



BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

White, Jerry (2010) City rivalries and the modernisation of Eighteenth-Century London, 1720-1770. *Literatur in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 43 (2/3), pp. 83-102. ISSN 0024-4643.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/4178/>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html>
contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

or alternatively



BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Enabling open access to Birkbeck's published research output

City rivalries and the modernisation of Eighteenth-Century London, 1720-1770

Journal Article

<http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/4178>

Version: Accepted (Refereed)

Citation:

White, J. (2011)
City rivalries and the modernisation of Eighteenth-Century London,
1720-1770 –
Literatur in Wissenschaft und Unterricht (In Press)

© 2011 Christian-Albrechts University, Kiel

[Publisher's Page](#)

All articles available through Birkbeck ePrints are protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law. Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

[Deposit Guide](#)

Contact: lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk

CITY RIVALRIES AND THE MODERNISATION OF EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY LONDON, 1720-1770

When I consider this great city in its several quarters and divisions, I look upon it as an aggregate of various nations distinguished from each other by their respective customs, manners, and interests. The courts of two countries do not so much differ from one another, as the court and city, in their peculiar ways of life and conversation. In short, the inhabitants of St. James's, notwithstanding they live under the same laws, and speak the same language, are a distinct people from those of Cheapside, who are likewise removed from those of the Temple on one side, and those of Smithfield on the other, by several climates and degrees in their ways of thinking and conversing together.¹

So Mr Spectator, in a famous passage from 1712, introduces the divisions that all Londoners of the time would plainly have recognised. Although Addison here alludes to four Londons, and goes on to describe others, it is plain that the primary facture of metropolitan life was between the two great cities of London and Westminster. These two nations did not lie easily side by side. During much of the eighteenth century the rivalry between them was intense, bitter, even existential. It was experienced at many levels – cultural, economic, political, even psychological, being deeply internalised by Londoners east and west of Temple Bar. Paradoxically, the only clear winner in this internecine metropolitan strife would eventually, by 1770, be the metropolis itself, though that was an outcome that appeared unlikely for much of the preceding period.

It is this spatial implication for the metropolis of these city rivalries that I wish to explore tonight. For the City of London and its citizens, the rivalry was so intense, so deeply felt, so hurtful, that envy and fear of progress in Westminster became the primary mobilising force of spatial change east of Temple Bar between the 1720s and the 1770s. We've been invited by Miles Ogborn to understand the politics of public space 'in terms of the tensions involved in the constitution of a public of individuals.'² The more interesting dynamic, it seems to me, arises in *this* period at least within a public of collectivities.

Why were these two cities, so closely connected, so much at odds? The reasons were complex and legion and shifted over time. In summary, the two cities of London and Westminster were riven by conflicting economic interests and class, by politics, by culture, by geography – we might sum it all up and say, by history. By Addison's day 'Westminster' and 'the City' were geographical tropes, used in common parlance, for the metropolitan struggle between new money and inheritance, of commerce and trade against land and property, of merchants and financiers against aristocrats and gentry, of City ratepayer democracy against an oligarchic Court and administration. It's of course true that the City and Westminster were hardly united 'nations' themselves – both were fractured by class, politics and religion. But these fratricidal divisions were generally overcome in the face of an affront or threat from the old enemy east or west of Temple Bar.

In the daily round of metropolitan interactions it was the cultural assaults that perhaps proved hardest to bear. For the vitriol directed at the citizen of London – the 'cit' in common parlance - was truly merciless. It found expression in novels and verse, in the journals or on the stage, in moralising pamphlets and in the daily conversation of all in the professions and above who claimed some sort of superiority over the trading sort. And it lasted throughout the century.

Snobbery was at its fiercest when the cits trod on the shoe buckles of those at the polite end of the town by daring to emulate fashionable living, as here in a Grub-street pamphlet of 1744:

yet with all Aids whatsoever, they appear at best but as very mean *Copies* of fine *Originals*; the *Ludgate-Hill Hobble*, the *Cheapside Swing*, and the general City *Jolt* and *Wriggle* in the *Gait*, being easily perceived through all the *Artifices* the *Smarts* and *Perts* put upon them. A Man may *waddle* into a Church, or Coffee-House, make a Leg to an Alderman, Levee a Common-Council-Man in his Counting-House, he may *D—mn* with a good Air, Dress well, Drink well, and even hum over two or three Opera Tunes, and pass in all the Wards of the City for a well-bred Person; but towards *St. James's* he won't pass muster, he must be ... return'd back to *Leaden-Hall*, like a counterfeit Guinea that won't go.³

The satirical figure of the citizens aspiring to a polite culture which their touch can only cheapen and tarnish provided one of the great themes of the London drama throughout the century. The stage had to tread warily, for it relied on the citizens, their families and apprentices for much of its patronage. Even so, the citizens were more often than not stock figures of fun: mangling the language with their cockneyisms, greedy of lucre and gluttonous at the dining table, too eager to impress with vulgar display and to lay claim to a gentility they could never achieve.

So there was many a chuckle at the readiness of City worthies to devise an ancient family line and have it represented in coats of arms, approved by Heralds' College for the appropriate fee. When the herald agrees to invent a coat of arms for the recently deceased Alderman Gathergrease in Steele's *The Funeral* of 1702, the undertaker quips, 'let him bear a Pair of Stockings, he's the first of his Family that ever wore one...'⁴ Christopher Bullock's *Woman is a Riddle* of 1716 makes all citizens' wives as vulnerable to a fashionable rake as a laundress's daughter or a chamber-maid.⁵ The amusing Samuel Foote tickled audiences at the Little Theatre, Haymarket, from the 1750s on with farces that frequently turned on the differences between citizens and the polite end of the town in pieces like *Taste* (1752) which hangs on gullible citizens cheated by virtuosi at an auction, *The Author* (1757) where a well-off merchant never goes out of the City without his pedigree on a scroll with 'seven yards more of lineals' soon to arrive from the Heralds, and in plays like *The Minor* (1761) where the penetration of fashionable vices among the youth east of Temple Bar becomes yet another stick with which to beat the citizens. In the 1760s and seventies, the plays of George Colman the Elder, of Westminster courtier stock, frequently traduced the citizens' vulgarity and greed, as here when Mr Sterling, a rich merchant, prepares to welcome Lord Ogleby to his City mansion; Lord Ogleby's nephew, I should point out, is betrothed to the rich man's daughter in that common tale of aristocratic bloodlines chasing City cash through marriage:

We'll shew your fellows at the other end of the town how we live in the city.
They shall eat gold, and drink gold, and lie in gold. Here, Cook! Butler!
[calling.] What signifies your birth and education, and titles? Money, money!
that's the stuff that makes the great man in this country.⁶

Satire at the citizens' expense was the very stuff of Arthur Murphy's comedies like *The Apprentice* of 1756 and *The Citizen* (1763), and continued to draw well at the box office through to the end of the century in plays like Thomas Holcroft's *The School for Arrogance* of 1791, and doubtless others. And admirers of Fanny Burney will recall how that eloquent spokeswoman for taste and politeness at the court end of the town savaged the citizens of London in the appalling Branghton family (*Evelina*, 1778), in Mr Briggs, Cecilia's City-miser guardian (1782), and in Mr Dubster, the citizen whose country 'box' or villa with 'a small Chinese gate', an island (with a lamb) on a pond (with a swan, 'a wooden one') and 'a grotto with patterns in shells' were all objects of Camilla's proper scorn (1796).

Did this hurt? I think it did. The stage, for instance, became something of a battleground between citizens and fashion, where authors could occasionally celebrate City values of probity and fair-dealing over the sharpening ways so commonly found west of Temple Bar. The citizen-playwright George Lillo, who seems to have followed his father's trade of goldsmith before taking up his quill, made one of the great theatrical successes of the century with *The London Merchant, or the History of George Barnwell* (1731). Dedicated to Sir John Eyles, a City Alderman and MP, Lillo loses no opportunity to extol the virtues of trade, an unlikely theme for a popular tragedy, and to praise City values and morals over those of the west end of the town. At the first night it was said that 'Certain witty and facetious persons, who call themselves The Town' designed to scoff the play from the stage, but were won over by the pathos of Barnwell's plight and Maria's staunch City virtuousness. The play was 'soon patronized by the Mercantile Interest, and after its first run of twenty successive nights in the [swelteringly-hot] summer, was also frequently represented to crowded houses during the following winter.'⁷ Later in the century, in the 1790s, the playwright Richard Cumberland, divided opinion by his choice of unlikely City heroes like *The Jew* and *The West Indian*. And off-stage, the cits of Grub Street returned something of the satirical fire, defending the straight ways of City shopkeepers against those at the west end of the town, for instance, and proposing an honest and truly-cultured citizen as the surest guide to avoid London's many pitfalls.⁸

There's little doubt too that all the snobbery directed almost without cessation from the west end of the town was resented greatly by some citizens who internalised the

hurt. Samuel Richardson, for instance, a rich and fiercely independent master printer, one of the most celebrated novelists of the age and a well-loved man among the polite classes, made much in private correspondence of living on the 'wrong' side of Temple Bar. There is a strange defensiveness about his correspondence on the issue. He is at once proud of his City connection but craven in the face of what that very connection might mean to his admirers.

'I drop Mrs. Palmer! – Alas! I never had the Pleasure of seeing her but once – I am very shy of obtruding myself on Persons of Condition, the Favour of a repeated Visit must proceed from her, as she only accompanied Lady B. And then the Condescension will be acknowledged as such, with all due Gratitude. But Temple-Bar is looked upon as a Bar indeed, that divides the two Ends of the Town. Mrs. Palmer, with all her Goodness, might be reproached for passing it, in favour of a Citizen.'⁹

About 'Temple Bar –', he wrote on another occasion, 'ladies who live near Hill-street, and Berkeley and Grosvenor Squares, love not to pass this bar.' And he wrote, also in the 1750s, to yet another lady correspondent that he feared she might be deterred from calling on him by the nuisances east of Temple Bar.

Richardson helpfully introduces us to that important spatial dimension of this city rivalry that I wish to focus on here. But before moving on to that most astonishing site of metropolitan change in the first half of the eighteenth-century, the growth of London at its north-western edge, it's worth noting, however briefly, that there was one more hugely important aspect to this intramural strife, and that was politics.

From the 1720s to the 1780s it frequently seemed as though the citizens of London were waging old wars by other means against the court and its lackies in parliament. The citizens or most of them took every opportunity to oppose government over interference in the City's own electoral arrangements to make opposition less effective in 1725, over excise in 1733, and over the War of Jenkins' Ear and the fall of Walpole between 1739 and 1742. The opposition embraced things both great and small, and it's not too far-fetched I think to see the mysterious affair of Elizabeth Canning of 1753-4 as playing out city rivalries, the wayward handling of the affair by Henry Fielding, the court justice in Bow Street, contrasted with the honourable search for truth by the Lord Mayor of London, Sir Crispe Gascoyne. And in the 1760s

the exasperating cry of 'Wilkes and Liberty' seemed to put the two cities on a real war footing. It brought out all the venerable hostilities represented on the London stage, Lord Pomfret complaining to the House of Lords of the 'swaggering and impudent ... low Citizens ... on their ... dunghill' in early 1770.¹⁰ Just one year later, a swaggering and genuinely impudent parliament imprisoned in the Tower of London the Lord Mayor, Brass Crosby, and Alderman Oliver for daring to interfere in the arrest of two City printers accused of libelling the House of Commons. Quarrels over the legality of press warrants east of Temple Bar rumbled on between the City magistrates and the Admiralty through the 1770s and into the eighties; and the row between the citizens and the Secretary of State for War over the daily affront of armed soldiers marching through the City to guard the Bank of England led to heated correspondence into the 1790s. Much of this has of course been well written up by historians over the past fifty or sixty years, though much of the cultural context of City and Westminster antagonisms, I think, has not been adequately drawn out.

Let's go back to the ladies of Hill Street and of Berkeley and Grosvenor Squares. These places, at the time Richardson wrote, were all pretty much brand-new, less than a generation old. They were representative of a further twist in the rising prosperity of Westminster. That of course had been a marked feature of metropolitan life for something like a century before, since the development of the Strand in the time of James I, the building of Covent Garden in the 1630s and Lincoln's Inn Fields in the 1650s, and all greatly exacerbated by the growth of new western districts following the Great Fire. So much of this had always seemed at the City's expense, as no doubt it partly was: first with the move westward of tradesmen and wealthy citizens, and second in the mortgaged coffers of the Corporation and Livery Companies struggling to rebuild their finances in the face of so many citizens of the better sort choosing no longer to live in the City.

All this was to grow immensely more difficult from the early years of the eighteenth century. From around 1718, Westminster and the adjoining parish of Marylebone began to prosper as never before. The great new towns of Hanover Square, the Harley Estate, Mayfair and the Berkeley Fields provided out-of-town modern residences for wealthy citizens to move to, in direct competition with the interests of City landlords. Many did indeed move westward. Sir Theodor Janssen, for instance, a famous and honourable director of the South Sea Company, was one of the first

occupiers of Hanover Square, and there were many others on his coat-tails. For much of the century this movement west was jealously watched by the citizens: when Joshua Johnson, a Maryland tobacco merchant, took up a counting house at Tower Street, in the east of the City, in 1771,

The different step pursued between most of my countrymen and me, in their running to the other end of the town to lodge and my fixing here, has not been without its good effects with the staid cits.¹¹

Just as important, these great developments brought into the expanded metropolis the aristocrats and country gentry who had previously confined any necessary London sojourn to a short stay in stuffy lodgings close to St James's Palace and the Houses of Parliament. By 1750 a town house, even though leased and not bought outright, was fast becoming an indispensable acquisition. It all marked a decisive westward shift in the metropolitan balance of wealth; and seemed to herald a concomitant rearrangement of the balance of power.¹²

From the outset this westward movement of wealth and luxury looked for its domestic needs increasingly to be satisfied not in the congested City but close to home at the west end of the town. The diverse shopping opportunities already present in seventeenth-century Covent Garden, Soho and St James's became ever more expansive, spreading north of Piccadilly, even to the Oxford Road. There was much intercourse between the investors of Westminster and the merchants and financiers in the City – Defoe thought that the extraordinary interest in the stock market was one important reason for 'the prodigious Conflux of the Nobility and Gentry from all parts of *England to London*' and the 'constant Daily Intercourse between the Court Part of the Town, and the City' in the early 1720s, for instance.¹³ But there was also a tendency for previously City industries to relocate in Westminster among their more genteel clients, as we'll see in a moment.

Through both these tendencies, the move west of wealthy residents and of trade, for some it seemed as though the City and its citizens faced a mortal threat:

a great Number of wealthy Traders in and about *London*, at present [1722] reside in the Liberties of *Westminster*, and the Western part of the Town, either thro' a Vanity in themselves, or from the Vanity of their Wives and

Families; otherwise we cannot account for the vast number of New Buildings being so well inhabited as Experience shews they are; how many Merchants and Traders more will go to settle in those parts, when they shall find the Stream of Business run there; ... till at last the City become desolate, and the Houses therein stand empty, or drop down, for want of Tenants to live in them, or Encouragement of Trade to support them.¹⁴

Worries about ‘the stream of business’ drifting westwards did indeed ring true, even in the industry the City had made very much its own: finance. From the beginning of the century, for instance, there was a geographical duality in the London banking system. The City node around Lombard Street catered very largely to the mercantile interest and the needs of international trade; the banks of Fleet Street and the Strand, while inevitably involved in mercantile affairs at the beginning, by around 1720 had begun to look westward for their business, to the west-end gentry and aristocracy who could offer land as security. This separation was never exclusive, but it was distinctive nonetheless and became more so as the century grew older, with most moneyed Westminster residents banking west of Temple Bar or just inside.¹⁵ So by 1792 there were thirty-nine banks in the Lombard Street area, fifteen of them in Lombard Street itself, and another three nearby; and looking west or in the west end of the town were nineteen, including three each in Pall Mall (the first appearing in 1756) and Bond Street.¹⁶

The same was true for insurance, a financial industry that grew dynamically in eighteenth-century London. It provides us with a particularly acute instance of City and Westminster business rivalry.

The Hand-in-Hand or Amiable Contributors for Insuring from Loss by Fire, was formed in 1696 at Tom’s Coffee House, St Martin’s Lane, Westminster, with about a hundred initial investors. The business quickly grew so that in 1704, for instance, the Hand-in-Hand issued 7,300 policies insuring premises (not contents or merchandise) within five miles of London. The Hand-in-Hand had originated in a Westminster coffee house and put its first office there. But a great deal of its business was City-based and early on tensions arose between citizen directors and those at the west end of the town. In 1701 a City office opened for two days a week at the Crown Coffee House near the Royal Exchange but this failed to satisfy the city’s aspirations

and grumbling discontent persisted. In 1711 there was a series of City coups. Meetings of the society resolved that all its general meetings should be held in the City and that half the directors should live there. By the end of the year a new office was opened at Angel Court, Snow Hill, and the securities were removed there from Tom's Coffee House. The office at Tom's was closed in 1714 and all business conducted east of Temple Bar. Aggrieved by the 'hardships and indignities' suffered at the hands of the dictatorial citizens, the west-end directors unclasped from the Hand-in-Hand and formed their own Westminster Fire Office in 1717. The 150 original subscribers 'were mainly craftsmen and tradespeople of Westminster', paying premiums of £5-50.¹⁷

There were doubtless numerous reasons for this drift of City industries westwards and it's not too farfetched to think that the cultural animosities that were so evident in the playhouses, in Grub Street and polite novels played their part. But there was one more practical reason too, an important consequence of the growth of the town. This was the pressure of extra people and traffic on London's streets, and the very great difficulties that resulted when making the relatively short journey, say, from Pall Mall to Lombard Street.

As London became more wealthy, and more of a national and international showcase, its disabilities grew less and less tolerable. The frustrations of traffic and communications became the most important engine of physical change or 'improvement' in both the cities of London and Westminster – and, we might add, in the Borough of Southwark too. Later generations would find different reasons for knocking down old London. But in the eighteenth century it was the sheer inability to get from one place to another that most of all refashioned central London on the ground. This was the issue over which city rivalries would find their longest-lasting and finally most productive battleground.

Getting around this 'Scarse practicable' city was already a pressing concern as the century opened. Parliament did all it could to aid attempts to improve things, even giving power to local residents to open out a few notorious bottlenecks. The 'usual orders' of every parliamentary session required the parish constables to keep the way clear of obstruction from Temple Bar to Westminster Hall while Members were sitting. But complaints of obstruction and delay, of frayed tempers and the insolence

of hackney coachmen and chairmen, even of the constables themselves, became the subject of frequent parliamentary debate and retribution. From 1709 there emerged a parliamentary obsession with the paving of Westminster's streets. Numerous paving acts in the succeeding fifteen years or so produced utterly indifferent results.¹⁸ In 1724 it was found by a House of Commons Committee that the streets of Westminster were

very much neglected, and ill paved, and that a proper Care has not been taken of the Levels and Declivities; and the Steepness and Depths of the Channels make it extremely difficult and dangerous for all Wheel-carriages that pass through the same: That the Dirt and Soil, for Want of being properly taken and carried away, lie so thick, all over the Pavements, that the Streets are become now scarce passable for Foot-passengers.¹⁹

By then, though, parliament had sought to address Westminster's problems with a very grand gesture that provoked the fury of the City Corporation. Acting on behalf of its own Members and other wealthy residents for whom moving around London, and getting to and from their country seats, had become increasingly difficult with the growth of the town, parliament sought to make possible the greatest metropolitan improvement for generations past. This was the construction of a second bridge across the Thames.

The City Corporation had always opposed other bridges over the Thames anywhere in reach of London, as a mortal threat to its trade, to its property in the medieval London Bridge, indeed to its very existence as a city. When a bridge far downriver between the country villages of Fulham and Putney had been unsuccessfully canvassed in 1671 it was said that next to pulling down Southwark nothing could more certainly ruin the City of London. But in December 1721 there would be a threat much closer to home: 'divers Gentlemen, Freeholders, and Inhabitants' of Westminster petitioned parliament for a bridge across the Thames at either one of the horse ferries to Lambeth or Vauxhall, close to the Houses of Parliament and Westminster Hall. It was made necessary by 'the great Increase of the Inhabitants' of Westminster and around.²⁰ A bill was brought in but it aroused the opposition of the Borough of Southwark, the City Corporation, and numerous other interested parties, from the leaseholders of houses on London Bridge to the watermen and lightermen

of the Thames. The anxieties were existential, and there's something resounding here of the affronts and humiliations endured by the citizens under the ceaseless lash of their fashionable foe:

The Birth-right and Privileges of Freemen of *London*, will hereby in a little time become Contemptible: For as *South Sea* has strip'd them of their superfluous Riches, long Wars, continued Taxes, and high Duties, impair'd their Stock, and shock'd their Credit; so a new Bridge will take their Meat out of their Mouths, by drawing off their Supply of Provisions, and pick the Money out of their Pockets, by enabling the Inhabitants of Westminster to Trade at less Expences, Houses being at less Rents, Lodgers more frequent, and no Time or Money spent to qualify them for Shopkeepers.

It will enrich the Inhabitants of *Westminster*, and impoverish the Citizens of *London*....in short, it will make *Westminster* a fine City, and *London* a Desart....²¹

The bill to construct a bridge at Westminster duly foundered in early 1722.

But the City could not remain blind to the competition that Westminster, growing so vigorously in size and wealth, presented to it. So it was in the City that the age of metropolitan improvement – as distinct from growth - first found expression in the 1730s, inevitably with more than half an eye turned to its rival in the west. The first major public improvement of the age was the City Corporation's project to cover the river Fleet between Holborn Bridge and Fleet Street. This part of the Fleet had been canalised as part of a post-Fire improvement. But the warehouses on the quaysides had never taken, profits proved insufficient to maintain the waterway, and the Fleet for years had been filled with mud, filth and the leavings of the Field Lane slaughtermen and tripe-dressers further upstream. In 1733 the City obtained permission from Parliament to culvert the Fleet and turn it into a roadway (the present Farringdon Street) and a market. Fleet Market opened on 30 September 1737 with a central row of shops and a market building complete with clocktower.²² Removing this notorious 'common Nuisance' provided an opportunity to fulfil a long-cherished ambition to build a mansion for the Lord Mayor of London during his annual term of office. The Stocks Market, selling provisions not shares, occupied a building and sheds in a space where Poultry, Cornhill, Threadneedle Street,

Lombard Street and Walbrook all converged. The new Fleet Market now allowed the Stocks Market to close and its tenants to relocate. In its place, on this most prominent City site, the new Mansion House was built, a 'palace' for 'the capital city of the world'. It eventually opened for business, after fifteen years of much grief, in the latter part of 1753.²³

There was no similar driving force behind civic improvement in and around Westminster. The only landowner capable of playing the part of the Corporation of London was the Crown, but the Crown was supine and never seized any opportunity to improve London in the eighteenth century. Westminster city government was archaic, impotent and fractured. Parish authorities increasingly occupied that vacuum after 1737 but were generally impecunious and unadventurous. For the first three decades of the century it was left to small communities of wealthy residents, united by a common interest, to improve the patch of London they could see from their front windows, at Lincoln's Inn Fields (Holborn, 1707), in St James's Square (Westminster, 1726), Red Lion Square (Holborn, 1737), Charterhouse Square (City, 1743) and Golden Square (Westminster, 1751).

Parliament, the most disgruntled observer of Westminster's messy ways, was the enabler of all these ventures, and it was parliament that effectively managed the improvements of Westminster in this first half century. And its greatest project was that second bridge over the Thames at Westminster.

Fourteen years after the failure of the Westminster Bridge Bill of 1722, a petition was again presented to parliament by the Burgesses, Freeholders and Inhabitants of Westminster in February 1736 arguing that the great increase in buildings and population made a new bridge essential. Parliament indeed went further, deciding that a new bridge 'would be advantageous not only to the City of *Westminster*, but to many other of his Majesty's Subjects, and to the Publick in general', and duly brought in a bill to empower construction of a second bridge.²⁴ Again, petitions against were received from many, including the Archbishop of Canterbury in whose gift the horse-ferry from Lambeth to Westminster lay. The City Corporation opposed it as 'destructive of several Rights, Properties, Privileges, and Franchises', and as rendering navigation of the Thames 'dangerous, if not impracticable'. A pamphlet war was waged once more, but this time most voices debated the practicalities rather

than the principle. For now the arguments in favour of a new bridge were weighted with fourteen years' more growth in the western suburbs. And this was, after all, the improving decade of the 1730s, with the City's own achievements at Fleet Market already well advanced. Most important of all, parliament – or at least Walpole's administration after the Excise fiasco of 1733 – had fallen out of love with the City of London. All that was a far cry from the politics of 1721-2. So now the City Corporation was waved away. The Westminster Bridge Act gained royal assent in May 1736.²⁵

Despite many false starts and frustrations, Westminster Bridge, designed by Charles Labelye, a naturalised Swiss engineer, no Briton apparently equipped with the necessary skills in bridge design, eventually opened on 18 November 1750. It was 'allowed, by the judges of Architecture, to be one of the grandest Bridges in the World', 'a monument of glory unequalled in all Europe'.²⁶

This long and difficult project was managed by Commissioners appointed by government. That their task was not just to build a bridge had been clear from the outset. The House of Commons was plainly told that a bridge alone would merely exacerbate Westminster's difficulties by bringing yet more traffic to its impassable streets.²⁷ So in 1739 the Commissioners were given additional powers to acquire land and buildings to widen existing streets and to create new ones altogether.

So it was not only the bridge but these new approaches to it, especially on the north bank of the Thames, which had such an impact on the metropolis. The new bridge entered Westminster just north of New Palace Yard, the main entrance to the Houses of Parliament. A wide new Bridge Street obliterated an ancient narrow way to the river called Woolstaple and required the removal of the old Westminster Market. North from Bridge Street ran King Street, the main route for citizens approaching parliament and Westminster Hall from the Strand, Charing Cross and Whitehall. It had long been narrow, filthy and difficult to negotiate. The Bridge Commissioners bypassed it altogether and drove a wide new street parallel to it on the east, connecting New Palace Yard to Whitehall. The new road swept away Rhenish Wine Yard, Stephens Alley, White Horse Yard and other places. It was named Parliament Street, and grand houses began to appear in it from 1750. Finally, Great George Street, a continuation of Bridge Street westwards, provided a straight

broad avenue from St James's Park to the Bridge. It was built from 1753, houses appearing four years later, and removed a complex of courts, alleys and yards north of Thieving Lane. Its projector was James Mallors, a prominent Westminster builder, and parliament gave him powers to purchase land and lay out the street.²⁸

Despite the opposition of the City of London, these Westminster improvements were the first modern step forward in overcoming some of the divisions of London on the ground: Parliament Street eased the link between Westminster and the City; and the Bridge connected the Surrey shore at Lambeth – and what would in time become south London - with the giant metropolis.

The prickly pride of the City Corporation had taken a body-blow from the building of Westminster Bridge, made more painful by the eventual success of the project, plain for all the world to see. The success of Westminster Bridge changed the direction of City thinking. It did not cease to cast a jaundiced eye on any improvement elsewhere in London that might affect its interests, as its hard-fought blocking tactics against embanking the Thames as part of the Adam Brothers' Adelphi showed in 1771. But practically there was only one way to respond and that was to fight back.

All this was articulated as the new streets around Westminster Bridge were still in building by Joseph Massie, a writer on economic and financial matters about whom we know little. He was probably a West Indian sugar merchant and he won most renown for pamphlets on trade. But though he lived in Covent Garden his concern for the financial health of the City of London never left him. In February 1754 he published *An Essay on the many Advantages Accruing to the Community from the Superior Neatness, Conveniencies, Decorations and Embellishments of Great and Capital Cities, particularly apply'd to the City and Suburbs of London, Renowned Capital of the British Empire*. He addressed it to Sir John Barnard, the City Alderman, former Lord Mayor and an MP for the City. It became one of the most influential pamphlets of the century on the future of metropolitan improvements, far more influential it seems to me than the much better-known proposals of John Glynn some twelve years later. The reason for its influence was simply this: the City authorities listened to Massie and acted on what he said. And the reason they did so was because he addressed head-on the crucial question of city rivalries.

For Massie, the City of London

has the justest Grounds for being alarmed at the Schemes already laid, and laying, for *new and magnificent Streets, new Inns, Stage Coaches, Livery-Stables, and Trades of all Kinds*, in the Neighbourhood of *Westminster-Bridge*.

He asked

Shall the City of *London* remain any longer supine and inactive, until it be rivalled, and in some Measure eclipsed, by Cities both Abroad and at Home...?

Assuming the answer would be no, he proposed numerous improvements: removing '*Inconveniencies and Inelegancies*' like '*Nastiness*' at the posterns of the City gates, ruinous houses, the old City wall and streets too narrow for carriages to pass one another; adding '*Ornaments and Embellishments*' like public fountains, triumphant arches and equestrian statues, of which the City had none, to numerous places, including London Bridge; and constructing 'fine Openings' at the City boundaries. And he called for a new bridge 'at the Mouth of FLEET-DITCH' across the Thames to Southwark. All this was 'by Way of *Retaliation*, or rather of *Self-Preservation*', in the face of Westminster's aggrandisement.²⁹

Some nine months after Massie's pamphlet in November 1754, John Spranger, also of Covent Garden and perhaps with an eye to Massie's proposals, published a far more famous *Proposal or Plan* for better paving, lighting and cleansing the streets of Westminster. He reiterated a familiar litany showing how little improvement had been effected in the first half of the century: 'broken or irregular Pavements', 'Foulness and Darkness of our Streets – scarcely passable in Carriages with Safety', 'frequent and melancholy Distresses and Disasters', 'fatal Mischiefs' daily 'to Men and Cattle' (meaning horses), the 'Quantity of Filth...so great, that Man and Beast, in some Places, can hardly wade through it...'³⁰ An enthusiastic endorsement of Spranger's proposals was soon published by that tireless reformer Jonas Hanway.³¹ Central to their plan was the establishment by parliament of commissioners to oversee the paving, lighting and cleansing of streets in Westminster and nearby parishes. But parliament had grappled ineffectively with this problem before and these proposals directly countered the interests of Westminster parish government. With parliament still recovering from the cost and difficulties of the Westminster Bridge

improvements, and no parish prepared to make the running, Spranger's proposals were allowed to lie on the table.

Not so in the City. With Massie's pamphlet acting pretty much as a blueprint, in January 1756 – the same year that Samuel Richardson apologised to a lady correspondent for the nuisances east of Temple Bar, we might recall - the City Corporation took a momentous step forward. It petitioned for powers to build its own new bridge at Blackfriars, where the river Fleet, still an open sewer south of the new Fleet Market, joined the Thames; at the same time, a petition of London and Southwark citizens and merchants urged the widening of London Bridge by the removal of houses from both sides of its carriageway.³²

The Committee of the House of Commons established to consider the petitions heard much evidence on the adverse financial position in the years since Westminster Bridge opened of the City's rents and land tax yield. There were said to be many empty houses in the western wards of the City, and that the property around the proposed bridge-head at Fleet Ditch was ruinous. The Committee was assured that all this would be replaced with better housing should the bridge be built and that many merchants who had left the City 'with regret', would move back. In the event the Committee gave leave to bring in two Bills: one for the widening of the carriageway on London Bridge – even though that meant demolishing housing built by the City just ten years or so before; and one for building a new bridge at Blackfriars.³³

Both Bills duly passed into law, but the widening of London Bridge proved easier to effect. It began in 1757, the housebreakers wielding hammers and crows from February, a temporary wooden bridge constructed alongside and opened that October. That burned, or was burned, down but quickly rebuilt, yet work on the ancient bridge itself moved slowly - demolition of the houses and laying a new carriageway took till 1762 to complete. Beneath the roadway, two central arches were combined into one to ease the passage for rivercraft shooting the rapids.³⁴

Blackfriars Bridge proved a far more difficult project, partly because of its enormous cost. After some three years' debate and parliamentary niggardliness over funds, a public subscription in interest-bearing bonds was taken out among the citizens sufficient to raise the £144,000 thought necessary to build it. That alone, perhaps,

was some measure of citizen anxiety for the future of their City. In 1760, Robert Mylne, a brilliant young Scot fresh from Rome, just twenty-six years old and with no or little experience of London or of bridges, won in competition the contract to design the City's second bridge. Construction was arduous and time-consuming. Mylne devised innovative solutions to the difficulties posed by the swift-flowing river; even so, Blackfriars Bridge took eight years to build and finally cost some £153,000. It opened to wheeled traffic in November 1769, a magnificent undertaking and a most beautiful bridge. But that didn't stop smart carping at the cits – this time for a blundering Latin inscription on the bridge that a pamphlet by Busby Birch described as 'wholly ignorant of *Classical Latinity*'. He suggested that many citizens would have been more conversant with 'HEBREW'.³⁵

While these great works were being projected the lamentably unfinished business of the streets of London once more claimed attention. The delay in building Blackfriars Bridge proved more than frustrating for the City. New dwellings near the bridge-head at Westminster, including those built for a widened Charing Cross where it joined Whitehall, all potentially drew rich citizens from their proper domain. In a state of some anxiety, the City procured an Act in 1760 empowering a lengthy list of some thirty-four street improvements to free traffic and remove eyesores.³⁶ In effect, this was an attempt more or less to complete the programme Massie had laid down in his *Essay* of six years before. Thirty or so separate schemes involved the demolition of hundreds of old houses. Blind courts were broken through to make new streets. Sheds and other encumbrances built against church walls were cleared away. Important avenues like Threadneedle Street, Cornhill, Old Bailey, Lombard Street, Houndsditch and a dozen others less significant had their worst obstructions demolished and 'the ground laid into the street'. Not all the plans were implemented, and many took a decade or more to complete, but much was done.

In separate initiatives the Corporation took down the last important remains of the Roman wall from Moorgate to Cripplegate, leasing the ground for new houses in its stead. It was an irony of the times that, just as the 'antique' of Robert Adam was gripping the imagination of wealthy Londoners, the remains of London's real antique was busily done away with as a public nuisance. Eight City gates, mostly rebuilt after the Great Fire, were also demolished by the Corporation between 1760 and 1762 to ease traffic congestion. And somewhat later, by the end of the 1760s, access to the

new Blackfriars Bridge was provided by culverting over the southernmost run of Fleet Ditch, and conveying it as a sewer some way into the Thames beneath the bridge. The roadway was called Bridge Street, now New Bridge Street.

These were astonishing changes. But another great transformation was also getting underway in this energetic decade. And this was begun in Westminster.

John Spranger's proposals, we might recall, had been published some months after Massie's in late-1754. There was of course no effective corporation to take forward his proposals, and so Spranger had gone into much detail with a draft Bill setting out how a new local authority was to be appointed and just what it should do. Despite this eminently clear and feasible proposition, and despite the improvements underway on London Bridge and in other parts of the City, nothing was done to implement his proposals for some eight years. The reason seems to have been the fractured parish government of London which left no one to take the initiative for a city-wide approach. Indeed, it was a petition in February 1762 for powers to employ the poor in cleansing the streets of St James's that seems to have been the trigger for parliament considering the longstanding nuisance of the Westminster streets once more.³⁷

At last, from 1762, the Westminster Paving Act and its later amendments finally established an entirely new framework for paving, cleansing and lighting the streets west of Temple Bar. Instead of responsibility falling on individual householders, paving commissioners were endowed by parliamentary grant to begin a large-scale programme of street improvements. Carriageways were laid in flat stone and kennels moved from the centre to the edges; footways were raised above the level of the roadway and evenly paved; globular lights were erected on poles at regular distances; streets displayed their names and houses were numbered; posts on the pavements, hanging signs and high-level rainwater spouts were all abolished. Once effected, improvements would be paid for by a rate levied on those householders who benefited from them and by an extra Sunday toll at the Middlesex and Westminster turnpike gates. This was a true collectivisation of individual responsibility, and a turning point in the history of municipal enterprise in London.³⁸

This great reform of the Westminster streets provided a sharp contrast with the outdated condition of carriageways and pavements east of Temple Bar, despite the

vaunted and venerable government of the City Corporation. By 12 July 1765 the transformation of Westminster had come right to the door of the City.

The new pavement from Charing-cross to Temple-bar, which was begun at the first of these places, was this day ended at the latter, and the communication opened for carriages. Those, who have not seen this new pavement, can scarcely imagine the alteration made by it, the taking down of signs, and fixing up of lights in a regular manner. It may be said that no street in London, paved, lighted, and filled with signs in the old way, ever made so agreeable an appearance, or afforded better walking than the Strand does in the new.... In short, too much cannot be said in praise of those noblemen and gentlemen, who first promoted this improvement, and have so steadily carried it on, in spite of all the obstacles thrown in their way, and all the cavils against their proceedings.³⁹

Here then was yet further provocation to City rivalry. That same year a French visitor noted how the City streets were 'eternally covered with dirt', and 'paved in such a manner that it is scarce possible to find a place to set one's foot, and absolutely impossible to ride in a coach'. Comparisons with the new Westminster were both inevitable and invidious. How *could* the ladies of Hill Street or of Berkeley or Grosvenor Squares be expected to shop at a City draper's in St Paul's Churchyard or Cheapside in circumstances such as these?⁴⁰

The City's response to the new pavement in Westminster was – for the times – immediate and decisive. In November 1765 the City Corporation received a report on the unsavoury condition of the City streets and by May 1766 the City had procured from parliament an Act that put in place a close copy of the statutory framework established by its neighbour.⁴¹ Southwark won similar powers that same year and so did a clutch of Middlesex parishes by 1770.

The City Commissioners of Sewers and Pavements proceeded with extraordinary energy. At their first meeting on 17 May 1766, just a few days after the London Paving and Lighting Act gained royal assent, they established posts for nine professional staff, adopted priorities (the first street to be paved, Fleet Street to meet the Strand at Temple Bar, had been named in the Act), and agreed the terms of advertisements for tenders. Householders were ordered to remove their 'Signs, Sign

posts and Sign Irons' by 24 June, after which the surveyors would be instructed to take them down in default. Water spouts were to be replaced by 'wooden Trunks' or lead pipes fixed to the walls. Carriageways were to be laid in Aberdeen stone (Scotch Granite) – which led to some Wilkesite ribaldry at the expense of the North Britons - and the footways in Purbeck stone not less than 2 inches thick. 'Bulks and Rails' or shop projections were taken away, even fitches of bacon obstructing an alley into Newgate Street attracted the commissioners' attention.⁴²

Why so much vigour and urgency? There were two main reasons. First, because in places things were so very bad. We might instance the pavement outside Miles Nightingale's warehouses in Fore Street, Cripplegate Without in 1765, which for 36 ft 'lies in an hole eighteen Inches deep from the top of the new paving in the Carriageway, and thereby creates a Slough full of Mud and Water to the great annoyance of the Neighbourhood and all Persons who pass or repass that way.' And the second was put to the commissioners by the shopkeepers and others of Holborn, Snow Hill and Newgate, 'one of the two great Avenues from the north west end of the Town into and through the City of London', who asked that they be given priority for the new street works: 'since the new Paving of the Strand your Petitioners as well as many of the Inhabitants of Smithfield and other places ... have sensibly felt a great and general diminution of their Trade' as the carriage-owning classes deserted them for an easier journey within Westminster.⁴³

Across London, these were momentous changes. They were not comprehensive because some places like the ancient Liberty of Norton Folgate in Shoreditch, for instance, opted out of street improvements through the poverty of their residents. And doubtless the commissioners were not always and everywhere as vigilant as they should have been. But the reorganisation of paving and lighting, the naming of streets and numbering of houses, all made London tangibly more manageable, and more modern too. By 1770 it could be said with some confidence that 'London is the best paved and best lighted city in Europe.'⁴⁴

As I've already indicated, historians' consideration of city rivalries in the eighteenth century has largely been confined to the political sphere. Their impact on the development of eighteenth-century London has not been much regarded. John Summerson was more alive than many to the importance of this issue but was most

interested in identifying the villain of the piece. Summerson had no hesitation in castigating the 'City's inevitable bone-headed opposition' to any scheme of improvement outside its area, while paying due credit to its modernising tendencies in the square mile.

That, I think, is a judgment with much of condescension about it. Prosperity in the eighteenth-century was in general so fragile, so vulnerable to the exigencies of fortune, the misfortune of poverty so brutally experienced, that anything adding to the uncertainties of life was reasonably feared. The threat to the citizens of a brash and thrusting new city next door did indeed seem to undermine their very survival. The stridency of their rhetoric in the 1720s cannot be dismissed as bone-headed: it symbolised a genuine existential anxiety. But once protectionism, that article of faith in contemporary trading circles, was seen to fail with the construction of Westminster Bridge, aggressive competition appeared to be the only possible response from the 1750s on. For the next twenty years the pendulum of progress swung from Westminster to the City and back again during the century's most energetic period of urban change. We should look to these city rivalries if we wish to understand better the politics of metropolitan improvement and the modernisation, indeed the emerging unification, of London in the eighteenth century.

Jerry White

March 2011

9687

The place of publication is London, unless otherwise specified.

¹ *The Spectator*, 403, 12 June 1712: the Temple was the lawyers' quarter, and Smithfield the cattle and horse market for London.

² Ogborn, Miles *Spaces of Modernity. London's Geographies, 1680-1780*, 1998, p115: his sole reference to the question is to note that the City 'copied' the Westminster Paving Act of 1762. George, M Dorothy *London Life in the XVIIIth Century*, 1925, Rudé, George *Hanoverian London 1714-1808*, 1971, Sheppard, Francis *London. A History*, Oxford, 1998, Thorold, Peter *The London Rich. The Creation of a Great City, from 1666 to the Present*, 1999 make no reference to the issue, at least as it impacts on spatial change in London. Inwood, Stephen *A History of London*, 1998, p366, implies that the Westminster Paving Act of 1762 was intended to bring streets up to the City's standards. Summerson, John *Georgian London*, 1945, as ever, is more alive to these issues (pp46, 105, 121). For a contemporary view, see for instance John Noorthouck, *A New History of London, including Westminster and Southwark, 1773*, pp397-8.

³ Anon *A Trip from St. James's to the Royal Exchange. With Remarks Serious and Diverting, on the Manners, Customs, and Amusements of the Inhabitants of London and Westminster*, 1744, pp4-5.

⁴ Steele, Richard *The Funeral*, 1702, Act I Scene I. On the coats of arms see also Warburton, John *London and Middlesex Illustrated*, 1749, defending the 509 citizens' coats of arms with which he'd decorated a map of London.

⁵ Bullock, Christopher *Woman is a Riddle*, 1716, Act I Scene I.

⁶ Colman, George *The Clandestine Marriage*, 1766, Act I.

⁷ Davies, Thomas *Lillo's Dramatic Works with Memoirs of the Author*, 2 Vols., 2nd edn, 1810, Vol. I, pp8ff, 145ff.

⁸ Anon *The London and Westminster Guide, through the Cities and Suburbs*, 1768, p xv. Anon *The Midnight Spy or, A View of the Transactions of London and Westminster from the Hours of Ten in the Evening, till Five in the Morning*, 1766, pp10-17.

⁹ See Eaves, TC Duncan and Kimpel, Ben D *Samuel Richardson. A Biography*, 1971, pp539-41.

¹⁰ Cited in Postgate, Raymond 'That Devil Wilkes', 1956, p170.

¹¹ Price, Jacob M (ed) *Joshua Johnson's Letterbook, 1771-1774. Letters from a Merchant in London to His Partners in Maryland*, 1979, p17.

¹² See Stewart, Rachel *The Town House in Georgian London*, 2009, ch. 1.

¹³ Defoe, Daniel *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain*, 2 Vols. 1724-26, Vol. I, pp338-9.

¹⁴ Anon, *Reasons against Building a Bridge from Lambeth to Westminster. Shewing the Inconveniencies of the same to the City of London, and Borough of Southwark*, 1722, pp13-14.

¹⁵ Michie *London as a Financial Centre*, Vol. I, pp60-3.

¹⁶ The figures for 1792 come from Barfoot and Wilkes *Directory*, pp47-8; for the first bank in Pall Mall (Backwell, Darel, Hart and Croft) see Pennant *Some Account of London*, pp342-3.

¹⁷ Davies, EA *An Account of the Formation and Early Years of the Westminster Fire Office*, 1952, ch. 3.

¹⁸ The first of several Commons committees on the Westminster streets seems to appear in *House of Commons Journal [HCJ]*, Vol. 16, p58, 13 January 1709; the bill can be found at *HCJ*, Vol. 13, p342, 1 March 1710. See also the report of the committee on obstructions in the Westminster streets in *HCJ*, Vol. 19, p92, 9 February 1719 and pp118-9, 3 March 1719.

¹⁹ *HCJ*, Vol. 20, pp278-9, 3 March 1724.

²⁰ *HCJ*, Vol. 19, pp694-5, 15 December 1721.

²¹ Anon *Reasons against Building a Bridge*, pp6-7, 21.

²² *HCJ*, Vol. 22, pp59-60, 26 February 1733. On the slaughterhouses of Field Lane see Maitland, *History and Survey*, Vol. II, p965.

²³ The idea of a Mansion House had been mooted since at least 1670: see Sydney Perks, *The History of the Mansion House*, Cambridge, 1922, ch. X. Batty Langley, writing in August 1734, is cited in Perks, *Mansion House*, p166. See also Sally Jeffery, *The Mansion House*, 1993, for the definitive study.

²⁴ *HCJ*, Vol. 22, pp568-71, 16 February 1736.

²⁵ 10 Geo.2 c.16. See *HCJ*, Vol. 22, p547, 4 February 1736; pp568-71, 16 February; pp612-3, 5 March; pp641-2, 22 March. See also Anon, *Reasons for erecting a Bridge Cross the River Thames, from Westminster to the opposite Shore in the County of Surrey*, n.d. [1736].

-
- ²⁶ Maitland, *History and Survey*, Vol. I, p682; Grosley, Pierre Jean *A Tour to London: or, New Observations on England, and its Inhabitants*, 3 Vols., Dublin, 1772, Vol. I p27. See also Survey of London, Vol. XXIII. *South Bank and Vauxhall. The Parish of St. Mary Lambeth Pt.I*, 1951, pp66-7.
- ²⁷ *HCJ*, Vol. 22, pp568-71, 16 February 1736.
- ²⁸ The best summary of these complex affairs is in Survey of London, Vol. X. *The Parish of St. Margaret, Westminster (Pt. I)*, 1926, pp1-60.
- ²⁹ Joseph Massie, *An Essay on the Many Advantages Accruing to the Community, from the Superior Neatness, Conveniencies, Decorations and Embellishments of Great and Capital Cities. Particularly Apply'd to the City and Suburbs of London....*, 1754.
- ³⁰ John Spranger, *A Proposal or Plan for an Act of Parliament for the Better Paving, Lighting, Cleansing...of the City and Liberty of Westminster....*, 1754, Preface, n.p., [iv]. His *Proposal* also extended to some parishes in Middlesex.
- ³¹ Jonas Hanway, *A Letter to Mr. John Spranger, on his Excellent Proposal for Paving, Cleansing and Lighting the Streets of Westminster, and the Parishes in Middlesex*, 1754.
- ³² *HCJ*, Vol. 27, p134, 1 February 1755 and pp158-60, 14 February 1755; pp348-9, 13 January 1756; pp514-22, 12 March 1756.
- ³³ *HCJ*, Vol. 27, pp514-22, 12 March 1756.
- ³⁴ See Gordon Home, *Old London Bridge*, 1931, pp264-77.
- ³⁵ See Robert Ward, *The Man Who Buried Nelson. The Surprising Life of Robert Mylne*, Stroud, 2007, ch. 5. For the inscription see Birch, *Busby City Latin, or Critical and Political Remarks on the Latin Inscription on Laying the First Stone on the intended New Bridge at Black-Fryars*, 2nd edn, 1761, pp2-3.
- ³⁶ 33 Geo. II c30, the London Streets (City) Act 1759, bearing the date of the start of the session. See Noorthouck, *A New History of London*, pp397-9 and fn. David Hughson, *London; being an Accurate History and Description of the British Metropolis and its Neighbourhood to Thirty Miles Extent, from an Actual Perambulation*, 6 Vols., 1805-9, Vol. I pp446-50 usefully sets out what was and was not completed. See also George Laurence Gomme (ed), *The Gentleman's Magazine Library...London Vols. I-III*, Vol. 1 pp227-9, citing the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1760. And there is a good description too in Henry Hunter, *The History of London, and Its Environs....* 2 Vols., 1811, Vol. II pp754-6.
- ³⁷ *HCJ*, Vol. 29, p189, 23 February 1762.
- ³⁸ *HCJ*, Vol. 29, pp233-8, 15 March 1762. 2 Geo. III c21 London Streets Act 1762, subsequently explained and enlarged by 3 Geo. III c23, 4 Geo. III c39, 5 Geo. III c50, and 6 Geo. III c54. The best account of these events remains Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *English Local Government: Statutory Authorities for Special Purposes*, 1922, pp276-88; see also George, *London Life*, pp99-102; Ogborn, *Spaces of Modernity*, pp91-104.
- ³⁹ *Annual Register for 1765*, Chronicle p110.
- ⁴⁰ Massie, *Essay*, p12. Grosley, *Tour to London*, Vol. I pp35-6 and fn. His stay in London was in 1765, and his equally severe strictures on the Strand presumably predated July.
- ⁴¹ 6 Geo. III c26, London Paving and Lighting Act 1766. See John Entick, *A New and Accurate History and Survey of London, Westminster, Southwark, and Places Adjacent....*, 4 Vols., 1766, Vol. III pp264-90; Noorthouck, *A New History of London*, p436ff; Hughson, *London*, Vol. I pp546-64.
- ⁴² City of London Commissioners of Sewers and Pavements: Proceedings 1766-67, [Minutes of Public Meetings for Implementing the New Act for Improving the Streets of London etc.] CLA/006/AD/04/004 [London Metropolitan Archive (LMA)], pp1-69, 17 May to 16 July 1766.
- ⁴³ City of London Commissioners of Sewers and Pavements: Proceedings 1765-69, [Minutes of Courts of Sewers and Pavements] CLA/006/AD/04/001 [LMA], ff40-1, 18 April 1766.
- ⁴⁴ Daniel Defoe, Samuel Richardson and another, *A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain. Divided into Circuits or Journeys*, 4 Vols., 1769, Vol. II p163; Grosley, *Tour to London*, Vol. I, pp35-6fn.