was discolouration, ingrained surface dirt, edge tears (especially where the outermost pages extend beyond the inner ones), tearing and detachment along the spine fold, small areas of loss, and rounded and folded corners. 86 out of the 90 pamphlets were suffering from some form of damage. The pamphlets near the beginning of the series, which had been at the top the storage box (probably made for the original owner in the early twentieth century) were the most badly damaged owing to overfilling of the box and over-handling.

The treatment

All pamphlets were first surface-cleaned with vulcanised sponge. Particularly soft or vulnerable areas and areas with frequent small edge tears were supported on the verso (or on both sides if the damage was severe) with Japanese paper (Tengujo bib tissue) and wheat starch paste. The repairing paper was toned with watercolours to match almost the colour of the original paper so that the repairs were visible but did not detract from the overall appearance of the pages. Larger tears were repaired on both sides of the page with the same Japanese tissue. Damaged spine folds were also reinforced.

Before treatment. Here you can see an example of the typical damage along the edge of the pamphlet including folding over of corners and paper loss.

After treatment. Folds have been opened and losses have been made up using Japanese tissue toned with watercolour to blend, although not exactly match, the colour of the cover.

Before treatment. One of the most severely damaged of the pamphlets with folding of edges and large areas of paper loss.
After treatment. The folds have been opened and the areas of paper loss skilfully filled in using Japanese tissue and toned using watercolour.

Where the pages had become detached from one another along the spine folds, they were reattached using wheat starch paste. This was not an ideal solution, as it did not eliminate the risk of tension at the head and tail of the spine fold, but it was not possible to resew the pamphlets (a preferable solution) without obscuring the illustrations, the whole point of the publication, across the centrefold.

Each pamphlet was individually stored in an archival envelope open on two sides, to minimise unnecessary handling. They were then stored in a custom-made clam-shell box.

Similar work was carried out on all Guildhall Library’s holdings of Tallis’s Street Views. Some of the material had been rebound, probably a generation ago, in such a way that the binding was doing more harm than good to these delicate and rare pamphlets. This too was rectified and the material stabilised. It is only through the generosity of the London Topographical Society and its members that Guildhall Library’s remarkable collection of John Tallis’s London Street Views is now in a condition that allows better access, opportunities for exhibition and is preserved for the future. Guildhall Library would like to thank the Society, its Council and its members.

– Peter Ross
Principal Librarian, Guildhall Library

Circumspice (see p.5)

Three children stand in a forecourt of a railway station, surrounded by their meagre luggage. They look bewildered; some perhaps a little defiant. Aged, say, from five up to 15, the three girls and two boys have arrived in a strange city, without their parents whom they will mostly never see again. This is London, Liverpool Street, July 1939, and they are some of the 10,000, mostly Jewish, children who arrived here, fleeing Nazi persecution, and whom Britain welcomed in the months before the outbreak of World War II.

The scene we are looking at is to be found in today’s much brighter and less grimy and confusing Liverpool Street: it is a bronze memorial by sculptor Frank Meisler called Kindertransport – The Arrival. An accompanying plaque reads: “In gratitude to the people of Britain for saving the lives of 10,000 unaccompanied mainly Jewish children who fled from Nazi persecution in 1938 and 1939.” The memorial stands in an area of the station’s forecourt lately renamed Hope Square; along its base are the names of cities – Berlin, Leipzig, Prague, Vienna and a dozen more – from which these children came. An earlier Kindertransport bronze by Flor Kent, portraying just two children, stands rather hidden away in the main concourse below.

The story of Nicholas Winton’s behind-the-scenes efforts to save 600 Czech children from concentration camps and almost certain death is now well-known; less appreciated is the parallel between the plight of the Kindertransport children then and that of the thousands of today’s child refugees stranded too long in Calais’s ‘Jungle’ camp while a sluggish British bureaucracy has seemed to lack urgency in ‘processing’ them. Like the Kindertransport children, many of today’s young refugees have been threatened by a horrifically cruel and inhuman regime: in their case, so-called Islamic State. Today’s world, to be sure, is different. Is it that much better?

– Tony Aldous

The dramatic view on p.1 of this issue shows the City on fire with Ludgate in the foreground (Museum of London)

The Newsletter Editor welcomes suggestions from readers for items in the Newsletter. The deadline for contributions to the May Newsletter is 16 April 2017. For contact details see the back page.
Reviews

The Lost Rivers of London by Nicholas Barton and Stephen Myers, Historical Publications, 2016, 223pp, £22.50


The first of these is a new edition of a book first published in 1962 and last revised in 1992. Nicholas Barton was the author of the earlier editions, and his co-author in this one, Stephen Myers, is a water engineer. The book is indeed extended, as claimed on the cover: 223 pages instead of the 166 in 1992. 101 illustrations instead of 78 (many now in colour), 45 maps instead of 12. The Westbourne, for example, formerly claimed three pages and now has 14; the humble River Peck expands from five lines to three pages.

As before, most of the book consists of a section on each lost river and a series of thematic chapters examining the impact of the rivers on London’s development, the uses of the rivers (including defence, water supply, navigation, fishing, power and recreation) and the decline and disappearance of the rivers. Much new material is incorporated, and some earlier views are reconsidered: for example, Parr’s Ditch is upgraded from a ‘dubious river’ to a possible downstream stretch of Stamford Brook, and the Holebourne is identified as a tributary of the Fleet rather than an alternative name for it. The course of each river and its tributaries is described in much more detail, reflecting new research, and is plotted on one or more colour street maps, with the river clearly marked in blue. There is more thorough explanation of why London’s drainage and each river took the form it did, notably in a largely new chapter on ‘Geology and water sources in the London Basin’. River names receive more attention than before. A new chapter at the end sets out how short stretches of some of the lost rivers could be recreated using water from the original sources at Hampstead and Highgate.

The Waiilbrook provides an example of the much fuller account now given. Its sources are traced further north than previously, to Islington and Hoxton; its potential for powering mills is assessed; the impact of the Roman city wall in restricting its flow and creating the marsh called Moorfields is noted; and the effect of the Charterhouse commandeering the western source for its own piped water system is identified – apparently for the first time. The book is less up-to-date on unlost rivers such as the Wandle, which are referred to in the thematic chapters. As before there is a bibliography and footnotes, though the latter have become fewer and the archival research referred to on maps has unfortunately left no trace in them.

Nevertheless, this is a valuable and much improved version of the classic account, and the maps alone would make it worthwhile for owners of the old editions to upgrade to the new one.

The Effra claims only four pages in Lost Rivers, and is given much fuller treatment in River Effra. This examines the course of the river, the uses made of it, its medieval diversion, its management, culminating in its disappearance in the nineteenth century, its name and the various myths about it. There is a walkers’ guide describing the route in more detail, with black and white photographs on which the former course of the river has been marked in blue. The book has been thoroughly researched, and is well footnoted. It is particularly good on the way in which the Effra disappeared between 1820 and 1865. The river’s subsequent reappearances following heavy rain ended when storm overflows were constructed in the 1880s. The map of the river has numerous differences in detail from that in Lost Rivers, together with an additional source and several more tributaries. The author uses medieval court records to show that until the thirteenth century the river headed east from Kennington to join the Earl’s Sluice, and that its later course westward to Vauxhall was created by Bermondsey Abbey to reduce the flooding of the Abbey’s lands. This is an excellent book which makes clear how much is still to be discovered about each of London’s lost rivers.

– Dorian Gerhold


ISBN 978 1 85414 404 1

The map is a large-scale diagrammatic map of the London Underground with dates of opening and where appropriate closing of all sections of the line and of the stations. Changes of station names and their dates are also given. Lines now closed or no longer forming part of the London Underground are shown in outline only, examples being the Borough to King William Street portion of the City and South London Railway which only operated from 1890 to 1900 and the spur from the Circle into Liverpool Street main line station which only operated for five months in 1875.

The operation of the lines before and after they became part of the London Underground are ignored, so that the Hainault loop, much of which was steam-operated before both World Wars, is shown with opening dates in 1948 (as part of the Central Line eastern extensions) and the former East London Line is shown as having operated from 1887 to 1906 and from 1913 to 2007, in spite of its steam operation from 1869 and its current operation as part of London Overground. The Waterloo and City line is shown as first served from April 1994 since that was the date the London
Underground took over the line. A text panel explains how it previously operated as part of the British Rail Board, the transfer taking place during the Easter holiday period in 1994. Text panels are also provided to give a potted history of other lines.

A series of notes explains the criteria used in denoting changes to stations, so that different station locations are shown for New Cross, South Harrow and Uxbridge, but not for Hounslow Central and Hounslow West. The criteria also exclude the reallocations to provide cross-platform interchanges along, for example, the Victoria Line. Closed stations are shown, as are the platforms for the never-opened Bull and Bush station under Hampstead Heath.

It is preaching to the converted to tell LTS members how much information can be conveniently gained from a diagrammatic map and with his ninth edition Douglas Rose has honed his history to perfection, at least until an even more improved tenth edition appears.

— Roger Cline


What does the name Roehampton evoke for the outsider? A teacher training college in a fine Georgian mansion? Progressive LCC post-war housing? A prominent Victorian spire? And perhaps the assumption that the present Victorian village on the edge of the common land of Putney Heath, south of the grand mansions and parks, must have had an ancient history. But, as the author explains, this is a misconception. The broader history of the area was confused by Daniel Lyson’s incorrect assumption that the manorial deerpark of Putney Park encompassed Roehampton Lane. As this account explains, it was this lane, to the north-west of the present village, which was the heart of an older settlement. This study is concerned not with the medieval village but with what happened along the edge of the common.

Development on the borders of common land is a theme which can be pursued in many areas around London – the author mentions Hampstead as an example; another which comes to mind is Clapham, where the focus moved from ‘Old town’ near the church to the sites facing the common. At Roehampton development began in the late sixteenth century with a few cottages. A survey of 1617 (the subject of an earlier paper by the author), together with fines, rentals, leases and the hearth tax of 1665, are skilfully interrogated to provide a story of the buildings and occupiers of the cottages and enclosures which gradually encroached on the fringe of Putney Heath. By the early eighteenth century they included a pub, and had extended further east along the northern edge of the common. Some of these simple buildings, with brick or weatherboarded frontages and pantiled roofs, survived into the age of photography before most were swept away. The simplest were four back-to-back cottages in an alleyway, each with a single ground-floor room (they housed 19 people in 1881). The plans, views and descriptions provided here are a valuable addition to the scattered information available about minor vernacular buildings in the London area, and make this study of more than local interest.

By the early nineteenth century the settlement had expanded, with a number of larger houses as well as gentleman’s villas in the surrounding area; an infants’ school was built in 1835 and extended in 1852. The growth of the village from the 1860s (the population grew from 339 in 1851 to 744 30 years later) is explained by the extra employment provided by institutions which had taken over some of the larger mansions in the neighbourhood. Gardeners, laundresses and charwomen were among the inhabitants, as well as printers working for the Catholic press of the Society of Jesus based at Manresa House (a grand villa formerly called Parkstead). A Catholic church was begun in 1878, but an Anglican church, replacing one in Roehampton Lane, was built only in 1896-8. They served what was by then a densely built-up centre with pubs, shops, workmen’s club and police station. Twentieth century slum clearance removed many of the older houses, so that the fabric of the village is now predominantly Victorian.

An impressive amount of research is packed into this modestly priced A4-size publication, clearly
printed, with many illustrations and maps to elucidate the complex story. Roehampton village is fortunate in being the subject of such an enlightening study by our LTS Council member and author of the society’s recent publication on early plans of London buildings.

*– Bridget Cherry*

**The City’s lanes and alleys and a few streets**

Iconic skyscrapers apart, the most obvious feature of the Square Mile today is the plethora of building sites, evidence of the City’s continual reinvention of its built environment. It is only with the evocative street names – Crutched Friars, Idol Lane, Minories – and in the lanes, alleys and courtyards with which the City still abounds that one gets any sense of the past that lies sleeping beneath the bustling, scaffold-clad streets, so any book that delves deeper into the history of these byways is to be welcomed. As a member of the Corporation of London’s Conservation Areas Advisory Committee and past Chair of the City of London Historical Society and City Heritage Society, the author is well qualified to act as our guide.

Each chapter comprises a geographical area but, as the author admits, he has strayed a little outside the confines of the Square Mile to include Lincoln’s Inn and Chancery Lane to the west and Spitalfields to the east. His perambulations, however, stop short of crossing the river to include Southwark, despite that area’s long historical association with the City. Each chapter could form the basis of a walk, but if so a better map than the fold-out one provided in the book would be advisable.

There is so much to applaud here; the author has walked and observed, and his love of the City’s history is palpable. Yet while wishing to accentuate the positive it is impossible to ignore the negative. There is no index, no bibliography and no illustrations to punctuate or illuminate the text. Desmond Fitzpatrick acknowledges his debt to Bradley and Pevsner’s *London I: the City of London*, but the only other indication of sources consulted appears in footnotes which are often incomplete and inconsistent. (Some have an author and date of publication, but no title.) A rigorous proof reading would surely have eradicated inconsistencies with the spelling of proper names, e.g. St Ann/Anne Blackfriars, St Katherine Cree/Kree, St Dionis/Dionys Backchurch and John Rocque/Roque, or errors such as Fox’s Book of Martyrs, Ann Boleyn, etc. One of the two major landowners in the post-Dissolution Blackfriars was Sir Francis Bryan, not John Brian, and the grant of his property was made in 1548, not 1547; the name of the other landowner, Sir Thomas Cawarden, is mis-spelled throughout as Carwarden.

Such reservations aside, I hope that readers will use this book to explore aspects of the City’s history in unexpected places. Myself, I’m off to explore the Fitch Garden off Mitre Street (pp.187-88).

*– Valerie Hart*

**The Pubs of Dulwich and Herne Hill**

This attractively produced book is more than a history of the 40 pubs which it describes. It deals with a slice of south London history in all its variety, in an area stretching from the fringes of Brixton in the north, over Herne Hill and south to Dulwich, including not just existing buildings but pubs which have disappeared or been converted to other uses. The introduction traces the development of the ‘public house’ out of the older alehouse, the growth of identifying names, and the great rebuilding of pubs in the nineteenth century. The pubs are arranged alphabetically; each is set in its historical and topographical context and embellished with stories of its owners, licensees and customers. Both court cases and newspaper reports have been used fruitfully as evidence. (Coroner’s inquests were often held in pubs and provide some of the earliest references, furnishing some lurid and dramatic incidents.) The illustrations are agreeably varied, including both old and new photographs and sketches.

In the area of Dulwich village there were pubs in the seventeenth century; in the eighteenth century the Green Man at Dulwich was briefly popular on account of the mineral springs in the neighbourhood. It was the growth of the London suburbs, together with the coming of the railways (Herne Hill station dates from 1862) that accounts for the growth of pubs in other areas; the Dulwich estate landlords discouraged new pubs, unlike developers elsewhere. There is a useful map showing all the pubs discussed but it does not make it clear which are extant – would-be drinkers need to read the text first to discover which may satisfy their thirst. But the record of lost examples (a growing number) is particularly valuable in throwing light on the former character of different areas.

The illustrations display the variety of architectural styles, embellished Italianate stucco detail of the mid to later Victorian period giving way to the fanciful eclecticism of the turn of the century exemplified by the Half Moon, Herne Hill of 1896. The outstanding ornament and interior decoration of this example receive attention, but generally...
there is a little about interiors, and the often complex planning of Victorian examples designed to segregate different types of customers. This is a book to browse in at leisure for intriguing local stories; for those who would like to draw conclusions from the mass of information presented, summaries giving earliest reference, date and architect of present building, and current use would have been a bonus.

— Bridget Cherry

Gentlemen by Karen Knorr, London
Stanley/Barker 2016 ISBN 978 0 95699 229 1
S/B009A. 26 black and white silver bromide plates with accompanying text. £40+ postage

US photographer Karen Knorr’s visual essay on the interiors of four West End gentlemen’s clubs in the 1980s offers rare glimpses inside what she describes as ‘the most elite and exclusive enclaves of male power in Britain’. The four featured are The Arts in Dover Street, Brooks’s and the Carlton in St James’ Street and the Turf in Carlton House Terrace.

Knorr’s photographs are all the more intriguing because relatively few of these establishments welcome outsiders, even during Open House, London’s annual autumn ‘throw wide the doors’ weekend. The Reform, designed by Sir James Barry, is a rare exception; it was also a pioneer in admitting women. Perhaps this book will encourage others to follow suit.

Many of the images are anchored by members carefully posed against backdrops of wall-hung portraits of their predecessors, conveying a piquant sense of frozenness in time.

At October’s launch, Knorr told me that, with London private rentals currently so expensive, young professionals are finding it cheaper to join a club and stay there. (One club secretary confirmed that this can offer ‘great value’). So eighteen and nineteenth century institutions created for those who, by definition, didn’t work (doctors, lawyers and others who had to earn their livings were originally excluded) are now finding a new, very twenty-first century, purpose by giving young people who work very hard a prestigious, and affordable, address in London.

— David Crawford

Coming soon! Yet another book on South London – to be reviewed in our next issue.

Bookshop Corner

Rosemary Weinstein introduces her favourite bookshop.

In November 2015 Time Out voted Owl bookshop one of London’s 100 best shops. In fact Owl has been a much loved and valued resource since it was established in 1974. Moving down the high street to be close to the North-Western Polytechnic (closed 1996) in Prince of Wales Road, Owl expanded into their current location – the former Daniel’s department store – in 1994. Continuing to thrive, though nowadays with help from Daunt Books, Owl’s welcoming atmosphere (wicker chairs for browsing), next day delivery service, loyalty scheme, newsletter, suggested reading and events are all provided by a friendly and knowledgeable staff.
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