

REVIEWS

Roman Waterfront Development at 12 Arthur Street, City of London. By Dan Swift. Museum of London Archaeology Service Archaeology Studies Series 19, 2007. Pp 78, 60 figs, 12 tables. ISBN 978 1 901992 62 5. Price: £8.95 pb.

London's Roman Amphitheatre: Guildhall Yard, City of London. By Nick Bateman, Carrie Cowan and Robin Wroe-Brown. Museum of London Archaeology Service Monograph 35, 2008. Pp xviii + 241, 176 figs, 12 tables, CD supplement. ISBN 978 1 901992 71 7. Price: £29.95 hb.

The excavations at 12 Arthur Street took place in 2001–2 and this report covers the prehistoric and Roman activities in the waterfront area to the west of the Roman bridgehead. It starts with an excellent piece of work, combining an auger hole survey with a careful examination of the natural deposits. Together with environmental data these are used to reconstruct the prehistoric topography and environment of the riverbank area, including evidence of prehistoric marshes, later cut by a tidal creek.

There is evidence for the construction of a Claudian waterfront, dated to *c.*AD 55, and the associated terracing of the hillside. On the upper terrace there was evidence for a very substantial apsidal structure, with piled timber foundations, interpreted as possibly part of a bathhouse, temple, or impressive private house. It certainly suggests that from an early date the area west of the bridgehead was being developed, but perhaps for public/high-status activities, rather than industry or warehousing.

The buildings on the site were possibly destroyed in the Boudican sack of AD 60/1, although the evidence for this is very scanty. The authors go on to suggest that there was no redevelopment until *c.*AD 70–83,

suggesting that the recovery, west of the bridgehead, was slow. The redevelopment comprised a substantial new timber quay, with the terraces maintained but raised. The remains of high-status buildings were found on the lower terrace: these are perhaps domestic or public rather than warehousing or industrial, with hypocausts, paved floors, mosaics and painted wall plaster, and speak to the different character of the waterfront in this area compared to the mouth of the Walbrook to the west. After the Hadrianic fire, remains of substantial buildings were recovered on the lower terrace, extending the occupation sequence into the later 3rd century. These, and a major culvert drainage system, are all important indicators of the continued occupation of the area. The other significant discovery at the site was a well containing the well-preserved elements of an elaborate rotary water-lifting device, consisting of wooden buckets and an iron linking chain. Assuming it was originally used in the vicinity, the device suggests a need for substantial quantities of water and reinforces the suggestion that there is a civic/public character to the development west of the bridgehead.

The publication is attractively designed and laid out, with clear figures and tables. The report is organised in the now standard pattern: a discussion of the structural sequence, with key material culture and environmental data integrated into the text, followed by specialist appendices covering important building material, pottery, accessioned finds, plant remains, animal bone, dendrochronology and radiocarbon dating, not otherwise covered in the main report. While this works well in terms of a chronological narrative, authorship is problematic in these integrated volumes: it

is not always possible to understand who was responsible for the scholarship involved. For example, with the water-buckets, was it Swift (the main author and editor) or Powell (the accessioned finds specialist) who undertook the work? While it might appear to break up the flow of the report, simply inserting clear authorship for material would not be problematic: these texts are not read as single narratives from front to back, they are works of scholarship and reference and it is important that authorship is clear.

Perhaps even more problematic with this format is the difficulty of examining specific aspects of the material culture or environmental data as a body. The accessioned finds report, for example, states that 'most of the accessioned finds are discussed in the main text' (p 65). If a researcher wants to be able to examine the material culture they have to trawl through the whole report. Given that some objects are residual, then they may well end up being presented in much later chronological sections. Let me make it clear, I entirely agree with the approach of integrating material with the chronological narrative and the potential that this gives for exploring assemblages, depositional processes, *etc.*, is a powerful tool. It is often somewhat under-used, although this report has an interesting chapter (4) which explores the waterfront infill deposits, with separate discussions of the pottery, building material, accessioned finds and plant remains, but sadly there are no conclusions about the nature of refuse disposal, collection, recycling, *etc.*

In general, however, it is unfortunate that finds and environmental data are not better served by this publication structure. Given that the specialists almost always pull together a catalogue in the first instance, before it is 'cut-up', with some parts inserted into the integrated text, why are we so reluctant to disseminate this information: the full catalogue? The tradition of not duplicating material within published reports (reproducing the same material both in catalogues and within integrated texts) makes financial sense, even in these days of cheaper print costs, but the opportunity to link these publications through to the digital dissemination of specialist data is a missed opportunity. This is especially true in London, where we are served by the

excellent London Archaeological Archive and Research Centre (LAARC — <http://www.museumoflondonarchaeology.org.uk/English/ArchiveResearch/>). The LAARC has a digital collections officer, a very effective website platform, and a long-term commitment to developing access to London's archaeological research. Simple pdf versions of these specialist reports would be a start. More generally, full deposition of the digital archives will revolutionise our ability to restructure, interrogate and question the archaeological data from London, and provide a platform for new research.

There is no doubt that publishing these reports gets a large body of material into an accessible and useable form, and disseminates it to a wide audience. They are extremely reasonably priced. But as a front end to, and supported by, digital archives and access, they would have even greater impact.

The discovery of Roman London's amphitheatre came during major archaeological excavations between 1985 and 1999. The report now produced (Bateman *et al*) describes the construction, development and disuse of the amphitheatre, from the 1st to 4th centuries AD.

Chapter 2, after a brief introduction to the pre-Roman topography, explores the development, use, and disuse of the amphitheatre. The first timber amphitheatre, built in *c.*AD 74, was constructed on relatively low ground, to the west of the Walbrook. There was evidence for the eastern entrance, arena palisade, bank for seating and associated drains, as well as some surrounding structures. The amphitheatre was rebuilt *c.*AD 125, with masonry foundations and walls, and timber stands. It was abandoned by the mid-4th century, largely robbed or demolished, and then sealed by dark earth. The arena may have survived as a depression, until the area was reoccupied in the 11th century (a sequence discussed in a companion volume).

The evidence, excellently presented, provides the platform for a very good discussion (ch 3) of the possible reconstruction, its setting and ownership. These sections work well, with some interesting debate regarding the significance of the amphitheatre to the wider settlement, especially the relationship to the adjacent fort. This chapter also discusses

some of the most significant material culture assemblages from the site: decorated samian with arena motifs, an extremely important early 2nd-century dump of glass cullet, and the timber/woodworking evidence. Specialist appendices cover microstratigraphy, building materials, pottery, graffiti, accessioned finds, coins, environmental evidence, dendro-chronology, etc.

An interesting addition to this volume is the inclusion of a CD-ROM which contains 25 tables of dating evidence, environmental data and artefacts. The files are in Microsoft Word format, a rather strange choice as Adobe Portable Document Format (pdf) would preserve the pagination and thus make these documents more easily referenced. Nevertheless, this is an interesting move, disseminating a large body of data in a very accessible format.

The same issues that were raised over the Arthur Street report, however, surface here. Why not make the full catalogues, for ALL the material culture and environmental evidence available, even if already integrated into the main report? The CD is excellent, as a rapid means of disseminating information: cheap, easy to produce and widely accessible. But it is time limited and will get lost (especially in the library copies). The archive is deposited with the LAARC, so there are no concerns over its long-term future, but more accessible dissemination through the LAARC should be a priority.

What the report does less well is to use material culture and environmental data as meaningful assemblages within the chronological structural text (ch 2). Rather it tends towards presenting individual objects, not the complexity of assemblages, which is a wasted opportunity. On the issue of authorship, this volume, like the Arthur Street report, makes scrupulous efforts to identify the specialists responsible for the various research by listing all of the contributors, but when substantive arguments from specialists are being used in the integrated text there seems to be no real obstacle to crediting their authorship directly.

The conservation and display of the site make an interesting part of the publication. Chapter 1 provides some background to the sensational press coverage at the time of discovery and the planning background

(just as sensational, but dealt with here in a short, matter-of-fact, statement). The amphitheatre's remains are preserved and displayed in the basement of the new Guildhall Art Gallery, and this aspect is picked up in section 3.8 (which really should have been a separate chapter rather than bolted on to the end of the chapter about the amphitheatre and its material culture). The processes, and technical achievements, were significant and this aspect of the project merits fuller publication, perhaps elsewhere.

This is a beautifully designed book and competitively priced, given its hardback format and the scale of colour reproduction throughout. The use of colour in the book is extremely good: in particular, it provides excellent clarity for the many drawings. The photographs of the site and material culture also benefit from the use of colour, giving the book a very attractive look, and helping considerably to convey the detail of the site. There is no doubt that this discovery makes a major contribution to our understanding of *Londinium*, and this volume presents the evidence clearly and in depth.

Tim Williams

Londinium and Beyond: Essays on Roman London and its Hinterland for Harvey Sheldon. Edited by John Clark, Jonathan Cotton, Jenny Hall, Roz Sherris and Hedley Swain. Council for British Archaeology Research Report 156, 2008. Pp xxxii + 294, 130 figs, 20 tables. ISBN 978 1 902771 72 4. Price: £35.00 pb.

There is a wealth of material packed into this attractive tribute to Harvey Sheldon. Thirty one different papers report on more than three centuries of antiquarian and archaeological research, drawing on the evidence of some two hundred archaeological excavations and thousands of individual finds.

The book has two main aims: to honour Harvey's unique contribution as 'a doughty and principled champion of London's buried heritage' (p xxiv), and to report on recent research into the archaeology of Roman London, building on the objectives of the recently published *A Research Framework for London Archaeology* (Eds T Nixon, E McAdam, R Tomber and H Swain, 2002). This is a

dense academic report, but it includes some exceptionally interesting material and several of the papers will be essential reading for students of Roman London for many years to come. As might be expected from a volume dedicated to Harvey, this is a book for all of London, not just the City — and we are constantly reminded of the poly-focal nature of the Roman settlement both within and beyond the town walls.

The contributions come in five separate sections. The first is concerned with the chronology and cartography of the Roman and early medieval town, with papers that address the historiography of previous research and summarise current thinking on London's early development. The second part is about the landscape, environment and hinterland of the Roman city (including papers on Westminster, Shadwell, Enfield, Grim's Dyke, and the road to Colchester). Attention then turns to matters of ritual and belief, including papers on votive deposition and funerary practice. The fourth section contains a series of reports on recent finds research, whilst the final part describes Harvey's personal contribution to the archaeology of London.

Although some of the papers represent an exercise in better documenting what we already know, most introduce new material, and in several received wisdom is challenged and overturned. Perhaps the most striking example of the latter is where Swain and Williams show that Roman London was a far less populous place than has previously been assumed. It is possible to argue with some of their suggestions about the extent and density of populated areas, but not with their general conclusions. London at the time of the Boudican revolt — with a likely population of 10–15,000 — was less than half as populous as we have hitherto believed.

The most important of the reviews presented here are those that focus on particular classes of finds. London is one of the most intensively studied sites in the ancient world, and has benefited from hundreds of published archaeological studies, but we have been slow to draw together the evidence of material culture in advancing works of synthesis. This publication represents a turning of the tide, and exploits the research potential of the finds catalogues

that are now being assembled. Two examples are worth particular mention.

Tyers lists 994 dated Roman oak timbers recovered from London and its surroundings. The table in which the information is summarised is invaluable, and offers a fascinating insight into the settlement's building history. The earliest known programme of construction, identified in excavations at One Poultry, used timbers felled in the winter of AD 47/48 and the following spring. Since these timbers were associated with the layout of the town's first main roads, it is likely that they date the foundation of the city. Many other episodes of town-planning and private building can be reconstructed from the evidence brought together in this paper. The paucity of 4th-century material also begs interesting questions.

Crummy and Pohl review the evidence of small toilet instruments from London and Southwark. They identify some telling differences in the distribution of tweezers and nail cleaners, and suggest that the inhabitants of the western suburb had adopted practices best paralleled on military sites, whilst the inhabitants of Southwark and the eastern fringes of the city were more influenced by native civilian practice. Several other papers explore other examples of patterning (for brooches, bathing paraphernalia, samian inkwells, colourless glass vessels) with similarly fascinating results.

The sheer complexity of the archaeology of Roman London can sometimes confuse. This can be seen in the contradictory versions of the town-plan published here (compare figs 1.3.5, 1.4.3 and 4.2.2 — all of which differ from each other in important detail). It has also resulted in some strange gaps in our knowledge: Reece's complaint (p 48) about the absence of a reliable coin list could be echoed by others interested in, for example, the archaeozoological data. This complexity also, however, opens the door to some wonderfully nuanced investigations into social practice and cultural identity within the Roman city. This volume is the product of some very fine research indeed — and is a fitting testimony to the work of Harvey Sheldon and his colleagues in both winning the information from the ground and encouraging its study.

Dominic Perring

From Temples to Thames Street — 2000 Years of Riverside Development; Archaeological Excavations at the Salvation Army International Headquarters. By Timothy Bradley and Jonathan Butler. Pre-Construct Archaeology Monograph 7, 2008. Pp xiv + 141, 79 figs, 30 tables. ISBN 0 9542938 6 4. Price: £18.95 pb.

This clearly presented report, including many colour illustrations, describes archaeological excavations undertaken between 2001 and 2003 in the south-west quarter of the City of London.

Roman and medieval remains are separately described. Each section starts with the archaeological sequences followed by specialist reports on the finds recovered and concludes with an interpretative discussion. Despite the limited extent of the areas investigated, due in part to a misguided policy of preservation *in situ*, an impressive amount of new information was obtained. The medieval finds included a sequence of 11th-century and later streets and houses, including buildings destroyed in the Great Fire of 1666, but the main contribution of this report is to our understanding of the two successive Roman public building complexes (the 'Period I' and 'Period II' complexes) identified in previous studies (notably those of Marsden in the 1960s and Williams in the 1980s).

It had previously been believed that these buildings had been erected in an undeveloped area, peripheral to the Roman city. The excavations reported on here show this not to have been the case. Findings included part of a possible quayside and the doorway of a building credibly identified as a warehouse. These remains are dated to the late 1st century AD and show that the early port of Roman London was far more extensive than previously realised.

The 'Period I' building complex built over these early structures included two large masonry apses facing onto the river, linked by a possible ambulatory or portico. At least three main phases of construction were represented but there are problems in incorporating the earlier discoveries of Marsden into a coherent plan. The dating is also problematic. Williams has previously suggested a late 1st- or early 2nd-century origin for the 'Period I' complex, but a

timber pile from beneath one of the earliest walls gave a dendrochronological date of AD 165. Bradley and Butler are correctly cautious about placing too much emphasis on this solitary find, but it shows that the complex was built no earlier than the reign of Marcus Aurelius. Subsequent phases can be dated AD 205–33, again from the evidence of tree-ring dating (B & B propose a date in the 230s but it is not clear why an earlier date is discounted), and to the mid-third century. These dates fit well with the evidence of the architectural stonework reused in the Roman riverside wall (built *c.*AD 270), which probably derived from religious monuments within the 'Period I' complex. Archaeological evidence of building collapse found at the Salvation Army site provides a possible context for one of the altars found in the riverside wall which described the restoration of a temple that had fallen down through old age.

The 'Period II' complex has previously been dated to AD 294 through tree-ring dating. This has not been universally accepted since the timbers might have been felled some time before use, but Goodburn's important report explains why the timbers used in this construction had not been stockpiled for more than a year. These building works were therefore unquestionably associated with the period in which London was being promoted as an imperial capital by Carausius and his successor Allectus. The excavations at the Salvation Army HQ show that the intention was to build at least two large classical temples, of almost identical dimension and design, within a precinct set immediately inside the riverside wall.

There is good reason to believe that these buildings were never finished, and that the project was abandoned at foundation level. We are therefore left ignorant as to the intended appearance of the two temples. B & B assume that each temple would have been built over a rectangular podium (*c.*20.5m by 8m) set on the south side of an enclosed courtyard. In this reconstruction the temples would have faced north up the hill, with their backs to the river. This seems improbable. The 'courtyards' are perhaps better interpreted as the areas beneath the temple cella, where deep foundations were not required. The broad foundations to the south of these areas would, therefore, have

been but a small part of the temple podium, intended to support the columns and walls of the portico and pronaos. If this were the case both temples would have been over 20m wide, set overlooking the river to the south. This assumes that the riverside wall would have been breached to allow access to the temple steps.

However we make sense of the evidence that is so interestingly and clearly presented here, there can be little doubt that London was being prepared for a building programme of both unprecedented scale and alien conception. Large classical temples were unusually rare in Roman Britain. It is to be regretted that this exceptional scheme died with the failure of the British-based usurpers.

Dominic Perring

Early and Middle Saxon Rural Settlement in the London Region. By Robert Cowie and Lyn Blackmore. Museum of London Archaeology Service Monograph 41, 2008. Pp xvii + 239, 132 figs, 74 tables. ISBN 978 1 901992 77 9. Price: £14.95 hb.

Another high-quality publication from MoLAS. The volume under review conforms to the exemplary standard of content, format and production set by London's premier archaeological contractor. Few units produce works of synthesis and the present book joins a select body of such studies, which includes Oxford Archaeology's *The Thames Through Time* (2007), itself a landmark volume that draws together the work of several contractors. Using both books, it is now possible for the first time to form a view of early and middle Saxon settlement along the course of the Thames from its source eastwards to London.

Following introductory text, the book presents the sites with regard to traditional period divisions: early Anglo-Saxon (AD 400–650) and middle Anglo-Saxon (AD 650–850), although many would place the start of the Anglo-Saxon period in cultural terms rather later in *c.*AD 450. The sites in question range from settlements to fish-traps and represent the outcome of archaeological endeavours both amateur and professional between the mid-1940s and the present. Chapters 2 and 3 give details of a total of 30 sites in 13

London boroughs from St Mary Cray in Kent in the east to Harmondsworth just north of Heathrow in the west.

The two Kent sites, St Mary Cray and Keston, both comprised discoveries of single sunken-featured buildings (SFBs) of 5th- to 6th-century date on the basis of associated pottery. The northernmost site considered is that at Enfield in Middlesex where parts of two SFBs were revealed and dated to the later 6th or 7th centuries. Anglo-Saxon settlement sites are rare in both of these counties and these sites deserve further exploration. The only other site to the north of London is that at Clerkenwell, where a cluster of early Anglo-Saxon pits is dated to *c.*AD 450–550 by pottery; similar activity is also recorded at Clapham south of the river.

The majority of the sites lay to the west of London where more extensive settlement and economic evidence has been excavated. Six fish-traps are recorded between Putney and Isleworth: early Anglo-Saxon examples at Putney and Barn Elms; middle Anglo-Saxon ones at Chelsea (x2), Barn Elms and Isleworth. Settlement sites lay along the course of the river at Whitehall, Chelsea, Battersea, Hammersmith, Mortlake, Brentford, Ham and Kingston, many of these on river bends and affording an extensive view in either direction along the river. The majority of the sites comprised small parts of evidently larger settlements. Excavations in five locations at Harmondsworth, however, have provided an indication of the possible density of settlement that might be hinted at by lesser finds elsewhere. Perhaps the most important individual site (re)examined here is that at Whitehall, where rescue excavations in the 1960s revealed part of a high-status timber hall of 8th- to 9th-century date, two SFBs, and an array of finds including Ipswich Ware and other imported pottery (Tating-type ware and Badorf ware amphorae). The relationship of this settlement to *Lundenwic* is of considerable interest and brings to mind the relationship between the contemporary settlement of *Hamwic* and its siting in relation to the royal *vill* at *Hamton*.

With a few exceptions, finds from all of the sites are of a relatively mundane insular nature. A few glass beads, a perforated Roman coin, several plain buckles, and some coins represent the only traces of personal

items, while household fittings are limited to a small number of nails and hinges. Loom-weights and a few bone items attest textile manufacture. Pottery finds were much more extensive, however, and Lyn Blackmore's analysis and reporting of this material is first-rate.

Overall, this volume draws together disparate evidence to form a thoughtful and thought-provoking synthesis. Knowledge of *Lundenwic's* hinterland is now available to compare with the other English *wic* sites. Furthermore, this key region of England forms the division between what became the open-field 'Champion' region of nucleated settlement of the English Midlands and the dispersed landscape of small plots of enclosed land of the South-East. The present volume allows for an assessment of the Anglo-Saxon background to these major social and economic differences. With such a reasonable cover-price, all with an interest in the development of London and region can afford a copy of this excellent book.

Andrew Reynolds

London and the Kingdom: Essays in Honour of Caroline M Barron. Edited by Matthew Davies and Andrew Prescott. Shaun Tyas, Donington; Harlaxton Medieval Studies vol XVI, 2008. Pp xii + 436, 28 pls, 5 figs. ISBN 978 1900289 91 7. Price: £49.50 hb.

Caroline Barron (hereafter CMB) has long been the *doyenne* of historians of medieval London, and her range of interests and achievements is justly celebrated in these 24 essays with an introductory appreciation and a bibliography of published writings. Not that it took a festschrift to make the point: CMB has been well known in her roles as supervisor, consultant and counsellor, and also for her long-running Medieval London seminars. Held from the mid-1970s at the Institute of Historical Research, these quickly evolved into a kind of clearing house, and one to which many non-historians also contributed (no bones were made about one important objective of these colloquies: the collection of material for her *London in the Later Middle Ages...*, eventually published in 2004). All this, and the esteem and affection in which she is held by the innumerable people who have come into contact with her, is well brought

out in Vanessa Harding's introduction, and by the individual contributors in turn.

An early indication of the scope of these essays and of CMB's own range of interests is given by the sections into which they are divided, albeit sometimes rather arbitrarily: Production and Consumerism, Trades and Learning, Religious Life, Merchants and Trades, Lawyers and Law, Literature and Literacy. The contributors include Ian Archer on conspicuous consumption at Court and City under Elizabeth, Carole Rawcliffe on celestial therapeutics in the medieval hospital, Clive Burgess on London, Church and kingdom, Gervase Rosser on making friends in English medieval guilds, Hannes Kleinecke on a witness statement by a 15th-century St Paul's School pupil, John Oldland on the wealth of early Tudor craftsmen, Jenny Stratford on Richard II's treasure and London, Elizabeth New on representation and identity in medieval London from the evidence of seals, Jessica Freeman and Nigel Saul on aspects of the vintner Simon Seman, Stephen O'Connor on customs evasion in London at the outbreak of the Hundred Years' War, Penny Tucker on London and the making of the Common Law, Stephen Rigby on kingship and tyranny in Chaucer's *Knight's Tale*, Paul Strohm on the interpretation of a chronicle text, Mary Rose McLaren on literacy and the London Chronicles of the 15th century, and Laura Wright on playground language and Old English phonetics.

The categorisation disperses a particularly striking group of essays on a topic which CMB has championed: the role of women. Mary Erler's 'Religious Women after the Dissolution: Continuing Community' elegantly and concisely traces the experience of several discharged religious, whether returning to the security of their families or continuing to live together in small groups, pooling their meagre pensions. Anne Sutton's analysis, based partly on testamentary evidence, of the condition and role of the silkwomen of the Mercery, who lacked any formal community or guild beyond affiliation with the Mercers' Company but who were nevertheless prepared to lobby, even march, to protect their interests. On a similar theme, Stephanie Hovland's study, 'Girls as Apprentices in Later Medieval London,'

demonstrates the range of choices, in addition to apprenticeships, that were open to girls during the period. Christian Steer's 'Commemoration and Women in Medieval London' shows, along with an analysis of commemorative brasses and tablets, John Stow's marked tendency to omit from his *Survey* monumental inscriptions concerning women, unless they were royal, aristocratic, or related to prominent citizens — not perhaps an aspect of the historian likely nowadays to be fêted at his annual commemorations. Not too remote from these, Martha Carlin's 'Putting Dinner on the Table' draws a parallel between the contemporary housewife's growing preference for buying-in meals, instead of cooking, and the widespread medieval patronage of cookshops — testimony to the enduring appeal of the takeaway.

Also notable are Barbara Harvey's examination of Westminster Abbey's management of its property in the City, illuminating the practical implications of collecting the countless rents granted or confirmed to religious houses in so many medieval property deeds. Derek Keene conducts a commendably polyglot investigation into the activities of Francesco Accursii, a Bologna lawyer with the interesting distinction of being consigned to hell by Dante, detailing his legal and other services to Edward I in respect of Gascony and, at Rome, in advancing an episcopal promotion to Canterbury. Accursii's houses in both Bologna and London are identified and, characteristically, mapped: the latter, in Cornhill, soon to become the site of the Leadenhall garner and the later market. Sheila Lindenbaum's essay, 'Literate Londoners and Liturgical Change ...', shows how the Church tried, by means of an elaboration of ritual and liturgical books, to accommodate itself to the marked growth of literacy (a topic also covered here by Mary Rose McLaren) and the potential threat posed to doctrinal purity by vernacular bibles.

This wide-ranging festschrift pays fitting tribute to its honorand, and makes an important contribution to the study of medieval London.

Tony Dyson

A Detailed Street Map of the City of London Five Hundred Years Ago, reproduced from The British Atlas of Historic Towns vol 3: The City of London from Prehistoric Times to c 1520 (1989), with an introduction by Caroline Barron. Old House Books, The Old Police Station, Pound Street, Moretonhampstead, nr Newton Abbot TQ13 8PA, 2008. Price: rolled for framing £12.99 or folded in a wallet £9.99, +£3.00 postage.

Here is a good exercise for all students of London: take a tube journey to any station in the City of London, walk out to the street, and unfold this map. Try to work out where you are in the City of 1520.

In 1989 Mary Lobel and her cartographer, Colonel W H Johns, produced a volume on the City of London in their series of large-format historical atlases, *British Atlas of Historic Towns*. This contained maps of London in its region, in Roman times, about 1270, and about 1520, with further maps showing the wards and parishes; together with a notable gazetteer of principal sites (churches, houses and so on). Many scholars contributed but the prime mover was Caroline Barron. The atlas has not been available for several years, and Caroline Barron has now produced, with Edward Allhusen of Old House Books, a reprint of the 1520s map, in two forms: to hang on your wall, or take with you to the library or indeed to the City itself. Professor Barron supplies a short introduction and outline gazetteer of places in a leaflet. This is therefore a product of 1989, without any updating.

But what a synthesis! It is an essential companion for the student of London's medieval and Tudor topography. Here will be found the sites, and usually the accurate extent, of all of London's 100+ parish churches; all the monasteries (though the northern boundary is at the south end of St John Clerkenwell, and St Mary Clerkenwell is not in), scores of houses of nobles and the civic élite, and fairly good reconstructions of large complexes such as the cathedral precinct. As far as I know, the layout of the streets by Johns and his cartographers is accurate, that is it can be overlaid on the modern street map. This is of immense importance and usefulness for archaeologists assessing new development sites and indeed writing them up.

The accuracy of the mapping of streets (and the City wall, river *etc*) is the map's greatest strength. Second, the major buildings comprising many complexes (monasteries, palaces, larger houses) are mapped as was known or thought in 1989 (some of the reconstructed plans going back to the early 20th century), and archaeologists working in the City will gradually refine individual sites as they excavate and rethink them.

My only criticism of the map, and of its original form in the *Atlas*, concerns the buildings which line all the streets. There is an attempt to indicate the built-up area (and buildings *vs* gardens) by having a variable density of buildings, in pink, along the streets. What this is based on was not explained in 1989 and is not here. It is not based on the earliest reliable street map by Ogilby and Morgan of 1676, which is in any case after the Great Fire; and it is not based on the Agas map of about 1570 (which would be a mistake in any case). It seems to be a hypothetical or suggested indication of the arrangement of buildings, and if so is a little misleading for those who dig the sites on the ground. It certainly does not show the true extent of buildings in 1520. So do not trust the pink.

That apart, this is a most welcome teaching aid and makes available again one of the most important recent documents in the elucidation of the medieval topography of the City.

John Schofield

The Black Death Cemetery: East Smithfield, London. By Ian Grainger, Duncan Hawkins, Lynne Cowal and Richard Mikulski. Museum of London Archaeology Service Monograph 43, 2008. Pp xii + 63, 36 figs, 13 tables. ISBN 978 1 901992 82 3. Price: £10.95 hb.

Excavations at the former Royal Mint in East Smithfield during the 1980s made important discoveries concerning three phases of activity on the site: the emergency burial ground established for victims of the plague in 1348–9, the Cistercian Abbey of St Mary Graces founded in 1350, and the Royal Navy Victualling Yard which occupied much of the site between the mid-16th century and the setting up of the Mint in the late 18th century. The results are being published

in three separate volumes, of which this concerns the plague cemetery.

The Black Death is among the most severe episodes of epidemic disease in recorded history, notable for its rapid spread across great distances and for its high level of mortality. Its nosology continues to be debated, without much sign of an emerging consensus. Across Europe as a whole perhaps between a third and half of the population died, although the impact of the disaster varied locally. According to contemporary accounts the epidemic was apparent in London by November 1348, was at its worst between February and April 1349 and past its peak by the end of May. In the North of England the peak came later that summer. So far as London is concerned this chronology is confirmed by the dating of wills enrolled in the City's court of Husting, although many of those wills were not actually enrolled until later in 1349 or in subsequent years. This delayed registration of the wills of many who had probably died at the height of the epidemic has caused some historians to claim that the epidemic continued well after 1349. The delay, however, is probably to be explained by confusion during and in the aftermath of the epidemic, not least surrounding the identification of the heirs and successors of those who had died during it. The outbreak, however, certainly had a continuing disruptive effect on agriculture, trade and domestic economies and this, combined with the effects of bad weather, doubtless left many of the survivors exposed to new risks of disease and infection. In subsequent decades there were further outbreaks of pestilence. These and other episodes of crisis mortality in the 14th century contributed to a long-term reduction in the level of population and a major redistribution of wealth as the price of labour rose and that of land fell. In London and other towns there was a reduction in the extent and density of building and one expression of the increase in the general standard of living was an improvement in housing conditions.

The population of medieval London cannot be estimated precisely. There are grounds for suggesting, as I have done in the past, that in 1300 it housed about 80,000 people, but higher or lower figures are certainly possible. Thus during the epidemic of 1348–9 there

may have been at least 20,000 bodies of the dead to be disposed of, and perhaps many more. A recent, though not especially well founded study, however, claims that there was a relationship between the size of a city and the duration of the epidemic there (R A Olea & G Christakos, 'Duration of human mortality for the 14th-century Black Death epidemic' *Human Biology* 77 no. 3 (June 2005), 291–31): by this measure London would have had 50,000 inhabitants on the eve of the outbreak. Whatever the likely size of the population of London, in the City, and especially within the walls, there would have been great pressure on the space available, for the parish churches were small and in many cases lacked churchyards or cemeteries of any size, while the common cemetery at St Paul's, like cathedral cemeteries elsewhere at that time, had limited space available. Towards the end of 1348 it was apparent the City faced a major problem in dealing with the dead and by March two large extramural burial grounds had been established outside the walls just beyond the edge of the built-up area and beyond the limit of the City's jurisdiction, one just north of West Smithfield and the other at East Smithfield. An emergency such as this may have been beyond the City authorities' capacity for rapid action and the response, like that to the Great Fire of 1666, required assistance at a higher level. A much later and somewhat confused source states that this was sought by the 'substantial men' of the City. Certainly, two men close to the king, one a household knight and the other a clerk, were responsible for acquiring the land and setting up the cemeteries. The king himself may have been directly involved, and the bishop of London certainly was.

The East Smithfield site was bounded on the east by open fields, on the west and south by houses and gardens facing East Smithfield, and on the north by Hog Street (later Rosemary Lane and now Royal Mint Street), which presumably served as the main route by which to bring in the bodies of the dead. The archaeological evidence indicates that over the century or so before the Black Death the predominant use of the land was for digging brickearth, sand and gravel, extracted from rectangular pits set out in a tightly organised pattern which

bears a remarkable resemblance to that of a graveyard. Even more striking is the regular organisation of the new burial ground. The most likely interpretation of its layout is, as suggested in the report, that in the first stage two long trenches for mass burial were laid out on the approximately north–south alignment dictated by the field boundaries. The western trench was some 70m long, and 30m to the south of it was evidence for a structure which may well have been the chapel dedicated to the Holy Trinity set up in the graveyard by April 1349. The second trench lay some 70m east of the first and was at least 125m long. In these trenches corpses were carefully laid up to five deep, some in coffins but most without and in shrouds or everyday clothing, the latter being indicated by the brooches and buckles among the small number of finds associated with the burials. A second stage appears to be marked by burials in individual graves carefully laid out in rows close to the trenches. These were probably concentrated towards Hog Street, most of them perhaps close to the western trench, where a short burial trench and a mass burial pit were also dug. None of the coins associated with the burials, most notably two collections in individual graves, were minted any later than the issue of 1344–51.

Altogether 759 skeletons were excavated, a figure which suggests that the total number of individuals likely to have been buried in the graveyard during the Black Death was about 2,400. On that basis the larger, but less well understood, burial ground at West Smithfield probably contained between 2,500 and 10,000 victims. Such totals for the Black Death burials in these cemeteries are much smaller than those stated or implied by contemporary or later medieval authors, and smaller than my own estimate, as above, of the numbers of Londoners likely to have died during the epidemic. However, we have no idea of how many victims may have been buried in the existing cemeteries of the City, Westminster, Southwark and other outlying settlements, many of which were outside the jurisdiction of the bishop of London. There may also have been unofficial burial pits and it is also likely that a good many Londoners fled the metropolis, only to die of the disease and be buried elsewhere.

The report provides a clear and valuable

account of the site and the burials. It explains the likely origin of the prehistoric, Roman, and earlier medieval finds and includes a useful, if at times uncritical, account of the historical context. It includes an analysis of the skeletons, which indicates a predominance of adult rather than children or youthful victims. The average height of the adults was perhaps a little less than that of populations from other medieval graveyards in London and elsewhere, but the statistical and social significance of this observation remains uncertain. The skeletons revealed that the adults had suffered the wide range of degenerative and infectious conditions (but not, of course, 'plague') now familiar from other sites of the period. The report provides an admirably clear-headed assessment of how its estimate of the numbers buried might or might not contribute towards answering the difficult question of the size of London's population on the eve of the epidemic.

Above all, this report adds to the narrative of the experience of the Black Death in London, notably through the insights it offers into the practice of burial during one of the most traumatic episodes of crisis mortality in the City's history. It throws light on the political economy of the response and on London's capacity to survive through a period of severe disruption, as is also indicated by continuity in the City's administrative procedures and record keeping. It may be, too, that the obvious concern for regularity in the cemetery indicates that this special place of burial had a symbolic significance as a necessary assurance that the living would continue to care for the dead and their ordered passage into the next world.

Derek Keene

London's Delftware Industry: the Tin-glazed Pottery Industries of Southwark and Lambeth. By Kieron Tyler, Ian Betts and Roy Stephenson. Museum of London Archaeology Service Monograph 40, 2008. Pp xv + 138, 174 figs, 28 tables. ISBN 978 1 901992 76 2. Price: £15.95 hb.

This volume is a product of the joint English Heritage and MoLAS (now MoLA) programme to publish backlog excavations from before 1992. It describes the excavation of five tin-glazed ware production sites on

the south bank of the Thames at 5 Montagu Place, Pickleherring, Rotherhithe, Norfolk House, and Glasshouse Street. It synthesises a great deal of archaeological information that has come to light since the pioneering days of Ivor Noël Hume, who published *Early English Delftware from London and Virginia* in 1977. A brief introduction outlines the terminology and conventions as well as the referencing system used for the illustrated pot. The scene is then set by a brief overview of the industry's early development in England and especially London. The writings of the main continental commentators on ceramic technology (Piccolpasso, Paape, and Diderot) are then discussed alongside the London archaeological finds, to shed light on the production sequence. Unfortunately, little reference is made to recent work by continental archaeologists, for example, the published excavations of production sites at Deventer or Saint Sever in Rouen.

The reports on the individual kilns take a common format which can be illustrated by the Pickleherring pothouse at Southwark, which was in operation from c.1618 to 1713. Firstly, the history of archaeological investigation is described, extending between 1954 and 1973, accompanied by a table listing the known range of forms. A detailed documentary history of the pottery follows based on secondary sources, notably, the publications of Frank Britton and Rhoda Edwards. The archaeological evidence for the potworks (three excavated kilns in the case of the Pickleherring works) is then discussed. However, anyone interested in technology will be disappointed by the lack of a synthetic analysis of the excavated Southwark and Lambeth kilns and especially by their illustration using 1:200 plans which reduce the walls to black blocks.

The real meat of each chapter is the discussion of the kiln furniture and wasters associated with each potworks. This section is amply illustrated, both by 1:4 line drawings and numerous high quality colour photographs. The illustrations are mostly integrated in with the text, which makes for ease of reference. However, the page design is rather untidy and the reviewer (suffering with varifocal lenses) found the convention of bracketing pot numbers <P70> to be distracting. Each pot type (porringer, posset

pots, salts *etc*) is discussed in turn. Finally the floor tiles, both blue-and-white and polychrome, are detailed; accompanied by colour photographs presented in dedicated plates in contrast to the pottery. Each design is presented in turn with an assessment of its attribution (mostly certain) to the kiln.

Chapter 8 summarises the development of the London industry, stressing the impact of new drinks like coffee and tea and London's position as a major port. None of the London pot houses appear to have occupied specially built complexes and they seem to have developed largely by conversion and extension of existing buildings. The movement of potters between both London potteries and further afield is also discussed and usefully tabulated in appendix 9.1. The London potteries appear to have been producing similar ranges of products. Visually, the fabrics of the various Southwark and Lambeth potteries appear to be virtually indistinguishable as they all used a mixture of local red clay and white lime-rich clay from East Anglia or Kent. However, ICP (inductively coupled plasma) analysis of the fabrics has shown clear differences both between potteries and between tiles and pots. This reflects both variations in the red clay geology underlying the various pot houses and the use of different red and white clay mixtures. The results of all the ICP analyses are presented in tables and scatter diagrams in appendix 9.3 with a detailed technical discussion by Michael Hughes. In conclusion the volume ends with a brief discussion of the decline of tin-glaze production under increasing pressure from the products of Staffordshire.

Despite a few minor quibbles, this is yet another excellent product from Museum of London Archaeology. It makes a great deal of archaeological and technical information readily available for the first time. Anyone who has ever worked on backlog material produced over many decades to varying standards will know this is no easy task. The volume will be an important work of reference for all those who are interested in the economic, social, technological, and art historical aspects of the tin-glazed industry. One eagerly awaits the hopefully forthcoming MoLA volumes on the excavated tin-glazed vessels and tiles from London for

further insights into the consumption of this ware in the metropolis. In these days of increasingly inflated prices for both new and used academic books, this volume also offers incredible value for a hard-backed volume with excellent colour illustrations. Please go out and buy a copy as just encouragement for the future expansion of this outstanding monograph series.

Paul Courtney

Burial at the Site of the Parish Church of St Benet Sherehog before and after the Great Fire. By Adrian Miles and William White, with Danae Tankard. Museum of London Archaeology Service Monograph 39, 2008. Pp xii + 114, 63 figs, 43 tables. ISBN 978 1 901992 75 5. Price: £12.95 hb.

Late 17th- to 19th-century Burial and Earlier Occupation at All Saints, Chelsea Old Church, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. By Robert Cowie, Jelena Bekvalac and Tania Kausmally. Museum of London Archaeology Service Archaeology Studies Series 18, 2008. Pp xii + 69, 49 figs, 20 tables. ISBN 978 1 901992 73 1. Price: £8.95 pb.

It was in the summer of 1963 or 1964 that I first came across the small churchyard of St Benet Sherehog, off Sise Lane. Dominated by a huge lime tree, and hemmed-in on three sides by 19th-century commercial buildings, it was neatly kept, boasting two dishevelled brick tomb-chests, one to John Maurois (d 1674) and the other to Michael Davison (d 1676). St Benet Sherehog had been destroyed during the Great Fire of 1666, but its churchyard survived as an additional burial ground for St Stephen Walbrook, to which parish St Benet's had been annexed in 1670. In the autumn of 1994, 30 years after my visit, it was announced that the churchyard was to go, for its site and that of 1 Poultry were required for a new complex of offices and shops designed by James Stirling. The evaluation work and excavations of the designated site took place between March 1994 and June 1996 and it was during summer and autumn of 1994 that the burial ground and underlying church of St Benet Sherehog were excavated.

This report focuses on a study of the parish before and after the Great Fire, a

summary of evidence for the medieval church of St Benet's and the religious life of the parish, and a section on the historical and archaeological evidence for funerals and burial practices, including an analysis of coffins and coffin fittings. Bill White's section incorporates a detailed account of the human skeletal remains from the 17th- to 19th-century burial sample and a comparison of contemporary cemetery populations from elsewhere in London. 56 of the burials were pre-Great Fire, of which 15 were churchyard burials, the rest being within the church destroyed in 1666. Of the remaining 224 burials, the majority had been encoffined, so one was dealing with the reasonably well-to-do lower-middling sort.

The most productive samples came from the Davison vault. There were five deposits, though only two had been provided with lead shells. But it is these two deposits — those of Judith Davison (d 1685) and (possibly) Michael Davidson (d 1676) — which yielded the most important observation, for neither had outer wooden cases; rather, the grips and grip-plates had been punched through the lead shells. This rather shoddy workmanship, and the closeness in date of the two deposits, may well have been the work of one undertaking establishment. One of the deposits was not noted in the burial registers; this is not all that unusual where burial vaults are concerned, for it was common practice not to note the deposit of a body in a vault whose funeral service had been held elsewhere than in the parish church in whose vaults the body was deposited.

Site development was also the reason for the excavations at All Saints, Chelsea Old Church in 2000. The Cowie, Bekvalac and Kausmally report concentrates on an area to the north-east of the church which had been requisitioned for burial *c.*1700, containing at least ten rows of graves dated to the 18th century and the first half of the 19th century. The richest material came from two brick graves and a private vault.

The brick grave of the Long family (in use between 1788 and 1827) yielded seven deposits, though only three had been placed in lead shells. The other brick grave contained a single lead shell, encasing the remains of an unidentified female over 46 years of age. The Butler vault, in the north-east corner

of the churchyard, was in use between 1712 and *c.*1750 and contained three deposits. It has been suggested that the roof of this elegant structure had either collapsed or been broken prior to the deposit of Martha Butler (d 1739); I think not, as it was not at all uncommon for vaults to be crudely entered via the roof, and this intrusion probably occurred in 1739 to facilitate the deposit of Martha Butler's coffin.

The remainder of the report discusses the early archaeological evidence of the site, the development of Chelsea between the 16th and 19th centuries and burial practice in the 18th and early 19th centuries. Bekvalac and Kausmally's section on 'Life and death in Chelsea' deals with an analysis of the preservation, population structure, accuracy of osteological age and sex determination, bio-metric data, non-metric variation, palaeopathology and dental pathology of 198 of the 250 skeletons retrieved from the site.

I did get a little confused at times with some of the terminology in the Chelsea report. By 'brick-lined' graves I assumed that the authors meant 'brick graves' (a grave lined with brick need not be emphasised as 'brick lined'), for 'lead-lined coffins' I read 'lead shells' (a lead-lined coffin is a wooden coffin internally lined with thin sheet lead and rarely used prior to *c.*1860), and for 'table tomb' I inferred 'tomb chest' (a table-tomb is a ledger raised from the ground by means of pillars of stone supporting each corner). However, Adrian Miles puts the reader right in his section on 'Coffins'. But these are niggling criticisms of an otherwise excellent report.

Because of the amount of post-excavation analysis, both reports have been some years in preparation, but what might be regarded as one man's delay is another's opportunity for research. The Sherehog report by Adrian Miles and Bill White — the latter's last major publication prior to his official retirement from the Museum — is the finest such treatise I have ever read, more so as Miles refreshingly adheres to the original terminology for coffin-furniture. In Miles and White one has a combination as perfect as that of Gilbert and Sullivan. The Chelsea report is also outstanding, if only because this is the first time than an assemblage from

a settlement on the edge of 18th- and 19th-century London has been studied in full.

Julian WS Litten

St Marylebone Church and Burial Ground in the 18th to 19th Centuries: Excavations at St Marylebone School 1992 and 2004–6. By Adrian Miles, Natasha Powers and Robin Wroe-Brown, with Don Walker. Museum of London Archaeology Service Monograph 46, 2008. Pp xiv + 172, 168 figs, 78 tables. ISBN 978 1 901992 79 3. Price: £18.95 hb.

Some osteologist and historian readers have had difficulty with the integrated approach to cemetery publications by MoLAS but in this 46th volume in the Monograph Series the text flows beautifully. The title says ‘Church and Burial Ground’ and despite the main thrust of archaeology being directed at the latter, fortuitously the excavated area includes much of the demolished church (built originally when the parish was partly rural). The textual transition to consideration of the St Marylebone dead is then bridged elegantly by chapters on funerary customs, grave and vault furniture, and potted biographies of some of the parishioners (including Elizabeth Orly Hunter (d 1813), who preferred parrots to men, and the Rev Dr John Fountaine (d 1787), whose ‘most wicked and abandoned wife’ Jane also found the time to produce 14 children). Finally, there is the parallel discussion of the ‘buried population’ from the point of view of the documentary sources and separately the osteology.

Excavations in 2004 produced 314 skeletons. With 34 individuals excluded from the analysis because they were less than 30% complete, but supplemented with skeletons excavated from test pits during the earlier presence on the site in 1992, sample size was 301 — large for post-medieval assemblages. It is also closely dated to the mid-18th century to c.1850. The sex ratio at 120:100 exceeded the expected 106:100, as with other London post-medieval sites where there seem to have been an excess of male deaths. Child mortality at 30% of the sample was of the expected order, whereas in some other sites this figure can be suspiciously low.

The documentary work on the population and the occupations of the men of the parish

indicates that the skeletal sample was one of high socio-economic status. Initially the authors do not find it simple to sustain this from the osteological results. For example, insofar as physical stature can be an indicator of social status, the authors found that average statures for men and women were consistent with the results from other Early Modern sites in England and were not significantly greater than the contemporary paupers buried in the Cross Bones cemetery in Southwark. The prevalences of healed fractures and of periostitis of the lower limbs were rather high and comparable with those from lower class samples. However, the prevalence of dental caries infection was twice as high as that shown in any contemporary site. Rickets was present at a high prevalence. However, while this condition was characteristic of poverty in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, reasons why this was consistent with higher social status are elicited here. When it comes to the evidence for dentistry and orthodontic practice St Marylebone really begins to be seen as a wealthy parish. Also, an exciting find was a young leper (only the second post-medieval victim of leprosy to be encountered in an English cemetery). His right foot had been amputated some years before he died, presumably as palliative treatment for the damage sustained as the disease advanced. This episode is remarkable for showing influence in gaining surgical attention, probably not available to the poor. Finally, osteological studies were raised to new heights in examining the vicissitudes of fashion. Just as with the dead from the Battle of Towton (1461), where it was possible to match cranial injuries with the precise type of weapon that caused them, here the frequent occurrence of *hallux valgus* (bunions) could be matched to the fashionable footwear that led to this painful condition. During the 18th century the more prosperous could afford hand-made shoes with symmetrical soles and pointed toes. The authors elegantly make use of footwear in the Museum of London’s own Dress and Decorative Arts Collection to explore this phenomenon. A similar synthesis was possible to match the frequently observed distortion of the torso in women with contemporary tight corsets and stays in the Museum’s collection.

Unfortunately, researchers in osteology,

medicine and social customs, having had their appetites whetted by this volume, will look in vain for information concerning where the bones are curated. This book marks a departure from previous practice in that it concerns a large assemblage that has now been reburied, rather than being retained as a research resource. The authors of course are not responsible for this reprehensible policy which continues in vogue. The volume is very readable, a delight to the eye, and is well indexed. At less than £20 for a 172-page hardback it is exceptionally good value.

Bill White

Pots and Potters in Tudor Hampshire: Excavations at Farnborough Hill Convent, 1968–72. By Jacqueline Pearce. Guildford Borough Council, 2007. Pp 234, 125 figs. ISBN 978 0 9553251 1 3. Price: £19.95 pb.

This book could easily be overlooked by many London archaeologists. The ‘Hampshire’ in the title makes it seem rather remote and irrelevant for a subject as mundane and local as domestic ceramics in the 15th and 16th centuries. But in fact it tells the remarkable story of a rural site which played a key role in the development of the ceramic industry in southern Britain, and in the supply of pottery to London. From the 14th century through to the 18th century, a corner of west Surrey and north-east Hampshire supplied a large proportion of London’s pottery, starting and finishing with (very different) productions of mainly utilitarian ‘kitchen’ wares, separated by a period of intense innovation and diversification which ran from the late 15th to the early 17th centuries. Kilns and waster pottery representing this period were excavated at Farnborough Hill in 1968–72 by Felix Holling of the Guildford Museum, and an interim report was published in *Surrey Archaeological Collections* with commendable speed. In the present volume, Jacqui Pearce revisits the site with the aid of new documentary evidence, scientific analyses, and recourse to material in the Museum of London’s collections, much of it excavated since the publication of the interim report.

The author would be the first to admit that this publication represents the work of many individuals: professional, amateur, student and ‘Young’ archaeologists, supported by

many organisations, notably the HLF and charitable trusts. Only this level of support has enabled the work to be brought to a successful conclusion and publication, and one wishes that the same could be done for other ceramic production centres in our region. The study is wide-ranging and thorough, covering in successive chapters the historical sources; the geological and topographical setting; the excavation itself; the pottery (late medieval coarseware, late medieval and transitional finewares, and the post-medieval white- and redwares); manufacturing and its problems; fabrics, forms and functions; distribution and marketing; and the origins, influences and development of the wares. The depth and breadth of the more practical chapters give the author a firm base from which to discuss the various influences that may have contributed to creative developments in this previously conservative industry, and indeed to the transition of the ceramic industry of southern Britain from ‘medieval’ to ‘post-medieval’. Characteristic of this period is the appearance of a wide range of new forms, particularly of ‘table’ ware, together with new fabrics and improved glazing techniques. The appendices contain useful reports on petrological characterisation and chemical analyses, which should help in the identification of products found elsewhere. It is good to find an index.

It still seems little short of amazing that this area should have been the focus of a revolution that transformed the ceramics of our region from the 15th to the 17th century, but this study does at least make it plausible (though far from inevitable). A key new piece of evidence is the discovery of documents relating to the Raignold family of potters (later anglicised to Reynolds) and the less obviously alien Marnar family, who appear to have migrated to this area from the Rhineland in the mid-16th century.

On the whole, the book is excellently presented and illustrated, although it could have been improved by the use of colour if the budget had allowed. There are some minor glitches: the Reading Beds do not appear explicitly on the geological map (fig 6), and it would be useful to have a scale on each set of pottery illustrations in case they are photocopied or scanned. There may be some

confusion over the capacity of the 'large' Cheam kiln (p 38); the 600 pots quoted refer to the typical redware production of that kiln, not to the small whiteware jugs fired in the previous kiln. More use could perhaps have been made of the various quantified measures in answering questions about (for example) the proportions of handled vessels.

The production of this report highlights the need for similar syntheses and publications relating to other areas around London. The obvious ones are Woolwich, and the many other Thames-side production sites flagged up by Rhoda Edwards in the 1970s. Together they might be able to answer the question of what transformed the London region from a ceramic backwater to a market leader in a little over a century.

Clive Orton

The Greville Estate: the History of a Kilburn Neighbourhood. By Marianne Colloms and Dick Weindling. Camden History Society, 2007. Pp 112, 24 figs. ISBN 978 09044 91685. Price: £7.50 pb.

This interesting book is a well-presented publication on the history of a distinct area of Kilburn. The standard and detail of the research is admirable and wide-ranging with a sources section at the back of the book.

The first four chapters of the book deal with the history and development of the estate from the 12th century until the 1970s, whereas the second half of the book records the history of individual roads, buildings and the occupants on a street by street approach. There are fascinating short biographies of past residents of many of the houses, sometimes supplemented by photographic portraits, such as in the section on the social reformer Annie Besant. There are also absorbing stories about buildings such as the Kilburn Fire Station and the Maida Vale Picture Palace.

The black and white illustrations add to the interest of the book, but it is the detailed maps and street plans of the estate that really help the reader to obtain a sense of the locality. The publication would have been enhanced by the addition of a short introduction and conclusion stating the aims of the volume and achievements of the research, but this is still an excellent publication well worth reading.

Diane Tough

Historic Views of London: Photographs from the Collection of B E C Howarth-Loomes. By Ann Saunders. English Heritage, 2008. Pp 237, many illus. ISBN 9 781905 624188. Price: £19.99 hb.

Historic Views of London is by no means the first book of early photographs of London, but it is the first to draw upon the extensive holdings of the late Bernard Howarth-Loomes, a well-known collector of early photographs. Thankfully, his collection has been saved for the nation and is now housed at the National Museums Scotland. However, the fact that the book is based exclusively on this collection is both its strength and its weakness.

On the plus side, many, if not most of the photographs in the collection have not been published in recent times. This means that the book does not just feature 'the usual suspects', and indeed it contains some real delights, including a number which I had not seen before. On page 33, for example, there is a superbly atmospheric view of a paddle steamer disembarking at Greenwich Pier in the 1850s, and on page 44 a beautifully composed photograph of the northern end of Hungerford suspension bridge *c.*1850.

On the down side, at least from the point of view of reproduction quality, is the fact that Haworth-Loomes specialised in the collection of stereo cards. These photographic objects, consisting of pairs of images mounted side-by-side on card, were designed to be seen through a binocular viewer which gave the illusion of a 3-D, or stereo, image. Viewed in this way they can give a stunning sense of reality, but when only one of the pair of images is reproduced on the printed page it can look rather flat. Furthermore, stereo cards are relatively small — each photograph is only about 75 by 75mm — and so the amount of detail they contain is limited. Several of the images in this book could be said to be somewhat 'overblown' in reproduction as a result.

Also to be regretted is the fact that the reproduction throughout the book is in black and white. At £19.99 the book represents good value but today there is very little difference in cost between black and white and colour printing. Early photographs may be monochrome but they are never black

and white. Colour printing would, in my view, have considerably enhanced the visual appeal of many of the photographs, and the book as a whole.

The size of stereo cards, on the other hand, meant that only small cameras were needed to take the pairs of photographs. Small cameras have faster lenses, and consequently shorter exposure times, so that the earliest examples of 'instantaneous' photographs, in which the motion of moving objects such as people and traffic was arrested, exist mainly in stereo card form. A pioneer of this new snapshot photography in the early 1860s was Valentine Blanchard whose series of 'Instantaneous Views of London' gives a real sense of the hustle and bustle of the capital's thoroughfares in contrast to the apparent emptiness depicted in most contemporary photographs taken with 'normal' cameras. *Historic Views of London* contains very good examples of work by Blanchard and other early snapshot photographers.

The main part of the book is divided into chapters dealing with a mixture of specific places, for example St Paul's Cathedral, and less specific subjects, such as Londoners. With the exception of the instantaneous street scenes, however, the emphasis is firmly on architecture. The introductory texts and extended captions are informative and give this book some value as a work of reference. For reasons that are not clear to me the book ends with chapters on the Kodak works at Harrow and Kodak shops in London.

All in all, this book is a welcome addition to the published body of 19th-century photographs of London where the photographs are treated, as they should be, as historical objects and not just as illustrations. The introductory texts by Alma Howarth-Loomes and Alison Morrison-Low provide a fascinating insight into both Howarth-Loomes, the man, and the extent and nature of his important collection.

Mike Seaborne

Survey of London: *South and East Clerkenwell* (Vol XLVI). Yale University Press for English Heritage, 2008. Pp xxi + 468, 585 illus. ISBN 03 00137 273. Price: £75.00 hb.

Survey of London: *Northern Clerkenwell* (Vol XLVII). Yale University Press for English Heritage, 2008. Pp xxi + 523, 598 illus. ISBN 03 00139 373. Price: £75.00 hb [or £135.00 with Vol XLVI].

First of all, I must declare a personal interest in the subject matter of these two volumes. I was born in a small 'fourth rate', late 1820s, terrace house on the Brewers' Company Estate, between St John Street and Goswell Road. My maternal grandfather had been born in the mid-1880s, the son of a journeyman compositor, in an early 18th-century cottage in Stewards Place, Clerkenwell Green. My maternal grandmother, the daughter of a London Italian family, was born just across the Green, in Jerusalem Passage. By then, however, the historic Jerusalem Passage, which had been the northern access route to the medieval Priory of St John of Jerusalem, had been boldly dissected by the Victorian civil engineering and social 'improvement' that was Clerkenwell Road. As a child, I played in old backyards — which had been paved-over during mid-19th-century cholera outbreaks — in the local streets, in the Finsbury Borough Council's inherited Victorian public gardens, as well as on local bomb ruins. On Sundays, I attended St Peter and Paul's Roman Catholic Church (1835), in Amwell Street, a short walk away from another point of pilgrimage — the Finsbury Borough Council's Merlin Street Public Baths (1932–3). Memorable childhood activities included pushing market barrows to Exmouth Market, where some traders still kept goats and miniature goat carts in their backyards. Exmouth Market, then a thriving working class street market, rather than a fashionable eating area, was the focus of much local life. Some of my earliest health care was provided by the pioneering Finsbury Health Centre (built 1937–8, to the design of Berthold Lubetkin). Much of my earliest reading came courtesy of the Finsbury Borough Council's old Clerkenwell Free Library (1890), in Whiskin Street, and then from the new Finsbury Library (1967), in St John Street. Like many London borough libraries, the latter had a comprehensive,

and, for me, inspirational, run of the Survey of London volumes. Friends lived in a mix of late Georgian terraces, Victorian model dwellings, and pre- and post-War Finsbury Borough Council flats. Clerkenwell was then still a place of small factories and workshops, as well as housing — most of which was still un-gentrified. Close to my home there were working watchmakers, watchcase makers, clockmakers, engravers, enamellers, platers, bookbinders, gilders and non-ferrous foundry men, working from backyard work-shops. Long evening walks, with my uncle Jim and a succession of family dogs, together with the early discovery of William Pinks' *History of Clerkenwell* (1865), fostered an increasing understanding of the area's rich and multi-layered history. Growing-up in Clerkenwell made me aware that it was, indeed, an 'old country' in terms of street layout, building stock, businesses and industry, family and social networks and, of course, its long history.

How wonderful, then, to now have these two fine volumes, extending to almost 1,000 pages, devoted to the detailed analysis and description of most of these themes. The volumes continue the high level of research and scholarship which historians have rightly come to expect from the Survey of London. They are the second area volumes to be published under the auspices of English Heritage, and the first to be published in association with Yale University Press, on behalf of the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art. The latter, no doubt, explains the extensive use of high quality illustrations throughout the text, many of them in colour, totalling just under 600 in each volume. Between them, the volumes cover the whole of the historic parish of Clerkenwell, as well as, to the south, the Charterhouse Square area, the Liberty of Glasshouse Yard, the old Middlesex part of St Sepulchre, and small contingent parts of St Botolph, Aldersgate, and St Andrew, Holborn. The two volumes divide the area into a south and eastern segment (Vol XLVI), which includes the Brewers' Company Estate, which is actually in the north, and a northern one (Vol XLVII), which includes the Baynes Warner Estate, which is in the south, to the west of Farringdon Road. Deciding on how to divide the area cannot have been an easy task and

some readers would probably have hoped for a more strictly north-south separation. Such a simple solution, however, would have inevitably split some of the major land parcels, such as the two Northampton Estates, in half, and would probably have unbalanced the two volumes.

Although each volume has its own introduction, that in Vol XLVI sensibly provides general coverage for both areas. This is a model of good, traditional, urban history writing. It covers the evolution of the medieval settlement and road pattern, beginning with the mid-12th-century foundation of the Priory of St John of Jerusalem and the Nunnery of St Mary, running through to the late 14th-century foundation of the Charterhouse, and on to the impact of the Dissolution on buildings and landholdings. The post-Fire patterns of building and estate development are then outlined, as well as key elements of population, social, economic, and industrial change. The physical and social impact of the new Victorian 'improvers' roads — Farringdon Road (1841-69), Clerkenwell Road (1874-8) and Rosebery Avenue (1887-92) — are briefly explored. Churches, prisons, schools, public buildings, and social housing are also introduced. For the 20th and 21st centuries, the introductory analysis focuses on major public and private sector buildings, as well as gentrification — typified, perhaps, by mention of Janet Street-Porter's homes in Britton Street and Clerkenwell Close. The introduction to Vol XLVII is equally scholarly, although it concentrates more strictly on the volume's geographic area of coverage. A special focus is on 18th- and 19th-century estate development, the impact of social change, and new building additions in the 20th and 21st centuries.

Leaving the wood for the trees, so to speak, the volumes then tackle their subject matter, in immense detail, in each of their respective 13 and 17 sections devoted to the local districts. Included in the latter are two separate introductions for the districts comprising the New River Estate and Pentonville. These very well researched, written and illustrated chapters (which reflect not only the well-honed skills of the Survey of London team, but the fortunately high survival rate of monastic, parish, estate and other records) contain something for almost

everyone interested in London history. Archaeologists and medieval historians will, doubtless, focus on the three local monastic houses, the morphology of the early town plan, and the processes and patterns of early building. For the topographical historians, as well as historical geographers, there are the in-depth analyses of the development of each of the major landed estates and their buildings, and also for the smaller parcels and ribbon developments found in the southernmost districts. Architectural historians will also enjoy these sections, as well as those on public sector architecture, especially those relating to Berthold Lubetkin and Tecton, and will welcome the sections on modern buildings, including those by Piers Gough's CZWG partnership and Troughton McAslan. Engineering historians will be drawn to the sections on the New River, as well as the new Victorian roads. Social historians will find much of interest in the sections on pleasure gardens, theatres, public houses, housing conditions, slum life (including selections from Charles Booth's Survey Notes), and social change. Industrial historians will be able to tease out much information relating to local breweries, gin distilleries, printing works, foundries, and, of course, to watch and clock making, jewellery making, scientific instrument making and the many other workshop trades found in the area. Architectural historians, engineers, and industrial historians will all appreciate the sections on Victorian warehousing. The literary historian is also well served, with numerous quoted extracts from most of the major works of fiction, including those by Charles Dickens, George Gissing and Arnold Bennett, to feature the area. There will also be an enormous appeal for local residents, keenly interested in the history of their own particular houses, and their earlier occupants (expect a rash of applications for Blue Plaques in the area!), streets and estates. Excellent indexes will help readers and researchers navigate the volumes.

Given the enormous breadth of scholarship displayed in these two volumes, it feels churlish to raise criticisms. Such, however, is the lot of the reviewer. Although the volumes have struck a sensible balance between the general and the detail, some elements have inevitably been lost in the mix. In the two

introductory chapters, for instance, there is nowhere any real mention of the fact that the process of suburban building in Clerkenwell, a relatively small area of only around 350 acres, took some 700 years to be completed. Thus, between around 1150 and 1850, Clerkenwell was part of London's urban fringe, with a distinctive *rus in urbe* feel. Why was this? Again, the general introduction would have benefited from a sharper review and analysis of the processes of demographic change. More fundamentally, this section would also have benefited from a map showing the different phases of building development, as well as from the inclusion of a modern street map of the area. These would have helped the general reader. Likewise, although there are many splendid elevations, plans and photographs of houses and flats throughout the two volumes, there are rarely any illustrations of their interiors and fixtures, such as doorways, fireplaces and chimneypieces, cupboards and stairs. Although the topographical division of the volumes inevitably, and understandably, weakens any strong thematic treatment of particular subjects, it is a shame that some key elements, such as the processes of building development, and the range of workshop housing, were not selected for more special treatment.

These, however, are in the general scheme of things only minor criticisms. The volumes are, undoubtedly, the best yet to have been produced by the Survey of London. Although, in many ways, the volumes work best as a twosome, their price represents very real value for money. Indeed, I suspect that there must have been a significant subsidy from the Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art. All parties involved with this monumental project are to be heartily congratulated — not least the researchers and editors who have spent some eight, or so, years engaged on it. This year, the Survey will publish a monograph on the Charterhouse itself, which will complete its work on the Clerkenwell area.

Chris Ellmers

The Pleasures of London. By Felix Barker and Peter Jackson, edited by Ann Saunders and Denise Silvester-Carr. London Topographical Society Publication 167, 2008. Pp x + 250, numerous illus. Available from the Society, £30.00 [or £35.00 with postage].

In 1783 the Royal Academy of Arts recorded 3,800 visitors on a single day to its annual exhibition. Even allowing for possible ‘massaging’ of the figures, this is an awful lot of Londoners with nothing better to do. London has been renowned over the centuries for providing ways of passing one’s leisure hours, and *The Pleasures of London* is packed full of illustrations of most of them. Indeed, like the picture-hang at Somerset House, the book is edge-to-edge pictures. The authors have collected a marvellous selection of etchings, woodcuts, prints and photographs showing both the citizens at play, and the venues used to that end. They also manage to insert an accompanying text and captions which give the necessary details of the events shown. At usually one spread per topic, the book is laid out chronologically — starting with a general over-view of medieval pursuits and getting more detailed as the present day is approached. It is a wonderful survey of almost every leisure pursuit, from aquatic theatre to zoos, via boxing, ballooning and Buffalo Bill, to name but three, as well as giving details of the various gardens, racecourses, halls and theatres that were established to house them. Many were the promotion of a single entrepreneur, and several were short-lived. There was the racecourse at Notting Hill (p 122), established in 1837 on undeveloped land to the west of Bayswater. The promoter failed to take into account not only the heavy clay soil, but a public footpath running through the course, and the venture failed four years later, despite the support of royalty. Then there is Theresa Cornelys, originally a singer from Vienna, who came to London in 1756 and achieved fame for her Masquerades which she held in Carlisle House and to which the *ton* flocked in droves (pp 72–5); for one event in 1770 the House of Commons was adjourned to allow its members to attend. Two years later, however, she was declared bankrupt. After several returns to prosperity she was finally forced to sell the house in the late 1780s; her end is not recorded.

The book was intended to be a sister volume to Felix Barker’s *London: 2000 Years of a City and its People*, published in 1974. He and Peter Jackson failed to find a publisher before their deaths in 1997 and 2003. They were both members of the London Topographical Society and the Society has managed to get the best part of their collection of pictures and text published as a tribute to both of them. There has had to be some substitution of pictures, and many items are unacknowledged.

Close inspection of the illustrations can, however, show up several direct as well as more oblique errors in captioning. Richard Tarleton (pp 16–17), for instance, is incorrectly credited with the achievement of Will Kempe (p 26) — dancing from London to Norwich; and a long caption explaining that there are no contemporary illustrations of English bear baiting is attached to a clear depiction of the very thing (p 14, presumably a later addition). The book ends with a photograph of a small boy sailing a boat in a puddle — the text calls him a ‘ragged child’, but his smart sandals, socks and haircut belie this assumption. This raises doubts over the whole tone of the book, in that the pleasures discussed are predominately those of the upper classes. But they are not called the ‘idle rich’ to no purpose; the well-off had the leisure and the money to spend, and were worth the efforts of entrepreneurs to help them do so. The poorer classes are shown at fairs and the theatre, including music hall, but later mass entertainment, such as the cinema and football, is thinly covered. The 20th century is only represented by a small portion of the book as a whole, which perhaps explains this, but even the 1908 Olympics only warrant a passing reference in a caption to the White City. A graver problem is the absence of either references or an index; it is to be hoped a second edition will rectify this, as well as tidying up the captions.

These criticisms aside, this is still a picture book *par excellence* — to be dipped into and savoured at leisure, preferably with magnifying glass to hand. If one remembers to take notes and treat the text and captions with caution, it will prove a lasting pleasure.

Ann E Hignell

Putney and Roehampton in 1665: a Street Directory and Guide. By Dorian Gerhold. Wandsworth Historical Society, 2007. Pp 107, 56 figs. ISBN 978 0 905121 192. Price: £9.50 from the British Academy Hearth Tax Project at Roehampton University, Roehampton Lane, SW15 5UP.

Following in the footsteps of the Hearth Tax assessor, as he walked up and down Putney High Street in 1665, Dorian Gerhold has reconstructed the social and material fabric of Putney and Roehampton in the 17th century. By combining the hearth tax lists with parish and other records he has identified the places of interest around the High Street and the people who lived there. The winner of the 2008 annual LAMAS Local History publication award, *Putney and Roehampton in 1665* is a detailed and interesting description of how people lived and earned their livings at the time of the plague.

The book is in two parts. The first is a history of the parish, with a guided tour of early modern Putney and Roehampton. Gerhold's description identifies the details of buildings and the households and plots their location using Nicholas Lane's map of 1636 as a base map. He then describes the people — rich, comfortable, and various categories of the poor — and how they earned their livings, what women did, and who got into trouble for what reason. He also provides detailed descriptions of the houses they lived in, what they were built of, and what they were like. Throughout this descriptive tour Gerhold examines the impact of the metropolis, the Thames, and the 1665 plague on the community.

The street directory, which makes up the second part of the book, brings together information in tabular form on the people, their occupations and status, and the various property locations; it is an excellent example of record linkage that allows for the detailed reconstruction of the social composition of the area. The text is illustrated with numerous images and maps, both contemporary and 20th-century, which make fascinating comparisons between Putney High Street in 1665 and the present day street scene. For many general readers such a comparison will be of great interest.

The book is published by the Wandsworth

Historical Society in conjunction with the Roehampton University Centre for Hearth Tax Studies, which undertakes research work involving both professionals and volunteer members of the public; Dorian Gerhold exemplifies this collaboration — as well as being an honorary Research Fellow of Roehampton University, he is also Chairman of Wandsworth Historical Society. Of the 13 items submitted for the LAMAS Local History Publication Award this year *Putney and Roehampton in 1665* was the unanimous selection by the Local History Committee; it fully met the purpose of the award, established to encourage well presented, original research, which is of interest to more than just a local readership. Although it is not the glossiest of publications submitted, it is a good example of the way in which original research can be presented in a way that is attractive to both the local public and local historians alike.

John Hinshelwood

Pinner: Hatch End, North Harrow and Rayners Lane. By Patricia A Clarke. Phillimore for Pinner Local History Society, 2007. Pp xx + c.100 unnumbered pages, map, 218 pls. ISBN 978 1 86077 465 2. Price: £15.99 hb.

Patricia Clarke's latest book on Pinner complements her 1994 publication, *A Pictorial History of Pinner, Hatch End, North Harrow and Rayners Lane*, which covered the history of the area from earliest times. The present book concentrates on the last 200 years and uses an entirely different set of pictures, taken mainly from family collections that have been given to Pinner Local History Society during the last few years.

The masterly introduction sweeps the reader across the whole of Pinner, not just the High Street and village centre (there is a useful map), describing succinctly the lives of the inhabitants, the local administration, and the evolution of the small agricultural community of 1800 into a suburb of London.

Photographs interspersed with prints and engravings, varying in date from c.1850 to the present day, are arranged in topographical order. A postcard written from a cottage at Pinner Green slipped neatly below a picture of the writer's home adds a human touch. There is a wealth of charming family groups

and activities. It is especially pleasing to see young Mrs Ambrose Heal, dressed in a long tightish skirt, practising on the fives court that was incorporated into the young couple's home, the eponymously named Fives Court on Moss Lane.

The key to such a book, mainly composed of illustrations, is the captions. Here the wide historical background of the author becomes apparent as information about the

people, the houses, and the surrounding scenery is effortlessly introduced in a lively manner. In the caption to a picture of a cottage with a man and a young girl standing in the doorway (No. 132), we are told the age of the building, the names of the people, the man's age at the time when the picture was taken and details of his career. Such information, accurately researched and well presented, is the kernel of local history.

Eileen Bowlt