10

London, 1660–1800:
A Distinctive Culture?

PETER BORSAY

POST-RESTORATION LONDON WAS an exceptional and extraordinary urban organism. Nothing in Britain could be easily compared to it. From a modest European city of 50,000 to 60,000 people in the 1520s, it mushroomed to almost half a million in 1700, and a million by 1800. About two per cent of the population of England and Wales occupied the capital in the early sixteenth century; by the eighteenth century this had exploded to ten per cent. In 1700 London was some seventeen times as large as its nearest provincial English rival (Norwich, 30,000), and in 1801—despite the dynamic growth of the cities of the Midlands and North—thirteen times the size of its nearest competitor (Liverpool, 82,000).[1] There existed no tier of substantial cities to occupy the middle ground between the metropolis and the provinces. Within the British Isles as a whole, Dublin came nearest to such a role. However, despite its impressive expansion in the eighteenth century (from about 60,000 inhabitants in 1700 to 224,000 by 1821), Dublin was only between a fifth and a quarter the size of the English capital in 1800.[2] Internationally, by 1700 London equalled and perhaps surpassed Paris as the biggest city in Western Europe, and by 1800 it had joined Edo and Peking as one of the three largest cities in the world, each with around a million souls.[3]

Exceptional size suggests that London possessed other special demographic characteristics. To fuel its growth (particularly given the high level of mortality), and to facilitate its operation as a city, the capital experienced flows of people, as migrants or short-term visitors, quite unparalleled amongst towns elsewhere in Britain. Sir Tony

---

[1] P.J. Corfield, 'Urban development in England and Wales in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', in D.C. Coleman and A.H. John, eds, *Trade, government and economy in pre-industrial England* (London, 1976), pp. 214–47; R. Finlay and B. Shearer, 'Population growth and suburban expansion', in A.L. Beier and R. Finlay, eds, *The making of the metropolis: London, 1500–1700* (Harlow, 1986), pp. 37–40; P.J. Corfield, *The impact of English towns, 1700–1800* (Oxford, 1982), pp. 7–10; B.R. Mitchell and P. Deane, *Abstract of British historical statistics* (Cambridge, 1962), pp. 24–7.

[2] D. Dickson, ed., *The gorgeous mask: Dublin, 1700–1850* (Dublin, 1987), p. vii.

[3] J. de Vries, *European urbanisation, 1500–1800* (London, 1984), pp. 270–8; J. Black and R. Porter, eds, *The Penguin dictionary of eighteenth-century history* (Harmondsworth, 1996), p. 117.

Proceedings of the British Academy, **107**, 167–84. © The British Academy 2001.

Wrigley has suggested that between 1650 and 1750 net immigration into London as a whole was of the order of 8,000 people per annum.[4] London was a society in a state of human flux on a grand scale. To accommodate its mass of inhabitants the capital occupied a physical space far more extensive, sprawling, fragmented and suburbanised than any other town.

For Defoe, the physical configuration of 'this monstrous city' was something confusing but awesome:

> New squares, and new streets rising up every day to such a prodigy of buildings, that nothing in the world does, or ever did, equal it, except old Rome in Trajan's time . . . It is the disaster of London, as to the beauty of its figure, that it is thus stretched out in building, just at the pleasure of every builder, or undertaker of buildings, and as the convenience of the people directs . . . this has spread the face of it in a most straggling, confus'd manner, out of all shape, uncompact, and unequal.[5]

London's physical extent and population was particularly prodigious given that it was the capital of what was a relatively small country. In 1700, when London's size was roughly that of Paris, the population of England (5.2 million) was only one-quarter that of France (20 million); and in 1800, when London and Peking vied in size, China's inhabitants numbered roughly three hundred million, England's less than nine million.[6] In such a context London's gargantuan proportions can only be explained by its universality of function, its position at the core of an economically dynamic and highly centralised nation, and—above all—its expanding role as an imperial capital and global city.

London was, on the face of it, a very different type of urban settlement to any in Britain. To what extent did the special features which have been identified generate a distinctive, even unique, set of cultural characteristics? This chapter will suggest six areas where a case can be made.

I

As a national and imperial capital, and as a world city, London was a remarkable cultural gateway, open potentially to a huge range of tastes, fashions, customs, ideas and beliefs. In 1700, eighty per cent (by value) of imports to England from overseas entered through the port of London, a figure which by 1770—despite the growth of the out-

---

[4] E. A. Wrigley, 'A simple model of London's importance in changing English society and economy, 1650–1750', in P. Abrams and E.A. Wrigley, eds, *Towns in societies: essays in economic history and historical sociology* (Cambridge, 1979), p. 217.

[5] D. Defoe, *A tour through the whole island of Great Britain*, 1st publ. 1724–6, ed. G.D.H. Cole and D.C. Browning (2 vols, London, 1962), vol. I, pp. 314–15.

[6] E.A. Wrigley and R.S. Schofield, *The population history of England, 1541–1871* (London, 1981), pp. 208–9; Black and Porter, *Penguin dictionary*, pp. 146, 257.

ports—had dropped only to seventy per cent. Much of this was raw materials for man-ufacture, but much also was semi-luxury consumables from Europe, North America, the West Indies, the East Indies and China; goods like calicoes, silks, earthenware, wine, sugar, tobacco, coffee and tea.[7]

These were products redolent with cultural meaning, and around some of them, whose use was expanding rapidly, developed new social rituals, such as tea drinking (tea was available in London by the 1650s, and Pepys had his first cup in 1660), and new institutions, such as coffee-houses. By the 1780s François de la Rochefoucauld could observe that:

> Throughout the whole of England the drinking of tea is general. You have it twice a day and though the expense is considerable, the humblest peasant has his tea twice a day . . . the total consumption is immense. . . . It provides the rich with an opportunity to display their magnifi-cence in the matter of tea-pots, cups, and so on, which are always of most elegant design based upon Etruscan and other models of antiquity.

Country as well as town customers ordered their beverages direct from the leading met-ropolitan suppliers. So in 1736 Mrs Lucy of Charlecote in Warwickshire purchased from Thomas Twining and Son, at the Golden Lion in Deveraux Court near the Temple, 'fine green' and 'bohea' tea, and raw and roasted coffee, to the value of £3 4s. 6d., with a further 1s. charged for carriage. From their introduction in the mid-seventeenth century, coffee-houses proliferated across the capital, with over 600 in operation by the early eighteenth century.[8]

London was frequently the point through which imports of exotic plants—which were to transform the nature of English gardening—entered the country, and it was the merchants, nurserymen and specialist gardens of the city and its vicinity that facilitated the cultivation and dissemination of the new species. The Gracechurch Street haber-dasher and linen-draper, Peter Collinson (1694–1768), played an important part in introducing North American species, and the Hammersmith nurseryman James Lee (1715–1795) employed collectors and agents overseas, and with his partner was respon-sible, for example, for introducing *Buddleia globosa* from Peru.[9]

The metropolis was the funnel for fashionable French and Italian musical taste and, because of its financial power and commercialised music industry, the magnet for any

[7] C.J. French, '"Crowded with Traders and a Great Commerce": London's domination of English overseas trade, 1700–1775', *London Journal*, 17 (1992), 27–35; W.E. Minchinton, ed., *The growth of English overseas trade in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries* (London, 1969), pp. 18–36, 78–118.

[8] J. Brewer and R. Porter, eds, *Consumption and the world of goods* (London, 1993), essays by Carole Shammas and Sidney Mintz, pp. 177–205, 261–73; R. Tannahill, *Food in history* (new edn, Harmondsworth, 1988), p. 268; *The diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Lord Braybrooke (2 vols, London, 1936), vol. I, p. 97, n. 1; *A Frenchman in England, 1784*, ed. J. Marchand and S.C. Roberts (Cambridge, 1933), pp. 23–4; Warwickshire County Record Office, Lucy MSS, L6/1276; D. Cruickshank and N. Burton, *Life in the Georgian city* (London, 1990), pp. 27, 30–1, 33, 42–3; A. Ellis, *The penny universities: a history of the coffee-houses* (London, 1956); B. Lillywhite, *London coffee-houses* (London, 1963), pp. 761–823, and *passim*.

[9] M. Hadfield, *A history of British gardening* (London, 1969), pp. 145–9, 219, 224–7, 235–7.

Continental musician seeking to make a name in England. When the German tourist Zacharias Conrad von Uffenbach attended the opera at the Haymarket in 1710, he found 'The singers were few in number but all were excellent, especially the principal and the Director Nicolai, who has already been much admired in Venice but has greatly advanced himself here, because he earns prodigiously large sums of money. The best of the females is Margaret de L'Épine . . . The orchestra . . . are all foreigners, mostly Germans and then French . . . the conductor is Pepusch from Brandenburg'. Johann Christopher Pepusch (1667–1752) was a native of Berlin, who came to England in about 1700, and assisted in establishing in 1726 the Academy of Ancient Music (founded originally as the Academy of Vocal Musick), which met at the Crown and Anchor Tavern. It is argued that between 1675 and 1750 there were more Italian composers resident in London than any other city except Vienna.[10] The capital was the natural point of entry for any *émigré* from overseas, and the city had significant communities of Jews and Huguenots. However, it should not be forgotten that great waves of migrants also came from within Britain, carrying with them their indigenous cultures and customs.

II

London was the forcing-house of cultural change in Britain. This was a function of its population and social composition, which ensured that the city constituted a market unique in its size, compactness, complexity, sophistication and affluence. Nowhere could compete with the capital for the range of opportunities it provided for the creative entrepreneur. This ensured that the metropolis pioneered the long-term trend towards the commercialisation and industrialisation of culture, in which there were fundamental alterations in the scale and character of production and sale, and in which the processes of manufacture and consumption were increasingly separated.[11] The penetration of culture by the market was hardly new; what was novel was the pace at which change occurred, and the outcomes generated. Quite new forms of enterprise emerged.

The pleasure gardens which sprang up on the periphery of post-Restoration London were a prime example of the commodification of leisure. Informal summer pastimes, such as perambulating and recreating in the city's rural environs, were turned into a business. Well over fifty gardens were opened, some based on mineral-water springs, all offering refreshments, and many providing a centre for additional

---

[10] *London in 1710 from the travels of Zacharias von Uffenbach*, trans. and ed. W.H. Quarrell and M. Mare (London, 1934), p. 17; J. Harley, *Music in Purcell's London: the social background* (London, 1968), p. 156.

[11] N. McKendrick, J. Brewer and J.H. Plumb, *The birth of a consumer society* (London, 1983); Brewer and Porter, eds, *Consumption and the world of goods*; R. Porter, 'Material pleasures in the consumer society', in R. Porter and M.M. Roberts, eds, *Pleasure in the eighteenth century* (Basingstoke, 1996), pp. 19–35; R. Porter, 'Visitors' visions: travellers' tales of Georgian London', in C. Chard and H. Langdon, eds, *Transports: travel, pleasure, and imaginative geography, 1600–1830* (London, 1996), pp. 38–40; J. Brewer, *The pleasures of the imagination: English culture in the eighteenth century* (London, 1997), especially p. 3.

recreational activities, like bowling, angling, cricket, gambling, theatre and music-making. Though in the early days access was often free, later an entrance fee was charged. Many of the gardens were only small-scale ventures, centred on a tavern or inn, but a number—notably the big four, Cuper's, Marylebone, Ranelagh and Vauxhall—became multi-faceteted businesses, involving substantial levels of investment.

Vauxhall started life in the 1661 as the New Spring Garden, but was extensively re-developed by Jonathan Tyers, after he took a thirty-year lease, at £250 per annum, in 1728. Its twelve or so acres became effectively a theme park, what Miles Ogborn has called 'a landscape of commodification and consumption', carefully designed, as David Solkin has argued, to allow the 'polite multitudes' who paid their entrance fees access to the 'refined public sphere'. The gardens, which were extensively lit at night, accommodated a wide range of walks, decorative elements and special features, such as the Cascade (an illuminated scene incorporating a mill-wheel and waterfall). To these were added a number of buildings, including a colonnaded range of supper-boxes and pavilions, adorned with large paintings, and an outdoor orchestra stand, opened in 1735 and rebuilt in 'Moorish' gothic style in 1757–8. To cater for inclement weather an impressive indoor auditorium, the Rotunda, was erected in 1743, attached to a long room known as the Saloon or Picture Room.[12]

A Rotunda was also built at Ranelagh in 1741, the capital for which was raised by the issue of thirty-six shares of £1,000 each. So impressed was Edward Pigott with the structure that in 1776 he recorded in his diary its vital statistics: 'number of lights in all 2080 . . . the circumference is 600 feet [180 metres], number of windows 60, number of boxes upstairs 60, number down stairs 60, this elegant room hold 3000 persons, as I like this place very much I have been since, very often'. The space created was used not only for concerts, but also for a type of mass promenading, emphasising the intensely public nature of the entertainments generated by commercialised leisure. The German travel writer, Carl Philip Moritz, described the interior in 1782:

> what a sight I saw as I came from the darkness of that garden into the glare of a round building lit with hundreds of lamps . . . Everything here was circular. Above stood a gallery . . . [in which] stood an organ and a well-built choir apse, from which poured forth music both vocal and instrumental . . . On the floor lay carpets surrounding four high black pillars containing ornate fireplaces where coffee, tea and punch were being prepared, and round all the circle tables were being set with refreshments. Around these four high

[12] S.E. Rasmussen, *London: the unique city*, 1st publ. 1934 (new edn, Harmondsworth, 1960), pp. 72–92; W. Wroth, *The London pleasure gardens of the eighteenth century*, 1st publ. 1896 (new edn, London, 1979); M. Sands, *The eighteenth-century pleasure gardens of Marylebone* (London, 1987); M. Ogborn, *Spaces of modernity: London's geographies, 1680–1780* (New York, 1998), p. 122; D.H. Solkin, *Painting for money: the visual arts and the public sphere in eighteenth-century England* (London, 1992), p. 155; J. Nicolson, *Vauxhall Gardens, 1661–1859* (London, 1991); D. Coke, 'Vauxhall Gardens', in M. Snodin, ed., *Rococo: art and design in Hogarth's England* (London, 1984), pp. 74–98.

pillars all of fashionable London revolved like a gaily coloured distaff, sauntering in a compact throng.[13]

The gardens made heavy use of advertising, peppering the London papers with details of forthcoming attractions, especially concerts, for which the gardens constituted a major venue. Publicity was vital, not only to provide the market with practical information, but also to construct and cultivate its expectations. Particularly important was the naming of individual performers, and the evolution of a type of 'star system'. This was indicative of the growing professionalisation of cultural production, a process which naturally centred on London, able as it was to exert a Europe-wide pull on artists and artistes seeking to make a career of their talents. Cyril Ehrlich has argued that within Britain 'By far the greatest number of mid-eighteenth century musicians, perhaps some 1,500, were based in London. Apart from the university cities, no provincial centre, except Dublin, Bath, and, for a brief period, Edinburgh, could provide regular employment for more than a score of full-time practitioners: and even their complements never exceeded fifty.'[14]

London's position at the centre of the nation's expanding leisure industry, together with its role as a cultural gateway, meant that there was no shortage of innovators and ideas. The outcome was that in field after field the metropolis pioneered change. Among a number of examples, the classical square was introduced into Britain by Inigo Jones at Covent Garden in the 1630s. The direct inspiration for its design came from Leghorn (the piazza) and Paris (Place Royale, 1605 onwards), both of which Jones had visited. When fused with the native traditions of urban open spaces, and of courtyard and collegiate architecture, Covent Garden became the prototype for a rash of classical square construction in post-Restoration London, especially but not exclusively located in the West End, led by Bloomsbury Square (1661 onwards) and St James's Square (1660s). Provincial squares, drawing on London as their model, began to appear from the very end of the seventeenth century, with ventures at Whitehaven, Warwick and Bristol.[15]

---

[13] Beinecke Library, Yale, Osborne Shelves, f.c. 80, diary of E. Pigott, 2 vols, vol. I, article 357; C.P. Moritz, *Journeys of a German in England*, 1st publ. 1783, trans. R. Nettel (London, 1965), p. 45.

[14] G.S. Holmes, *Augustan England: professions, state and society, 1680–1730* (London, 1982), pp. 21–34; P.J. Corfield, *Power and the professions in Britain, 1700–1850* (London, 1995), pp. 182–6: Brewer, *Pleasures of the imagination*, pp. 142–60, 396–7, 463–71; C. Ehrlich, *The music profession in Britain since the eighteenth century: a social history* (Oxford, 1985), p. 3.

[15] See also above, ch. 2. J. Summerson, *Inigo Jones* (Harmondsworth, 1966), pp. 85–6; J. Summerson, *Georgian London*, 1st publ. 1945 (new edn, Harmondsworth, 1962), pp. 27–51, 98–112; P. Borsay, *The English urban renaissance: culture and society in the provincial town, 1660–1770* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 74–9; E. McKellar, *The birth of modern London: the development and design of the city, 1660–1720* (Manchester, 1999), pp. 191–207. McKellar's study of building production and practice in later Stuart London provides an important corrective to a *purely* innovatory model of development, emphasising the mixture of new and old, the processes of 'transformation' and 'flux' rather than abrupt change, and arguing that 'The creation of modern London was an evolutionary not a revolutionary process' (p. 219).

Regular public commercial concerts were pioneered first in London, shortly after the Restoration, in particular by John Banister and Thomas Britton in the 1670s. Roger North wrote that 'the nation (as I may terme it) of Musick was very well prepared for a revolution. . . . A great means of bringing that foreward was the humour of following public consorts . . . [Banister] procured a large room in Whytefryars . . . There was very good musick, for Banister found means to procure the best hands in towne'.[16] The capital was the pace-maker in popular as well as polite pastimes. Modern circus, with its equestrian emphasis, was founded by Philip Astley in the 1760s at his Amphitheatre near Westminster Bridge.[17] Cultural innovation was not confined simply to the arts and leisure. Important changes in life-style were often first forged in London. The idea and reality of suburbia, and with it the urban cult of the countryside, first emerged in seventeenth-century London, only having a significant impact on provincial towns, according to Carl Estabrook, during the second half of the eighteenth century.[18] Adrian Wilson has argued that the metropolis pioneered changing sexual practices that then spread to the provinces, such as a pattern of courting in which full sexual intercourse began before rather than after betrothal. Tim Hitchcock has suggested that this was indicative of the capital's role in promoting a long-term trend towards penetrative sex.[19] It seems that wherever one looks—architecture, the performing arts, popular leisure, life-styles or sexual mores—London was the engine of cultural change.

III

That the capital was an engine, not simply an innovator, and that it had a dynamic role to play in disseminating culture, was due in large measure to the uniquely powerful influence that it exerted over non-metropolitan society. In this sense London can be seen as possessing a dominant culture. In their analysis of other settlements, many contemporaries propagated this view. In 1761 *The Annual Register* declared that 'the several great cities, and we may add several poor country towns, seem to be universally inspired with becoming the little *Londons* of the part of the kingdom wherein they are situated'; sixteen years later John Trusler claimed that 'the several great cities and large

---

[16] Harley, *Purcell's London*, pp. 141–51; *Roger North on music: being a selection from his essays written during the years c.1695–1728*, ed. J. Wilson (London, 1959), pp. 351–2.

[17] H. Cunningham, *Leisure in the Industrial Revolution* (London, 1980), p. 33; R. Porter, *London: a social history* (London, 1994), p. 176.

[18] K. Thomas, *Man and the natural world: changing attitudes in England, 1500–1800* (Harmondsworth, 1984), pp. 243–54; C. Estabrook, *Urbane and rustic England: cultural ties and social spheres in the provinces, 1660–1780* (Manchester, 1998), p. 270.

[19] A. Wilson, 'Illegitimacy and its implications in mid-eighteenth-century London: the evidence of the Foundling Hospital', *Continuity and Change*, 4 (1989), 103–64; T. Hitchcock, *English sexualities, 1700–1800* (Basingstoke, 1997), pp. 38–40.

towns of this island catch the manners of the metropolis . . . the notions of splendour that prevail in the Capital are eagerly adopted'; and in 1801 Richard Warner proclaimed London 'the central point where arts originate, and from whence they ramify'.[20] Travel diarists and guidebook compilers of the time, such as Celia Fiennes and Daniel Defoe, were keen to record how other towns adopted and mimicked the fashions of the metropolis, and there is little doubt that London was the model which provincial Britain followed.[21] The Robin Hood Society, founded in about the 1740s to encourage radical political debate—a place, according to one critic, 'where all sorts of people may harangue on moral & political subjects which few of them understand'— gave its form and name to societies established in cities such as Dublin, Edinburgh and Birmingham.[22] In 1703 the council at York admitted a new musician to the ranks of the city waits—which later, and perhaps already at this time, were used to support the assemblies and subscription concerts in the city—'upon the condition specified in his petition of being sent to London for six months in order to improve him in the way of music'.[23] The painter Joseph Wright and the engraver Thomas Bewick, both of whom were to display a fierce attachment to their home regions, the east Midlands and the North-East respectively, felt compelled to spend a period of their youth in the metropolis in order to imbibe the skills of their trades.[24]

The capital, because it was by far the most important market and entrepôt for finished goods, exercised a powerful impact on the products and operations of some of the nation's major provincial industries. During the seventeenth century, as David Hey has noted, 'Sheffield workmen frequently tried to pass off their wares as London products', and 'Until the early eighteenth century London merchants controlled the sales of Hallamshire goods in the capital and abroad.' Hey goes on to argue, 'One is left with the firm impression that in the early modern period Sheffield had closer links with the capital than with any other urban centre, including those in Yorkshire and Derbyshire, beyond the most immediate market towns.' Ursula Priestley has claimed of the Norfolk textile trade, 'The importance of London for the Norwich industry cannot be overstressed . . . as the prime arbiter of taste and fashion, London influenced the level of demand all over the country.'

---

[20] *Annual Register* (1761), quoted in M. Falkus, 'Lighting in the Dark Ages of English economic history: town streets before the Industrial Revolution', in Coleman and John, eds, *Trade, government and economy*, p. 259: J. Trusler, *The way to be rich and respectable* (1777), quoted in McKendrick *et al.*, *Consumer society*, p. 51; R. Warner, *The history of Bath* (Bath, 1801), p. 224.

[21] P. Borsay, 'The London connection: cultural diffusion and the eighteenth-century provincial town', *London Journal*, 19 (1994), 21–7: R. Porter, 'Science, provincial culture and public opinion in Enlightenment England', in P. Borsay, ed., *The eighteenth-century town: a reader in English urban history, 1688–1820* (London, 1990), pp. 251–2.

[22] M. Thale, 'The Robin Hood Society: debating in eighteenth-century London', *London Journal*, 22 (1997), 34; *The Diary of Sylas Neville, 1767–1788*, ed. B. Cozens-Hardy (London, 1950), p. 51; J. Money, *Experience and identity: Birmingham and the West Midlands, 1760–1800* (Manchester, 1977), pp. 111–12.

[23] York City Library, York Civic Archives, house book, no. 40 (1692–1706), 30 Nov. 1703.

[24] B. Nicolson, *Joseph Wright of Derby: painter of light, volume I: Text and catalogue* (London, 1968), p. 2; Brewer, *Pleasures of the imagination*, p. 500.

The close connection with the metropolis must have moulded the architectural tastes of Norwich's commercial élite. When Celia Fiennes visited in 1698, she recorded of the city's dwellings, 'some they build high and contract the roofes resembling the London houses, but none of brick except some few beyond the river [the textile district] which are built of some of the rich factors like the London buildings'.[25] It was common practice to take architectural ideas from the metropolis. Even Dublin, which was big enough to go its own way—and in some respects did—drew upon London proto-types, such as in the building of Essex Bridge (1753–5, modelled upon Westminster Bridge), the provost's house of Trinity College (1759, after a design by Lord Burlington for a London house for General Wade), the Lying-in Hospital or 'Rotunda' (1751 onwards, inspired by the Rotunda at Ranelagh Gardens), new Newgate Gaol (1773, based on George Dance's Newgate Prison, 1770–8), and St George's Hardwicke Place (1803–13, with a spire adapted from St Martin in the Fields).[26] Such cultural power bred in Londoners a special sense of their own superiority, alongside a disdain for provincial and rustic manners. The metropolis is portrayed as the epitome and fount of progress and improvement, the rural world as inherently backward. As Joseph Addison argued in *The Spectator* (1711), one of the principal organs of the English Enlightenment, and a journal overtly committed to spreading modern metropolitan values, 'If after this [the town] we look on the People of Mode in the Country, we find in them the Manners of the last Age. They have no sooner fetched themselves up to the fashion of the Polite World, but the Town has dropped them'. Defoe, a Londoner, can scarcely conceal his contempt for the linguistic deficiencies of those living beyond the capital's influence. As he passed through Somerset he observed:

> when we are come this length from London, the dialect of the English language, or the country way of expressing themselves is not easily understood, it is so strangely altered; it is true, that it is so in many parts of England besides, but in none in so gross a degree as in this part; This way of boorish country speech, as in *Ireland*, it is call'd the brogue upon the tongue; so here 'tis call'd *jouring*.[27]

London derived much of its dominance and its distinctiveness as a cultural centre from its role as the undisputed seat of the state. Crown, Court, executive, civil service, parliament and law courts were all located there. In the 1680s, in the wake of the Exclusion Crisis, in which the Whigs had harnessed the power of the London crowds against the Crown, Charles II had initiated a major project which might have returned

---

[25] D. Hey, *The fiery blades of Hallamshire: Sheffield and its neighbourhood, 1660–1740* (Leicester, 1991), pp. 159, 302–3; U. Priestley, *The fabric of stuffs: the Norwich textile industry from 1565* (Norwich, 1990), p. 27; *The journeys of Celia Fiennes*, ed. C. Morris (London, 1947), p. 148. See also McKendrick *et al.*, *Consumer society*, pp. 117–27, for the importance of London to Josiah Wedgwood's Staffordshire pottery business.

[26] M. Craig, *Dublin, 1660–1860* (London, 1952), pp. 140–1, 170–2, 182–3, 193–4, 197–9, 282; D. Cruickshank, *A guide to the Georgian buildings of Britain and Ireland* (London, 1985), pp. 290–3; M. Whiffen, *Stuart and Georgian churches: the architecture of the Church of England outside London, 1603–1837* (London, 1947–8), p. 41.

[27] *The Spectator*, no. 119, 17 July 1711; Defoe, *Tour*, vol. I, p. 218.

Winchester to its medieval function as a royal capital. But James II failed to continue work on the palace his brother had started. There was to be no alternative focus of power to diminish the glory of London, in the way Versailles did Paris.[28] Indeed, with the Unions of 1707 (Scotland) and 1801 (Ireland), the growth of the 'fiscal-military state' with its bureaucratic appendages, and the expansion of Empire during the long eighteenth century, the presence of realm and state loomed larger and larger in the identity of its capital. The mayoral inauguration ceremonials and Lord Mayor's Show were carefully constructed and staged to emblematise the association between Crown and town. The show had emerged in the sixteenth century, replacing the midsummer watch as the climax of the civic year, and incorporating pageantry from coronation celebrations and royal entries. The event of 1660 was designed to celebrate the Restoration of the Crown, and later seventeenth-century monarchs might attend, and even occasionally ride in shows (as Charles II did in 1661). Celia Fiennes' account of the occasion, composed in the early eighteenth century, described how the new mayor travelled along the Thames from the City to Westminster, attended by a great flotilla of highly decorated barges prepared by the City companies, so as to be sworn before the monarch or his/her deputy. Through such ritual, London and its government was imbued with an ambience of state authority and grandeur which was quite unique to it. In 1747 Campbell contended that:

> The Government of the City of London is the Picture in Miniature of the Civil Government of the Whole Kingdom of Great Britain: It is governed by the Lord-Mayor, who in every thing represents his Majesty, and appears in a Rank and Splendor above that of many European Crowned Heads. . . . The State the Lord-Mayor appears in when he goes to Guildhall, or on any public Occasion . . . resembles Royal Majesty the nearest of any thing possible.[29]

When von Uffenbach stayed in London in 1710, like a good tourist he systematically visited the iconic personalities, structures and institutions of the state, which were so concentrated in the capital: St Paul's, the Tower, Westminster Hall, the Houses of Parliament, Westminster Abbey, the Banqueting House Whitehall, St James's Palace, Hampton Court and Kensington Palace. At St James's Chapel 'we at last managed to see the Queen . . . When the sermon, which was very short was finished, all the other people had to go out; but any foreigners there were allowed to go into the seats at the sides, while the Queen walked with great ceremony up the central isle into a seat near the altar'. Queen Anne in fact made herself very visible to her subjects by reviving the

---

[28] A. Rosen, 'Winchester in transition, 1580–1780', in P. Clark, ed., *Country towns in pre-industrial England* (Leicester, 1981), pp. 180–1; H.M. Colvin, ed., *The history of the king's works, volume v: 1660–1782* (London, 1976), pp. 304–13.

[29] M. Berlin, 'Civic ceremony in early modern London', *Urban History Yearbook* (1986), 15–27; B. Klein, '"Between the Bums and the Bellies of the Multitude": civic pageantry and the problem of the audience in late Stuart London', *London Journal*, 17 (1992), 18, 20–1; *The journeys of Celia Fiennes*, p. 285; R. Campbell, *The London tradesman*, 1st publ. 1747 (repr. Newton Abbot, 1969), pp. 302–3.

Elizabethan practice of victory thanksgiving services at St Paul's, which she attended in some pomp.[30] Later in the century, George III used the public buildings of the metropolis and the Handel Commemoration of 1784 to boost his public image. He was a key actor in the festivities, and attended all three programmes—held at Westminster Abbey, 'converted into a most superb theatre with very rich & elegant decorations', and the Pantheon. The king's exploitation of the composer was in large measure due to the fact that Handel had become something of a British symbol. The statue of him (sculpted by Roubiliac in 1738) displayed in Vauxhall Gardens with those of famous English writers, and with the Francis Hayman paintings of scenes from Shakespeare and themes from the Seven Years War, were but one piece of the rich national and imperial iconography distributed across the metropolis.[31] London's physical and mental proximity to the state meant that its political culture was acutely attuned to what may be termed a national political agenda. Its citizens were far more likely to respond to events on this agenda, if necessary turning out on the streets to demonstrate, than those in the provincial town.

A further aspect of London's dominance was the way that it supported a network of cultural satellite settlements, tightly linked to it in a way that could not be found in any other city in England. The most obvious were the multiplicity of small spas that ringed the outer edge of the metropolis—such as Islington, Hampstead, Sadler's Wells, Dulwich, Sydenham and Richmond—which offered recreational as well as medicinal services.[32] To these must be added more distant watering-places and leisure centres. In 1663 Pepys recorded that on race days the road from London to Epsom was 'full of citizens going and coming', and when von Uffenbach covered the 'fourteen English miles' (22 km) from the capital to the spa he 'found all the houses so full of those taking the waters, and of others who had come to see the Hossemee [*sic*], that we were unable to find accommodation with all our horses in different houses'. Epsom was also developing a commuter function; according to Defoe, ''tis very frequent for the trading part of the company to place their families here, and take their horses every morning to London, to the Exchange, to the Alley, or to the warehouse, and be at Epsome again at night'.[33] Tunbridge Wells and Bath similarly had very close links with London. In 1766 Thomas Benge Burr, the historian of Tunbridge, extolled the advantages of the spa in terms of its capacity to satisfy the needs of the capital's citizens:

---

[30] *London in 1710*, pp. 35, 38–43, 72–4, 91–5, 104–5, 115–16, 153–8; E. Gregg, *Queen Anne* (London, 1984), pp. 165, 191, 216, 240, 276–7, 296, 368.

[31] W. Weber, *The rise of musical classics in eighteenth-century England: a study in canon, ritual, and ideology* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 223–42; L. Colley, *Britons: forging the nation, 1707–1837* (New Haven, 1992), pp. 31–2; Ogborn, *Spaces of modernity*, pp. 142–8; *Diary of Sylas Neville*, pp. 320–1; Moritz, *Journeys*, pp. 41–2.

[32] P. Hembry, *The English spa, 1560–1815: a social history* (London, 1990), pp. 99–110.

[33] *The diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. R. Latham and W. Matthews (London, 1970–83), vol. IV, p. 245; *London in 1710*, p. 105; Defoe, *Tour*, vol. I, p. 161.

the distance from London being only about thirty-six miles [58 km], a daily post is established, a stage coach regularly arrives every afternoon, the public papers come in there twice a day, and men of business, on any emergency, may get to town in four or five hours without difficulty and, with the same ease, return again to their families, and partake of all the pleasures of the country in their utmost perfection, in a place where town and country are so happily blended.[34]

Along the road (or, more correctly, roads) that connected Bath to the capital was a rich infrastructure of inns, located in road towns like Hounslow, Maidenhead, Reading, Newbury, Marlborough, Devizes, Calne and Chippenham, to cope with the great volume of affluent traffic; and during the season the Somerset spa was invaded not only by visitors but fashions, shopkeepers and tradesmen from London.[35]

The presence of London also exerted an enormous influence on the early development of the seaside, resorts in Kent and Sussex being heavily involved in servicing the needs of the metropolis's population. Plentiful and relatively cheap boat travel via the Thames and its estuary made Margate accessible to a surprisingly wide cross-section of London society, earning the town the accolade of 'London-by-the-sea'. William Robinson's *A Trip to Margate* (1805), describing those disembarking at the pier, recorded the 'male and female cits; / Loungers in Bond-street, looking for their wits; / To these still must be added Barbers, Taylors, /Slopsellers, Butchers, Bakers, and Toy-dealers', and in 1810 *The Morning Chronicle* reported that the resort was 'crowded with company, and indeed may be considered as London in miniature, being in many circumstances an epitome of that vast metropolis'.[36]

IV

London enjoyed both a powerful culture and a culture of power. This made the metropolitan experience qualitatively different from that in other towns. However, it should not be assumed that dominance implied uniformity and homogeneity. For a fourth characteristic of London's cultural scene was its relative diversity and fragmentation. The sort of coherence possible in a community of 10,000 or even 50,000 people— never mind 2,500 and below, the size of the vast majority of towns in Britain in 1700 —was simply not possible in an international city of half a million to a million inhabitants. In 1700 Tom Brown declared 'London . . . a world by itself: we daily discover in it more new countries and surprising singularities than in all the universe besides. There are among the Londoners so many nations differing in manners, customs, and religions,

---

[34] T.B. Burr, *The history of Tunbridge Wells* (London, 1766), pp. 110–11.
[35] B.J. Buchanan, 'The Great Bath Road, 1700–1830', *Bath History*, 4 (1992), 71–94; T. Fawcett, 'Eighteenth-century shops and the luxury trade', *Bath History*, 3 (1990), 52, 57–8, 64, 67–8, 71–2.
[36] J.K. Walton, *The English seaside resort: a social history, 1750–1914* (Leicester, 1983), pp. 12–14, 17–18; quotations from J. Whyman, *Kentish sources VIII: The early Kentish seaside (1736–1840)* (Gloucester, 1985), pp. 22–3.

that the inhabitants themselves don't know a quarter of 'em.' Twelve years later Joseph Addison adopted similar sentiments in *The Spectator*, describing the metropolis 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 the one side, and those of Smithfield on the other, by several Climates and Degrees in their way of Thinking and Conversing together.[37]

In 1805, Robert Southey declared it 'impossible ever to become thoroughly acquainted with such an endless labyrinth of streets . . . you may well suppose, they who live at one end know little or nothing of the other'.[38] Southey may well have been considering the stark contrast between the fashionable recreational West End, with its splendid classical architecture and polite pastimes, and the working districts, low-life zones and slums of the East End.[39] The map of social class was further fragmented by the presence of the City, which—as Addison implied— often kept its distance from the gentrified West End. For example, the City had its own musical institutions, originally based on gentleman societies meeting in taverns, where the members participated in the performances. Only the City's big bourgeoisie attended West End concerts, which were firmly under aristocratic control.[40]

The mosaic of cultures and cultural zones would have been added to by the presence of substantial national and ethnic minorities. There were in the Georgian period, for example, some twenty thousand Jews, focused especially on Whitechapel and Petticoat Lane, five to ten thousand blacks, and a strong Huguenot community based in Spitalfields.[41] In addition there was an exceptionally wide variety of religious denominations and occupational groups. Among the latter were the chimney sweeps, who shared powerful distinguishing features—Campbell argued that 'the proper business of this black fraternity . . . may be seen in their face'—and common rituals, such as the

[37] T. Brown, *Amusements serious and comical* (1700), in R. Allen, *The moving pageant: a literary source book on London street-life, 1700–1914* (London, 1998), p. 29; *The Spectator*, no. 403, 12 June 1712.

[38] Don Manuel Alvarez Espriella [R. Southey], *Letters from England*, 2nd edn, 3 vols (London, 1808), vol. I, pp. 72–3.

[39] M.J. Power, 'East London housing in the seventeenth century', in P. Clark and P. Slack, eds, *Crisis and order in English towns, 1500–1700* (London, 1972), pp. 237–62; M.J. Power, 'The east and west in early modern London', in E.W. Ives, R.J. Knecht and J.J. Scarisbrick, eds, *Wealth and power in Tudor England* (London, 1978), pp. 167–85; M. Power, 'Shadwell: the development of a London suburban community in the seventeenth century', *London Journal*, 4 (1978), 29–45; L. Stone, 'The residential development of the West End of London in the seventeenth century', in B.C. Malament, ed., *After the Reformation* (Manchester, 1980), pp. 167–212; R. Porter, 'Enlightenment London and urbanity', in T.D. Hemmings, E. Freeman and D. Meakin, eds, *The secular city: studies in the Enlightenment* (Exeter, 1994), pp. 31–40.

[40] S. McVeigh, *Concert life in London from Mozart to Haydn* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 6, 21, 32–4, 53–6.

[41] R. Porter, *London: a social history* (London, 1994), p. 132.

Jack in the Green.[42] Moreover, the huge volume and range of migrants entering the capital, all carrying their national, regional and local cultures with them, would have encouraged diversity. The cultural pluralism of the metropolis was reflected in the extraordinary range of clubs and societies the capital spawned. Some of these were associated with specific counties and regions of Britain. For example, the Society of Ancient Britons (founded 1715), the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion (1751) and the Gwyneddigion (1770), provided a base for London's community of Welsh exiles, at least the better-off amongst them, organising St David's Day celebrations, establishing a charity, and playing a significant role in the Welsh cultural renaissance of the period. Institutions and associations of this sort both contributed to the kaleidoscopic cultural character of London, and helped glue together its fragmentary parts.[43]

V

A function of London's size, pluralism and potential for innovation was its capacity to generate and support patterns of behaviour and their attendant subcultures that deviated from the norms of society. In the metropolis it was possible to push and stretch the boundaries of the ordinary and orthodox far more than in any other community. Gender and sexual relations were one area of experience where this could be done. It has been argued that 'from the beginning of the eighteenth century there existed a well developed and sophisticated homosexual subculture' in the capital, operating through a network of molly houses, and a well-defined array of open-air pick-up points—the piazzas of Covent Garden, and the latrines at Lincoln's Inn, Moorfields, Kensington Gardens, Hyde Park, Green Park, St James's Park and St Paul's Churchyard. A parallel lesbian subculture may also have been emerging in eighteenth-century London.[44] It is likely that sexual activity in general was relatively visible and public, that it was more varied and experimental, and that there were high levels of prostitution. Von Uffenbach recorded how at Cuper's Garden (which he refers to as Cupid's Garden), reached conveniently by ferry from Somerset House, 'countless whores are to be found . . . and there are disgraceful goings-on', and Moritz recounted that at Vauxhall Gardens, 'what

---

[42] Campbell, *London tradesman*, p. 328; C. Phythian-Adams, 'Milk and soot: the changing vocabulary of a popular ritual in Stuart and Hanoverian London', in D. Fraser and A. Sutcliffe, eds, *The pursuit of urban history* (London, 1983), pp. 97–104; R. Judge, *The Jack in the Green: a May Day custom* (Cambridge, 1978).

[43] P. Clark, *Sociability and urbanity: clubs and societies in the eighteenth century* (Leicester, 1986), p. 10; G. Jenkins, *The foundations of modern Wales, 1642–1780* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 390–3; P. Morgan, *A new history of Wales: the eighteenth century Renaissance* (Llandybie, 1981), pp. 56–62.

[44] Hitchcock, *English sexualities*, pp. 67–72, 84, 94–8; R. Trumbach, 'Sodomitical subcultures, sodomitical roles, and the gender revolution of the eighteenth century: the recent historiography', in R.P. Maccubbin, ed., *'Tis Nature's Fault: unauthorized sexuality during the Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 109–21; R. Trumbach, 'London's Sapphists: from three sexes to four genders in the making of modern culture', in J. Epstein and K. Straub, eds, *Body guards: the cultural politics of gender ambiguity* (London, 1991), pp. 112–41.

astonished me most was the boldness of the lewd strumpets who come in by the half dozen with their go-betweens'. James Boswell's London journal of 1762–3 leaves the impression—for those who sought it and could afford it—of an easily accessible world of casual and conspicuous sex:

> At night I strolled into the Park and took the first whore I met, whom I without many words copulated with free from danger, being safely sheathed. . . . At the bottom of the Haymarket I picked up a strong, jolly young damsel, and . . . conducted her to Westminster Bridge, and then in armour complete did I engage her upon this noble edifice. The whim of doing it there with the Thames rolling below us amused me very much.[45]

Masquerades were a common feature of the capital's pleasure gardens, and these provided temporary opportunities for the participants to subvert their identities and undermine social and sexual boundaries.[46]

Though notions of lawlessness and professionalised crime can easily be exaggerated, the capital's size and social fragmentation probably encouraged, in certain areas in which the presence of figures of authority was weak, something which approximated to a subculture of 'organised crime'.[47] Despite, and perhaps because of the existence of a pervasive state culture, norms could also be stretched in the political arena. London was a well known centre of radical religious and political thinking and action, from the Baptists and Levellers of the civil war period through to the Swedenborgians, corresponding societies and debating clubs of the late eighteenth century. All this, of course, is not to deny that the capital, and the political cultures of its populace, could also be intensely conservative and conventional. It is simply to acknowledge that the character of the city generated exceptional opportunities to stretch and deviate from the norms that ruled the majority of people's lives in rural and provincial England.[48]

VI

London generated—in a way no other settlement in England (with the possible exception of Bath) could match, or even pretended to attempt—a reflexive element in its

---

[45] R. Porter, 'Mixed feelings: the Enlightenment and sexuality in eighteenth-century Britain', in P.-G. Boucé, ed., *Sexuality in eighteenth-century Britain* (Manchester, 1982), pp. 9–10; *London in 1710*, pp. 130–1; V.L. Bullough, 'Prostitution and reform in eighteenth-century England', in Maccubbin, *'Tis Nature's Fault*, pp. 61–74; Moritz, *Journeys*, p. 41; *Boswell's London journal, 1762–3*, ed. F. Pottle (Harmondsworth, 1966), pp. 254, 278–9.

[46] T. Castle, 'The culture of travesty: sexuality and masquerade in eighteenth-century England', in G.S. Rousseau and R. Porter, eds, *Sexual underworlds of the Enlightenment* (Manchester, 1987), pp. 156–80; Sands, *Gardens of Marylebone*, pp. 30, 120.

[47] J. Sharpe, *Crime in early modern England, 1550–1750* (London, 1984), pp. 111–19.

[48] See, for example, P. Burke, 'Popular culture in seventeenth-century London', in B. Reay, ed., *Popular culture in seventeenth-century England* (London, 1995), pp. 41–9; T. Harris, 'The problem of "Popular culture" in seventeenth-century London', *History of European Ideas*, 10 (1989), 43–58; Thale, 'Robin Hood Society', 33–50; I. McCalman, 'Ultra-radicalism and convivial debating-clubs in London, 1795–1838', *English Historical Review*, 102, no. 403 (1987), 309–33.

culture. In the post-Restoration period, a wide range of visual and literary images or analogues of the capital were created, which allowed the city as an idea and working organism to be (in its entirety or its parts) reconstructed, contemplated and debated. Representations of the metropolis which immediately spring to mind are the maps of John Ogilby and William Morgan (1676), and John Rocque (1746); Samuel and Nathaniel Bucks' *Prospect of London and Westminster* (1749) and Henry and Robert Barker's 360-degree city panorama (covering 1,479 square feet or 137 sq. metres) of the 1790s, exhibited in the Rotonda at Leicester Square; Canaletto's mid-eighteenth-century canvases of Vauxhall Gardens, Ranelagh Gardens, Whitehall, Westminster Bridge, and the Thames from Richmond House and Somerset House; the surveys and histories of Strype (1720) and Maitland (1739); and the fictional, semi-fictional and quasi-realistic accounts in *The Spectator*, Alexander Pope's *The Dunciad*, Henry Fielding's *Tom Jones*, John Gay's *The Beggar's Opera*, William Blake's 'London', and William Hogarth's *Beer Street* and *Gin Lane*.[49]

For the educated and affluent Londoner, or for visitors, there were multiple opportunities to gaze and reflect upon images of their environment and themselves. Such a degree of reflexivity meant a culture that, compared to other places, was more self-conscious and cerebral. It was also one which was more 'constructed' and manipulative, in the sense that representations of urban life came to play an important part not only in reflecting but in actually determining patterns of perception and behaviour. Cynthia Wall has argued that, after the traumatic impact of the Fire of London, newspapers, maps, topographical works, and fiction were used to reinscribe the landscape with meaning, helping both to 'bridge the shocking gap between past and present', and develop new, more fluid attitudes to space.[50] For educated visitors London and its spaces were already mapped in their brains before they even arrived, due to the popularity of English literature. A German traveller of the 1780s observed that 'If we think highly of St James's Park and other places in London it may be because they have figured more often than ours in novels and other books. The very streets and squares of London are more world-renowned than most of our cities.'[51] Hogarth's illustrations structured how people saw the moral topography of London, and determined how they as agents responded to that landscape. *The Spectator* controlled how polite society behaved in the capital. One feature of the imagery created of London, and amply demonstrated in the works of Hogarth—for example, *Beer Street* and *Gin Lane*—was the mixture of exaggerated approval and virulent criticism. This gave rise to a

[49] P. Glanville, *London in maps* (London, 1972); A. Davies, *The map of London from 1746 to the present day* (London, 1987); R. Hyde, *Gilded scenes and shining prospects: panoramic views of British towns, 1575–1900* (New Haven, 1985), pp. 120–1, 130–2; B. Allen, 'Topography or art: Canaletto and London in the mid-eighteenth century', in M. Warner, ed., *The image of London: views by travellers and émigrés, 1550–1920* (London, 1987), pp. 29–48; C. Barron and V. Harding, 'London', in C.R.J. Currie and C.P. Lewis, eds, *English county histories: a guide* (Stroud, 1994), pp. 260–2.
[50] C. Wall, *The literary and cultural spaces of Restoration London* (Cambridge, 1998), p. 40.
[51] Moritz, *Journeys*, p. 30.

reflexive culture that was constructed around the interaction between the positive and negatives poles of idealism and 'realism'.[52]

VII

This chapter has briefly sketched in six aspects of metropolitan life that can be argued to have invested London with a distinctive culture: a gateway function, commercialisation and innovation, dominance, diversity and fragmentation, a capacity to stretch the social norms, and reflexivity. Many other aspects of the capital's culture might also have been explored with distinctiveness in mind, such as anonymity and secrecy.[53] There is clearly a case, and a strong one, for arguing that the extraordinary demographic, physical, economic and social characteristics of the capital gave rise to a culture that was qualitatively different to that of other towns. Yet there is also a counter-case: that London converged with, as much as it diverged from, the culture of the wider urban system. Much of this case flows from the very arguments for distinctiveness. If London was a gateway, then it necessarily drew on and reflected the influences of the world outside it. If London was a centre of innovation and domination, then its pattern of culture would necessarily determine that in other urban centres. The more successful the capital was in affecting such communities, the more those places would look like miniature replicas of the metropolis.

It must also be said that some of those characteristics that might appear peculiar to a great city were not that unfamiliar to lesser cities. Provincial towns, albeit on a lesser scale and at a later time, were affected by the commercialisation of culture. Moreover, they were perfectly capable of innovation. For example, the 'Egyptian Hall', a prestigious symbol of the new Palladian architecture, was apparently first introduced in Britain at York, in the assembly rooms (largely built 1731–2, designed by Lord Burlington), before being adopted by country houses and eventually London's Mansion House (1739–53). London was in fact relatively slow in building a mayoral residence, being preceded by Newcastle upon Tyne (1690s), Dublin (acquired c.1715) and York (begun 1725 and largely completed by 1730). The notion of a cultural gateway was not confined to the capital. Many ports developed an independent and

---

[52] M. Byrd, *London transformed: images of the city in the eighteenth century* (New Haven and London, 1978); A.J. Weitzman, 'Eighteenth-century London: urban paradise or fallen city?', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 36 (1975), 469–80; see also P. Borsay, 'Image and counter-image in Georgian Bath', *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 17 (1994), 165–79; P. Bishop, 'The sentence of Momus: satirical verse and prints in eighteenth-century Bath', *Bath History*, 5 (1994), 51–79.

[53] On anonymity and secrecy see J.D. Melville, 'The use and organization of domestic space in late seventeenth-century London' (PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 1999), pp. 176–7, which points to a heavy usage of locks, keys and chests in the households studied. This may reflect the greater need for security and secrecy in a large city, with a shifting population and a relative high degree of multiple occupancy (and in particular the presence of substantial numbers of lodgers).

expanding network of contacts with towns overseas, along which could flow fashions and ideas. But perhaps the strongest qualification to the idea of London as a distinctive culture is the implied notion that the cultures of other places were not distinctive. Each town had its own special characteristics and identity, its own local field of force through which external influences, including metropolitan fashions (however dominant these may appear), would have to be mediated. In this sense each urban community possessed a distinctive culture, and London would have been only exceptional had it *not* demonstrated special qualities.[54] That said, it would be naïve not to recognise that London's distinctiveness was of an exceptional sort, and that the cultural gap between it and other British towns was greater than that between the vast majority of those towns and each other.

[54] For much of the material on which this paragraph is based see Borsay, 'The London connection', 27–31.

List of Abbreviations

APC	*Acts of the Privy Council*
BL	British Library
CARD	*Calendar of the Ancient Records of Dublin*, ed. J.T. and R.M. Gilbert, 19 vols (Dublin, 1889–1944)
CLRO	Corporation of London Record Office
CJ	*House of Common Journals, England*
CSP	*Calendar of State Papers*
Ec.HR	*Economic History Review*
HCJI	*Journals of the House of Commons of the Kingdom of Ireland*
GL	Guildhall Library
HMC	*Historical Manuscripts Commission*
Lambeth PL	Lambeth Palace Library
LMA	London Metropolitan Archives
NAI	National Archives of Ireland
NLI	National Library of Ireland
PP	Parliamentary Papers
PRO	Public Record Office, Kew
PRONI	Public Record Office, Northern Ireland
RCB	Representative Church Body Library, Dublin
RIA	Royal Irish Academy
WAC	Westminster Archives Centre