The Annual General Meeting
13 June 2000

The 100th Annual General Meeting held at St James’s Palace on Tuesday 13th June 2000 was a very special occasion. Groups of members began to cluster round the Palace long before the doors were opened and once inside there was plenty to take in en route to the state apartments. On arrival His Royal Highness The Duke of Edinburgh was welcomed by our Chairman, who was later congratulated by HRH on conducting a brief and business-like AGM. The Duke of Edinburgh gave a short and amusing address, reminding his audience that St James’s Palace stood on the site of a leper hospital.

Andrew Ingamells spoke about his screenprint panorama, the LTS millennium publication, and the Duke of Edinburgh was presented with a signed and numbered print. Christopher Lloyd, Surveyor of the Queen’s Pictures, then treated us to an instructive talk about some of the oil paintings on the walls, from royal portraits to battle-scenes. At the conclusion of the talks members were able to wander through the state apartments to view the pictures, the work of William Kent, tapestries woven for King Charles I, a Tudor fireplace carved with the initials H and A and the armoury decorated by William Morris in the 1860s.

Unfortunately we were not permitted to bring the traditional AGM tea into these glittering crimson and gold apartments. We expect to revert to usual practice, all be it in less grand surroundings, in 2001.

Have you received the LTS publication for this year?

One way or another members should have received their copy of the Ingamells panorama, the LTS publication for 2000. If a member has not, please inform Roger Cline whose address is on the last page of the Newsletter before 1 January 2001. After that date it will be presumed that all members’ claims have been settled and remaining prints may then be available at £60 to members, £80 to non-members.
So it was sad when Tony Dyson of the Black Star Press, who had drawn, etched, printed, published, and marketed it since 1990, announced that the Calendar for the year 2000 would be the very last. I wrote the story up for Country Life (Is this the end for Monk’s Calendar?*, 13 January 2000), and then at greater length, and with a catalogue of all the Calendars and the various states of them, for Print Quarterly (William Monk’s Calendar: Time to Say Goodbye*, June 2000*). My Print Quarterly piece concluded with the words: “Monk’s Calendar... is no more. Unless, that is, someone steps forward to rescue and relaunch it”.

Well, I am happy to tell you that someone has stepped forward. This is Jason Hicklin RE, a lecturer at the City Guilds London Art School, Kennington Park Road. Mr Hicklin’s oeuvre already includes London images, in particular a series of London bridges – Hammersmith, Albert, Blackfriars, and Tower Bridges – etched on zinc. The headpiece for his first Monk’s Calendar (or Calendarium Londinensis, to give it its official title) is likely to be the Bankside Power Station, as recently transformed into Tate Modern. This calendar for 2001 can be ordered direct from the artist at Garden House, Melford, Suffolk, SY22 6BZ (tel/fax 01938 500 169). He is keeping the price down to £20 – not bad for an original etching.

And here is some more Monk news. In two auctions at Brightwell’s Fine Art Sale Room in Leominster, Herefordshire last year there were several bulging portfolios of material by William Monk. More portfolios appeared in their auction on 19 July this year. All this material would seem to be from Monk’s studio. It included original drawings for calendars, calendar mock-ups, trial states, and numerous proofs. It also included plenty of non-London material – views of university colleges, public schools, Venice canals, and skyscrapers in New York. Much of this material is now in the stock of Grosvenor Prints, Shelton Street, in Covent Garden.

The preparatory drawings for the Calendarium Londinensis in these portfolios (a collector has snapped them up already, I’m afraid) were as follows: 1903 – St James’s Palace; 1906 – St Paul’s from Ludgate Hill; 1908 – Staples Inn; 1912 – The Old Dick Whittington; 1915 – Buckingham Palace; 1922 – Piccadilly & Devonshire House; 1924 – Piccadilly Circus; 1925 – Trafalgar Square; 1926 – Whitehall; 1931 – Doctor Johnson’s House. There were also one or two etchings that were probably made for the Calendar but not used, such as a view of the Dorchester Hotel, and a view of Fishmongers’ Hall from Thames Street after the demolition of the Pearl Assurance Company’s HQ in 1920.

And even more Monk news. Kate Alcock, auctioneer at Brightwell’s, has submitted a dissertation to the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors – ‘A Forgotten Artist – William Monk’ – Ralph Hyde

*Available from 80 Carlton Hill, London NW8 0ER, £9.50 including postage.

All the Monk Calendar images from 1903 to 2000 can be viewed on motco.com/monk

London’s District Surveyors
by David Crawford

The history of building regulation in London dates from its first Mayor, Henry Fitz-Aylwin, whose Assize of 1189 provided for “the alaying of the contentions that at times arise between neighbours in the city touching boundaries made, or to be made, between their lands and other things”. It dealt with party walls, obstructions to “rights to light”, the carrying off of water, the fixing of joists in walls and the right of a citizen to object to a building being erected on land adjoining his own.

Policing of these early regulations was in the hands of persons appointed from early times to watch building operations within the City area and to report irregularities to the Aldermen. During the fifteenth century they became known as ‘City viewers’.

After the Great Fire of London in 1666, the 1667 Act for the Rebuilding of the City introduced a more formal arrangement that provided for statutory surveyors to be sworn in to see that its provisions were duly complied with. The Act states: “...that irregular Buildings may be the better prevented or more effectually discovered, be it further enacted by the Authority aforesaid, that the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Common Council of the said City shall and may, at their will and pleasure, elect, nominate, and appoint one or more discreet and intelligent Person or Persons in the art of Building to be the Surveyors or Supervisors to see the said rules and Scantings well and truly observed... And to administer to all the said Surveyors or Supervisors an Oath upon the Holy Evangelists, for true and impartial execution of their office in that behalf and to appoint the several Precincts which shall be under their several Surveyors”.

The duties of these early surveyors included the setting out of new foundations, the enforcement of regulations concerning wall thicknesses and timber sizes, and regulation of the height of buildings and their construction generally. They also acted as arbitrators in party wall disputes.

Their role was confirmed in a further Building Act, of 1774, and they were required to take the following oath:

“I, being one of the surveyors appointed in pursuance of an Act of Parliament, passed in the fourteenth year of the reign of King George the Third, for the further and better regulation of buildings and party walls; and for the more effectually preventing mischiefs by fire within the cities of London and Westminster, and the liberties thereof, and other parishes, precincts and places, within the weekly bills of mortality the parishes of St Mary-le-Bon, Paddington, Saint Pancras and Saint Luke at Chelsea, in the County of Middlesex: and for indemnifying under certain conditions builders, and other persons, against the penalties to which they are or may be liable for erecting buildings within the limits aforesaid, contrary to law, do
swear, that, upon receiving notice of any building or wall to be built, or other builders work to be done, within the district under my inspection, not being by illness or otherwise lawfully prevented, I will diligently and faithfully, survey the same, and to the utmost of my abilities, endeavour to cause the rules and regulations, in the said act prescribed, to be strictly observed; and that without favour or affection, prejudice or malice.

So help me God*.

The area controlled by these surveyors now included, as well as the City of London, the City of Westminster, Southwark and the suburban parishes of Saint Mary-le-Don, Paddington, Saint Pancras and Chelsea. The appointees were usually architects, who were allowed to continue to work in private practice.

At the start of the nineteenth century London still lacked a comprehensive Building Act covering the whole of the metropolis. This was remedied by a new Act of 1844, by which time the population of London had increased to over two million. It introduced the term ‘district surveyor’ and, for the first time, required candidates to pass a statutory examination before they could be appointed.

It also precluded district surveyors from supervising buildings of their own design, and gave them further duties including the enforcement of requirements relating to drainage and sanitation and such health and amenity provisions as the widths of streets, open space at the rear of buildings and the heights of rooms. In response to these growing responsibilities, the District Surveyors’ Association was founded in January 1845 and held its first meeting at the London Coffee House on Ludgate Hill.

In 1855 the Metropolitan Board of Works was set up to administer the Metropolitan Building Act of the same year. The Board took over the appointment of district surveyors and the Royal Institute of British Architects became responsible for the holding of the statutory examination for their certificate of competency.

The Board came to an end in 1888 and was replaced by London’s first directly-elected authority, the London County Council. The LCC made significant alterations to the conditions under which new district surveyors were appointed: candidates were required to give an undertaking that they would devote the whole of their time to their work as district surveyors, and would not carry on any private work as architects, surveyors or builders, either directly or indirectly.

The 1909 Building Act dealt mainly with the design of steel-framed and reinforced concrete buildings, the designs of which it was the responsibility of district surveyors to consider and check long before the first Codes of Practice were published in 1932. The increasing numbers of buildings requiring the skills of engineers rather than those of architects led, in time, to the requirement of corporate membership of the Institution of Civil Engineers or the Institution of Structural Engineers as a prerequisite for appointment.

In 1940 district surveyors, although retaining their statutory independence, became salaried officers of the LCC, transferring in 1965 to the Greater London Council (GLC). On the abolition of the GLC in 1986 London’s district surveyors transferred to individual London boroughs.

*David Crawford thanks the London District Surveyors’ Association, and its President, Robert Jones, for help with this article.

**************

George Scharf’s watercolour of the mouth of the Ranelagh Brook, Chelsea

by G. M. Saul

Amongst the collection of George Scharf’s drawings in the Department of Prints and Drawings of the British Museum is one beautiful watercolour of the stretch of the north bank of the Thames from the Chelsea (Pensioners’) Hospital to the Chelsea Waterworks. It is signed and dated 1824 and there can be little doubt that it is authentic (Figure 1).

Fig1. George Scharf’s watercolour of the Royal Hospital, Chelsea, signed and dated 1824. The dolphin is shown in the river in front of the west wing of the Hospital (Department of Prints and Drawings, British Museum).
THE DOLPHIN OR GRAND JUNCTION NUISANCE.

Fig 2. John Wright’s illustration of the scene in 1827 – a fraud.

One can recognize the scene even today with the two small summer-houses, now separated from the bank of the river by the main road. The Royal Hospital building is little changed but moving down river the scene has changed substantially. The Ranelagh Brook now comes out through a large round opening in the Embankment wall visible only at low tide. The engine house of the Grand Junction Waterworks’ pumping station with its smoke plume is nowhere to be seen and neither is the Chelsea Waterworks. When Scharf drew the scene the term Ranelagh sewer was more likely to have been used to describe the Brook.

The second illustration (Figure 2) purports to be by Scharf and appeared in a publication called The Dolphin, of which the first edition was printed late in 1826. A second edition, substantially revised and more focused appeared in 1827. The author was John Wright, a political reporter associated with William Cobbett. The illustration is no longer attributed to Scharf.

All three pictures show the same scene and were produced before an accurate survey of this part of London was available. What was available fills a gap and enables us to compare the three versions. There are only two pictures really, the second and the third being the same, except that Scharf’s name has been omitted from the third. The context of Wright’s paper was a growing unease about the state of London’s water supply: the full story need not concern us here but some details are relevant and they undermine the case which Wright was anxious to make.

The title of Wright’s publication was taken from the name of the structure through which water entered a water company’s reservoir from the river. The actual intake was between low tide level and the bed of the river. It was made visible to watermen by extending the structure above high tide level. The Grand Junction’s dolphin can be identified in the two pictures but whereas there is little difference between the rest of the details of the two pictures, the positions of the dolphin are different. It is at this point that the archives of the Thames Navigation Committee, a subcommittee of the Court of Common Council of the City, come to our assistance.

When the Grand Junction engine-house and dolphin were built between 1816 and 1819 the company needed the permission of the Navigation Committee to breach the bank of the river. The application was accompanied by an accurate plan of the proposed site of not only the breach but also the site of the ‘obstruction’ to be placed in the river – the dolphin. Any change in position would have been recorded and a change in the position of the dolphin also had to be cleared with the City committee prior to any action on the ground. Thus we have an independent check on the two pictures.

The dolphin stood where it appears in the Scharf watercolour until 1845.
Land Tax Assessments for Mile End Old Town 1741-90
by Derek Morris

Introduction

Studies of eighteenth-century London have been made at a variety of scales, from individual buildings to streets, estates and parishes, and have utilized a wide range of sources such as maps, deeds, wills, insurance records but rarely the Land Tax Assessments. Hugh Phillips made use of the rate books in his study of Mid-Georgian London but Francis Sheppard in his article on the methods used by the Survey of London commented on the difficulty of interpreting the parish rate books correctly. Whilst this generalization may be true for a large part of London, a nearly unique set of records has been discovered for Mile End Old Town (MEOT), Stepney.

Gibson recognized the usefulness of the Land Tax for urban studies and the Guildhall Library’s information sheet describes the many pitfalls when using these records. However, on a more positive note, Daigent’s study of eighteenth-century Bristol concluded: “The Land Tax returns, in which one would initially have the least confidence and which are almost uniformly discarded as useless, proved in fact very useful.”

The Land Tax in Mile End Old Town

A 2D CAD package was used to record in the form of a spreadsheet all the Land Tax data for over 800 properties from 1741 to 1790; a vertical column representing a single property or piece of land. Only the years 1748, 1751, 1766 and 1782 of the records are missing and few of the individual entries are missing or unreadable.

The early records contain few addresses but by working back from 1790 it is possible to show that the rate collectors went round the hamlet in a clockwise direction. Normally, the start point was the north end of White Horse Street, and this practice can be traced back to at least 1694 in CLRO records. The same route was used by the collectors of the sewer rate and the tithes but sometimes they started at different points.

It has been found that the majority of houses can be traced for over forty years and in some cases for over 100 years and can be located within about 100 yards and on maps such as Rocque’s.

Until 1765 the Land Tax Assessments were based on the ‘rent’ and thereafter on the ‘rack rent’, which was about fifty per cent higher, confirming Dr Johnson’s quotation from Swift as being the ‘annual rent raised to the utmost’.

The Land Tax covered land, property and stock, and the smallest category for assessment was a room. Thus in 1785 Esther Gorbell was assessed a rack rent of £5 for a room near to Charrington’s Brewery. In 1790 the room was in use as a school-room and by comparison with other assessments it must have been large.

Excluded from the assessments were the almshouses and the smallest hovels but not the Dissenters’ Stepney Meeting House. Shops, although they existed, are rarely mentioned in the Land Tax records, confirmation that the majority of shopkeepers in MEOT traded from their property – in the basement, back room or on the street.

Rack rents in 1780 ranged from £2 to £214; the values greater than £60 refer to either land holdings or to the Great and Small Tithes, which had a value of £214.

In 1780 the distribution of the rack rents for houses was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rack Rent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£1 to £10</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£11 to £20</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£21 to £30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£31 to £40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over £41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, potential house-holders had considerable choice in the selection of property that in size, scope and facilities best suited their family and business needs, with the added advantage over the City of London that land was available for gardens, orchards, stables, coach-houses and in a few cases for summer-houses.

When combined with other information it is possible to make the following observations. A rack rent of £2 covered land, garden, workshop, small house and stable and gardens, whilst a rack rent of £3 covered a small house, coal shed and a workshop. In 1769 Charles Mapp’s garden covered about a seventh of an acre and had a rack rent of £4.

The collectors of the Great and Small Tithes in 1775 and 1777 noted against some people that they were ‘poor’, and these were to be found in houses with rack rents of £8 or less.

For slightly larger houses, plans survive in the Tower Hamlets Local History Library for no.11 Greenfield Street, that had a rack rent of £13.7 This had a frontage of 22 feet 8 inches and a depth of 24 feet with a small yard and shed behind the house. This is typical of the better type of artisans’ houses erected west of the London Hospital between 1768 and 1773, the first time for over forty years that such developments took place in this part of London. In one of the houses lived a Warder from the Tower of London.
For larger houses with a rack rent of £25 we can still see in Ireland Row, 109 Mile End Road, a 1717 house that has recently been refurbished by the Spitalfields Trust. The house has two rooms in the basement, a ground-floor reception room and dining-room, a first-floor drawing room and a bedroom, and two bedrooms on the top floor. In 1779 the occupier was Admiral Abraham North, who had lived in MEOT from 1765, had married into one of the prominent land-owning families and in 1780 was taxed for one male servant.

The even better quality housing, still to be seen on the east side of Stepney Green, had rack rents between £28 and £40, the latter for Isaac Lefevre, distiller. This house was previously owned by Laurence Sullivan, a famous director of the East India Company and Captain Sabine Chandler, an assurance director.

Finally, the grandest house in MEOT had been built in 1738 by Mary Fitzhugh, the widow of an East India Company Captain. It had three storeys, leaded windows, eight rooms wainscotted and two rooms with deal and had a rack rent of £60 and was insured for £2,000.

**Agricultural Land and Stock**

Farming was still an important part of the activities around MEOT and the highest Land Tax payers were all farmers, several of them Quakers. Although property was recorded in a strictly sequential manner, the same did not apply to the large fields used for grazing and hay making. These were 'attached' in the Land Tax Assessments to the relevant tax payer's property, even though physically apart. Land Tax payers who did not live in MEOT were listed separately.

So Blake’s lands are paid for by John Bradby in 1743, by Thomas Cornwall in 1759 and by William Bowry from 1768 to 1780.

Stock was simply assigned to four groups of £50, £100, £150 and £200 and judging from the size of their houses, will and deeds, appears to be a rough and ready guide to a tax payer’s wealth.

**Tenants and Proprietors**

A common problem with Land Tax records is to decide the exact status of the names that appear. In MEOT from 1780 onwards both tenants and proprietors were recorded separately and combined with evidence from the estates of Stephen Martin Leake, Garter King of Arms, and Thomas Andrews, a local builder, it can be confirmed that the majority of the tax payers were tenants.

For some properties the proprietor assumed responsibility for payment of the Land Tax whether full or empty, e.g. Leonard Hammond for twelve small houses on Mile End Green. This practice varied from year to year and explains the apparent disappearance and subsequent reappearance of some houses from the records.

Proprietors can be divided into four well defined groups: organizations such as the London Hospital, the Drapers’ and Mercers’ companies, the church-wardens of St Giles, Cripplegate; trustees such as Thomas Moone, a school teacher from Aldgate; absentee landlords such as the Earl of Jersey and Sir Edward Ainsley, and lastly proprietors who lived in their own property, such as John Bartholomew, builder of the London Hospital.

It is also clear that many of the proprietors were concerned with more than one property and this fact can be used to distinguish proprietors from tenants in the pre-1780 Land Tax records.

In 1780 the proprietor is identified for 58 per cent of the properties. Twelve proprietors were responsible for 53 per cent of the properties, a pattern very similar to that found in nineteenth-century Camberwell.

**Accuracy**

The question that arises is how accurate is the tracing of any particular building over a period of fifty years? Three independent methods have been used to answer this question with very positive results. The most important method used the licensed victuallers records, which are available for a number of years and which record both the name of the licensee and the name of the inn or tavern. Their importance stems from the fact that in 1719 approximately one in eighteen of the houses in MEOT was licensed although this ratio decreased with time. In 1780 there were about forty licensed properties in MEOT and the licensed victuallers records can be easily linked to the Land Tax. Some of the taverns can be traced from 1722 until the present day, such as The Three Crowns and The Hayfield.
The second check was to use the marriage records in the International Genealogical Index to trace some of the reasons for the name of a tenant changing from year to year. For the Carpenters Arms near the Turnpike the two sets of records enable the changes to be followed from 1750 to 1769:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TAXPAYER</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Charles Woodall</td>
<td>For Carpenters Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1756</td>
<td>Ann Woodall</td>
<td>Widow of Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1759</td>
<td>William Smith</td>
<td>Married Ann Woodall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1762-70</td>
<td>Ann Smith</td>
<td>Widow of William</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1771 Ann Smith, by now twice-widowed, moved away from her home of twenty years to a house in Stepney Green.

A third check occurs when a bankrupt such as Captain Francis Fowler is followed in the Land Tax records by a relative; in his case in 1760 by his brother-in-law, Captain Henry Kent.

If the tax assessments had been incorrectly aligned it would have not been possible to make any of the above checks.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion it can be stated that the Land Tax records for Mile End Old Town from 1749 to 1790 provide a solid basis for the location of property and subsequent linkage to a large number of other records, such as insurance policies, deeds and the tithes. The sequence in which one approaches the records is important, the most efficient method being to follow the Land Tax records by the victualling records and then the MDR and insurance records.

A database is being prepared of the 4,500 or so Land Tax payers and their links to other records. The Land Tax has proved to be a valuable resource and it represents one of the first attempts to locate all the property in an eighteenth-century suburb.
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Robert Hooke Lecture

Make a note of a lecture about 'Robert Hooke: Science, Surveying and the City' on 4th April 2001, 6pm at Gresham College, Barnard's Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1 (nearest tube Chancery Lane). Michael Cooper, Professor of Engineering at City University, will talk about Hooke as a hands-on surveyor in the rebuilding of the City after the Great Fire. Aspects of his character which do not accord with the commonly-held assessment of Hooke will be revealed. He was curator of experiments to the Royal Society with rooms in Gresham College and the meeting is being organized jointly by the Royal Society with Gresham College. No ticket required and there will be drinks afterwards.

Treasures of Catherine the Great

One of the last of the great millennium projects to be unveiled in 2000 opens at the end of November and it promises to be a dazzling event. The Treasures of Catherine the Great, a tiny representative selection of a vast collection, go on display in a suite of rooms in the south wing of Somerset House. The Hermitage Rooms – as they will be known – have been decorated in the style of the Winter Palace in St Petersburg, and their opening will mark the completion of the massive restoration of Somerset House, a restoration that has not only returned Sir William Chambers' building to public use with fountains playing in the courtyard, but has allowed access to the terrace overlooking the river. The paintings in the Courtauld Art Gallery were recently rehung, the glittering Gilbert Collection of gold and silver now occupies galleries along the Embankment and a new restaurant and café have opened inside the building and on the terrace.

The final phase of this remarkable transformation will open on 25 November when some of the jewels, silver and gold, paintings, antiquities and Russian, European and Chinese works of art assembled by Catherine the Great (1729-96) go on display. The German-borne Empress who acquired the finest Old Masters in Sir Robert Walpole's collection in 1779 from his impeccable grandson, presented him in return with her state portrait by Alexander Roslin. This normally hangs in the saloon at Houghton Hall, Norfolk, but it is being lent to Somerset House by the Marquess of Cholmondeley, a descendant of Walpole, so that it can hang near the entrance to the gallery, close to a high-tech introduction to the Hermitage which will include a screen linked to a camera outside the Winter Palace, thus enabling London visitors coming into the rooms to see what is happening in St Petersburg at that precise moment.

The first gallery will evoke Catherine's life and be filled with her acquisitions, among them Poussin's Moses Striking the Rock – one of her Walpole pur-

Benjamin Read and his topographical fashion plates

Back in 1984 the Guildhall Library and the Costume Society published six full-scale colour facsimiles of Benjamin Read fashion plates in a portfolio entitled Benjamin Read's Splendid Views. The facsimiles were accompanied by explanatory text and commentary: Anne Buck wrote about the fashions; Ann Saunders wrote about the topography; and Ralph Hyde wrote about the tailor/printmaker who had produced these thoroughly charming things.

A 13,700 word catalogue of all the known topographical fashion plates issued by Benjamin Read is to be found in the September 2000 issue of Print Quarterly. It has been compiled by Valerie Cumming, one time Deputy Director of the Museum of London, and Ralph Hyde, one time Keeper of Prints and Maps at Guildhall Library. Read's practice was to show the fashions of the
coming season against a fashionable background. All but two of the scenes are of London. The plates began to appear in c.1825, and continued to appear, usually two per year, until 1848.

If you wish to buy Print Quarterly with this catalogue, write to: Print Quarterly, 80 Carlton Hill, London, NW8 0ER For a single copy, including postage, the cost is £9.50.

To see all the known Benjamin Read fashion plates, most of them in colour, visit www.motco.com/benjaminread.

The Thames Police Office Letter Books 1804-34

A note from the London Record Society invites members to a talk at London Metropolitan Archives, 40 Northampton Road, London EC1 on Thursday 23 November at 5.45pm. The talk will be given by Louise Falcini and Richard Samways who are editing the letters for the London Record Society. The documents illustrate the practical problems of policing the river and the new commercial docks at a time when crime and disorder were rife. The talk will be followed by the London Record Society’s brief AGM.

William Haywood and City engineering

The Newcomen Society for the study of the history of engineering and technology is holding a lecture on William Haywood and Municipal Engineering in the City of London, given by Don Clow on 13 December. Visitors are welcome and admission is free. The meeting will take place at 5.45pm and its location (somewhere in SW7) can be confirmed by phoning 020 7371 4445.

Names on the Copperplate Map: a note from Stephen Marks

I am working on the names on the three extant sheets of the Copperplate Map, as mentioned in Newsletter 47, and have prepared a complete comparative table of the names on that map and its two principal derivatives, the eight-sheet woodcut map produced in the early 1560s, and the reduced version published in Braun and Hogenberg’s Civitates Orbis Terrarum in 1572. An essential part of my study is to put the names as they appear on the three maps, especially on the Copperplate Map, in a linguistic context. For this I have begun to study the original sixteenth-century manuscript of the Diary of Henry Machin (d. 1563) in the British Library and transcripts or calendars of other documentary sources of the period. I am also getting to know a great deal more about early modern English, the language of the Diary and other contemporary documents.

The outcome of this study, which I hope will be published in due course, will be to show that the engravers of the Copperplate Map in the Netherlands reproduced as well as they could the information about names sent to them from London by the surveyors (who had probably been sent over in the 1550s from the Netherlands for the purpose); that the surveyors in many cases wrote down what they heard from the ordinary inhabitants of London; and that this represents how the names were pronounced in London at the time.
Book Reviews

London 1900. The Imperial Metropolis

Unlike Alastair Service’s London 1900 (1979), Professor Schneer’s book of the same title has little to say about London’s topography in the strict sense. He opens with the briefest of introductory sketches of the panorama of London, a rather equivocal assertion that “In 1900 London was no longer an industrial center”, more about London’s cosmopolitan character and its role as capital of the British Empire, and announces that this book’s startling argument will be “that the imperial metropolis both shaped and was shaped by Londoners in 1900”. A chapter on “The Face of Imperial London” gives equal prominence to the construction of the Kingsway – Aldwych thoroughfare by the London County Council, and to the triumphal return to the City from South Africa of the City Imperial Volunteers who in October 1900 marched along a curious route involving, we are told, a southward movement from Hyde Park Corner towards Apsley House (which was not the “gift of a grateful nation to the duke of Wellington”).

The work continues in a series of vignettes largely devoted to the fashionable theme of the racism inherent in many British institutions – particularly the London Zoo and the City – and manifested by various personalities, including Ben Tillett and Conan Doyle. Turning to ‘Alternative Imperial Londons’, we are given snapshots of the activities of four celebrated women in exploiting or transcending ‘female gender boundaries’: Lady Dorothy Nevill (too often described as ‘Lady Nevill’), Lady Londonderry, the journalist Flora Shaw and the explorer Mary Kingsley; followed by those of anti-imperialists: radicals, Irish, and blacks (in the person of the Indian Nairoji, and the West Indians Celestine Edwards and Henry Sylvester Williams).

Schneer concludes with a chapter on the Khaki Election of 1900, which he sees as “an opportunity for understanding the imperial metropolis at the apex of its influence and power”, concentrating on the campaigns of Bhownaggree (North-west Ham), John Burns (Battersea) and Alderman Newton (West Southwark) in order to catch “Londoners in mid-stride and mid-sentence, in all their contrariness, all their contrariness”.

Schneer has delved in original sources, as well as secondary works that give fuller treatment of personalities on whom he focusses. The result may be compared (in miniature) with the Royal Academy’s exhibition ‘Crossroads 1900’, as opening up for our consideration a number of themes of varying interest, not always adequately established in context.

And, sadly, the editing falls below Yale’s usual high standards: there are mis-spellings (too consistent to be mere typographical errors) and confusion about individuals that suggest the author needed more guidance through the thickets of English society in 1900.

- M.H. Port

Greater London History and Heritage Handbook, subtitled ‘the Millennium guide to historical, heritage and environmental networks and publications’, Compiled by Peter Marcan. Peter Marcan Publications 1999. 184 pages. £14.95 + £2 post and packing from Peter Marcan (cheques payable to him), PO Box 3158, London SE1 4RA.

This supersedes and is a great improvement upon Marcan’s Greater London Local History Directory which went into a second edition in 1993. The new handbook contains descriptive entries for over 600 organizations: local history archives and societies, libraries, museums, environmental groups and so on. The bibliographical listings have been expanded, hence the reader can pin-point the obscure local history that is often not available commercially. There are also useful tips that researchers would not normally be able to lay their hands on – for example under Dulwich a reader would expect to find information about the Dulwich Society and the Friends of Dulwich Picture Gallery but without Marcan’s help it would have been hard to trace another important contact for Dulwich history – Brian Green who runs the Art Stationers and Village Toy Shop.

The index gives a soupçon of the feast of delights to be enjoyed, from Adventure Balloons Ltd (for exceptional views) to Prince Henry’s Room (a collection of Pepysiana in barristers’ chambers). In the list of London and national organizations the LTS is given a good write-up – it is even said that “some of the hon. officials are important London scholars”.

Greater London History Sources vol 1 City of London

This is another helpful handbook for the researcher. Archives on London history are not always in the location where they might be expected and use of this volume will save time and telephone calls. The book lists printed and visual material, archives and manuscripts held by the Corporation of London Record Office, Guildhall Library and St Bartholomew’s Hospital Archives and Museum.

LTS members will generally be aware of the Guildhall Library’s collection of maps, plans and illustrations of London but how many have inspected the surveys of woods and groves in Edmonton, Tottenham and Enfield belonging to Sir Robert Cecil and drawn by Israel Amyce in 1599?
Guildhall Library also safeguards the personal papers (1641-95) and journal (1672-83) of Robert Hooke. And one of the six undisputed examples of Shakespeare’s signature is to be found on a conveyance of a tenement in Blackfriars (1613) at Guildhall Library.

Records of the City’s fairs and markets, prisons, almshouses, estates and charities held by the Corporation of London Record Office include plans and maps although it has not been possible to give details. The St Bartholomew’s Hospital Archives (an appointment is necessary) have maps and plans of the hospital from 1587.

The collections of the British Library and the Public Record Office relating to London history are beyond the scope of this series but further volumes will cover material held by the publicly-funded record offices and local studies collections of the thirty-two boroughs that make up Greater London.

– Penelope Hunting

Local history publications

Recent publications from the Hornsey Historical Society: A History of Muswell Hill by Ken Gay who has lived there for forty-five years, with many illustrations, maps, £6.50 plus 80p p&p. Gateway to the City, The Archway Story by Simon Morris and Towyn Mason is about the Highgate Archway, London’s first fly-over which was replaced in 1900 by the Archway Bridge. This is a story of vision, incompetence, overspending, tragedy and bureaucracy – £4.50. The Society’s Bulletin for 1999 maintains its usual high standard, and there are two booklets from the Society on the graves of St Mary’s churchyard: Buried in Hornsey by Joan Schiwitzer and a tombstone trail by Eric Robinson. Please contact Hornsey Historical Society to order, tel: 020 8348 8429.

The Camden History Society offers a revised edition of Christopher Wade’s The Streets of Hampstead: six walks with plenty to sustain the interest and pretty illustrations of lost scenes (£6.90 inclusive). The Camden History Review number 24 for 2000 is larger than usual and includes an insight into the building of the mansion blocks of Finchley Road written by Isobel Watson: essential reading for anyone who regularly experiences the Finchley Road traffic jam, £7.80. Both are available from CHS Publications, 1 Daleham Gardens, London NW3 5DA.

The Annals Of London. A year-by-year Record of a Thousand Years


Our great capital is a bottomless pit for authors: every entry in these annals might inspire a book and many of the subjects have. Take 1065, the year of the first entry: The Building of Westminster Abbey – there must be shelves groaning with volumes devoted to this subject: the Great Exhibition of 1851 is another favourite title, and the last entry, on The Dome, the Wheel and the Fireworks (1999) is bound to generate more than a few tales.

The compilation of the Annals by John Richardson poses some problems, most obviously in the selection of entries for a particular year (which year was the dullest, the most difficult to fill?). Another problem is the most appropriate date: the beginning or the completion of a building? How to choose one date for the intermittent upheaval stirred by John Wilkes in the 1760s and 1770s? Similarly, how to allocate a specific date to a protracted development such as Regent’s Park or the Victorian metropolitan improvements? Is it wise to do so?

The strength of the book lies in the minutiae and the stories, some of which stretch the bounds of credibility. For example an entry for 1600 reveals that a climbing horse was led to the top of St Paul’s Cathedral; another of 1723 tells of the Billingsgate fish-wife who was London’s champion woman boxer challenging a Newgate basketwoman to fight it out for £10.

The illustrations are commonplace with the exception of six surreal reconstructions of London (medieval, Tudor, 1666, 1720, 1851, 2000) in colour. A fascinating coffee-table book for the did-you-know enthusiast.

– Penelope Hunting
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# LONDON TOPOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY

## INCOME & EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions paid by members</td>
<td>17806.00</td>
<td>16597.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions from earlier years</td>
<td>76.00</td>
<td>116.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax from Covenants (estimated)</td>
<td>2000.00</td>
<td>2000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total subscription income</td>
<td>19162.00</td>
<td>18713.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit from sales of Publications</td>
<td>5537.71</td>
<td>6052.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest received</td>
<td>1461.19</td>
<td>2353.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, raffle &amp; donations received</td>
<td>1783.83</td>
<td>1481.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income for the year</strong></td>
<td>27944.73</td>
<td>28600.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members subscription publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Printing</td>
<td>12994.54</td>
<td>14014.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Distribution</td>
<td>2522.52</td>
<td>2761.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost of members publications</strong></td>
<td>15517.06</td>
<td>16775.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>2558.25</td>
<td>2459.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGM</td>
<td>694.66</td>
<td>2573.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>235.16</td>
<td>524.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications Storage and Service</td>
<td>1836.09</td>
<td>1843.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition at Guildhall Library (1998)</td>
<td>422.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Administration Costs</strong></td>
<td>5324.16</td>
<td>7823.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditure for the year</strong></td>
<td>20841.22</td>
<td>24599.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Deficit) for the year</td>
<td>7103.51</td>
<td>4001.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## BALANCE SHEET 31 December 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money in bank and National Savings</td>
<td>44783.00</td>
<td>36652.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax claimable on covenants</td>
<td>8000.00</td>
<td>6000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Payments</td>
<td>7796.00</td>
<td>3819.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash with Hon. Editor</td>
<td>175.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of Society's stock of publications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock at end of previous year</td>
<td>26404.31</td>
<td>17660.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions to stock</td>
<td>3400.00</td>
<td>21031.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Value of publications sold</td>
<td>-11243.22</td>
<td>-12287.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value of stock at year end</strong></td>
<td>18561.09</td>
<td>26404.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>79315.59</td>
<td>72876.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>1998</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions paid in advance</td>
<td>3834.00</td>
<td>4558.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas members’ Postage in advance</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>3934.00</td>
<td>4598.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Worth of the Society</strong></td>
<td>75381.59</td>
<td>68278.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Change in net worth                |          |         |
| Previous year's net worth          | 68278.08 | 64276.88|
| Surplus for the year               | 7103.51  | 4001.20 |
| **End-year net worth**             | 75381.59 | 68278.08|