

London and Middlesex in the 1660s

Introduction:

The early modern metropolis first comes into sharp visual focus in the middle of the seventeenth century, for a number of reasons. Most obviously this is the period when Wenceslas Hollar was depicting the capital and its inhabitants, with views of Covent Garden, the Royal Exchange, London women, his great panoramic view from Milbank to Greenwich, and his vignettes of palaces and country-houses in the environs. His oblique birds-eye map-view of Drury Lane and Covent Garden around 1660 offers an extraordinary level of detail of the streetscape and architectural texture of the area, from great mansions to modest cottages, while the map of the burnt city he issued shortly after the Fire of 1666 preserves a record of the medieval street-plan, dotted with churches and public buildings, as well as giving a glimpse of the unburned areas.¹ Although the Fire destroyed most of the historic core of London, the need to rebuild the burnt city generated numerous surveys, plans, and written accounts of individual properties, and stimulated the production of a new and large-scale map of the city in 1676.² Late-seventeenth-century maps of London included more of the spreading suburbs, east and west, while outer Middlesex was covered in rather less detail by county maps such as that of 1667, published by Richard Blome [Fig. 5].

In addition to the visual representations of mid-seventeenth-century London, a wider range of documentary sources for the city and its people becomes available to the historian. Samuel Pepys records the lived experience of the early modern metropolis, connecting people, places, and activities in a virtual stream of consciousness.³ Effective vital registration resumed after the interruptions of the Interregnum. John Graunt recorded and preserved earlier demographic data in his *Natural and Political Observations upon the Bills of Mortality* (1662), and a regular series of original annual Bills survived to be reprinted in the eighteenth

¹ Robert J.D.Harding, 'Hollar, Wenceslas (1607-77), etcher', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <http://www.oxforddnb.com> [hereafter *ODNB*]; R. Pennington, *A descriptive catalogue of the etched work of Wenceslaus Hollar, 1607-1677* (1982); Simon Turner, 'Hollar prospects and maps of London', in M.C.W.Hunter, ed., *Printed images in early modern Britain : essays in interpretation* (Farnham, 2010), pp. 145-66. For a wide range of Hollar's work see the British Museum's Collections Database (http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search_the_collection_database.aspx) and The Wenceslas Hollar Digital Collection at the University of Toronto (<http://link.library.utoronto.ca/hollar/index.cfm>), both last accessed 28 March 2013.

² *The survey of building sites in the city of London after the Great Fire of 1666*, by Peter Mills and John Oliver, ed. P.E.Jones and T.F.Reddaway (5 vols; London Topographical Society, 1962-7); *The A to Z of Restoration London*, ed. R.Hyde (London Topographical Society, 1992).

³ *The diary of Samuel Pepys : a new and complete transcription*, ed. R. Latham and W. Matthews (11 vols; London, 1970-83), [hereafter *Pepys, Diary* and year or volume title].

century.⁴ The detailed inventories of citizens' estates produced for the City of London's Court of Orphans survive from 1660.⁵ The destruction caused by the Fire stimulated the creation of written records of rebuilding, replanning, compensation, and the settlement of legal disputes.⁶ And the imposition of the Hearth Tax entailed the first house-to-house survey of the whole metropolis and its suburban and rural hinterland. An unparalleled source, the surviving pre-Fire returns for the Hearth Tax published here identify and locate some **XX,000** householders in London and Middlesex, with an indication of the size and hence the relative value of the dwellings they occupied, and in some cases evidence of their poverty or inability to pay. Named individuals are anchored in time and space, and it is possible to map the social topography of the metropolis on the eve of the Great Fire.⁷ In addition, because assessment and collection continued till the 1670s, the records of the Hearth Tax chart the decimation, destruction and rebuilding of the city centre and the ongoing expansion of the wider metropolis. The rest of this introduction deals **[further chapters in this volume deal]** with the Hearth Tax, its assessment, collection, and documentation, the research project that yielded this edition of the returns, and an initial analysis of the data, but this section focuses on the metropolis and the county it so richly documents.

Boundaries and jurisdictions

Restoration London was something of a monster, sprawling, misshapen, uneven, heterodox, of uncertain temper. Its population had multiplied four or five times over the preceding century, and on the eve of the 1665 plague was probably well over 400,000. Physical expansion had blurred the boundaries between city, suburb, and satellite settlements, so that 'continual buildings' extended from Westminster to Wapping and once-distinct

⁴ John Graunt, *Natural and political observations, mentioned in a following index, and made upon the bills of mortality by John Graunt, citizen of London; with reference to the government, religion, trade, growth, ayr, diseases, and the several changes of the said city* (London, 1662); *A collection of the Yearly Bills of Mortality from 1657 to 1758 inclusive* (London, printed for A. Millar in the Strand, 1759).

⁵ London Metropolitan Archive [hereafter LMA] CLA/002/02. These inventories form the basis for, among other works, Peter Earle, *The making of the English Middle Class: business, society, and family life in London, 1660-1730* (London, 1989).

⁶ *The survey of building sites ... by Peter Mills and John Oliver*, vol. 1 (1967); *The Fire Court. Calendar to the judgments and decrees of the Court of Judicature appointed to determine differences between landlords and tenants as to rebuilding after the great Fire*, ed. P.E.Jones (2 vols; London, 1966, 1970).

⁷ See e.g. M.J.Power, 'The social topography of Restoration London', in *London 1500-1700. The making of the metropolis*, ed. A.L.Beier and Roger Finlay (London, 1986), pp. 199-223.

villages and hamlets had been caught in the spreading web of streets and houses.⁸ Maps of the metropolis, before or after the Fire, depict an undifferentiated urban entity [Fig. 1].

But jurisdictions still made a difference to the lives and fortunes of Londoners. The medieval boundaries of the City of London had remained static even as the metropolis doubled in size, and there was a crucial distinction between the area ruled by Lord Mayor and Aldermen and the rest of the metropolis. The City comprised an area of some 567 acres (230 Ha), centred within the Roman walls but including an extramural half-circle of early suburbs. Perhaps half or less of metropolitan London's population lived within this area by 1660. The dense matrix of regulation and citizen participation in a framework of ward offices within the city's boundaries contrasted with the looser, less-defined government of the suburban parishes. Outside the City north of the river only Westminster had a distinct urban status, based on a charter of 1585 establishing a Court of Burgesses. The anomaly by which a large urban area – the parishes to north and east of the city – had no corporate identity or governance was largely the result of the City's reluctance to take on wider responsibility, while the king's attempt to create by fiat a new Incorporation of the Suburbs in 1636, extending three miles (4.8 km) from the City, was a political and practical failure. The City and Middlesex were normally separate units for taxation and military levy; City, county, and Westminster each had their own parliamentary representation, as did Southwark and Surrey on the south bank.⁹

Nevertheless there were ways of looking at London which recognised its identity as a single conurbation regardless of jurisdictional boundaries. While the authority of the Mayor and Aldermen as local governors ended at the City's limits, several of the Livery Companies had been granted powers to regulate trade or manufacture within a wider sphere, up to fifteen miles (24 km) from the city.¹⁰ All of London (north of the river) and Middlesex lay within the diocese of London; the ancient layout of parishes predated and did not coincide with the city boundary, while the Archdeaconry of London included several Middlesex parishes.¹¹

⁸ V.Harding, 'City, Capital and Metropolis: the Changing Shape of Seventeenth Century London', in *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598-1720* ed. J.F.Merritt (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 117-143. Cf. *London in the age of Shakespeare, an anthology*, ed. Lawrence Manley (London, 1986), pp. 42-3.

⁹ V.Pearl, 'Change and stability in 17th century London', *London Journal*, 5 (1979), pp. 3-34; eadem, 'Social policy in early modern London', in *History and Imagination: essays in honour of H.R. Trevor-Roper*, ed. H.Lloyd-Jones, V.Pearl, and B.Worden (London, 1981), pp. 115-3; Julia Merritt, *The social world of early modern Westminster: abbey, court, and community 1525-1640* (Manchester, 2005); Joseph P. Ward, *Metropolitan Communities. Trade Guilds, identity and change in early modern London* (Stanford, 1997); N.G.Brett-James, *The growth of Stuart London* (London, 1935), pp. 223-47; <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/research/constituencies/constituencies-1660-1690>.

¹⁰ Ward, *Metropolitan Communities*, esp. pp. 27-44.

¹¹ J.S.W.Gibson, *Wills and where to find them* (Chichester, 1974), pp. 85-91.

Ecclesiastical parishes started recording vital events, returning numbers of communicants, reporting mortality figures, and administering poor relief in the sixteenth century. In the seventeenth, the publication of weekly and annual totals of deaths and births by parish in the Bills of Mortality helped to define the metropolis. Early Bills listed the parishes within the city walls and those immediately outside them, but as time went on outer and more distant parishes were added, north and south of the river, extending well into Middlesex and Surrey. By 1636 the area encompassed 'within the Bills' extended from Westminster to Stepney and from Islington and Hackney to Lambeth and Bermondsey. From 1660 there were four groupings of parishes within the Bills: the ninety-seven parishes within the walls; the sixteen parishes immediately outside the walls, some wholly within the City, some like St Andrew Holborn partly within the City but extending into Middlesex; twelve 'outparishes', including Clerkenwell, Hackney, Stepney, Bermondsey, and Lambeth; and five parishes in the City and Liberties of Westminster. Although the outer parishes included much land still open and undeveloped, 'London within the Bills' proved a convenient and enduring shorthand for the built-up metropolis, and probably accurately reflected the area subject to the 'urban penalty' of raised mortality.¹²

The Hearth Tax returns reflect this jurisdictional complexity, in their organisation and in their uneven survival. Different units of assessment were used on different occasions. For the 1662 collection, assessments and returns for the city of London were made by ward. The main set of assessments presented here, from Lady Day 1666, is arranged by parish; those parishes straddling the City/Middlesex boundary made separate returns for each part. However, several books from 1666, covering a number of city parishes, have not survived; to patch these gaps, data from 1662/3 have been included, but the patching is uneven since parishes and wards are never coterminous. No returns for the parishes of St Margaret Westminster, Hackney, Greenford, Perivale, and Ashford survive for 1666 [though they were presumably made], so returns for the 1664 collection have been substituted. Returns for 'London within the Bills' are included in Volume I of this edition; those for Middlesex outside the Bills in Volume II. Returns for Southwark and metropolitan Surrey are not included in this edition.

¹² V. Harding, 'The population of early modern London: a review of the published evidence', *London Journal* 15 (1990), pp. 118-28. Cf. *A collection of the Yearly Bills of Mortality*.

The population and demography of metropolitan London

Estimates for London's population vary, not least since the definition of 'London' can be elastic, but a total of 400-450,000 for the whole conurbation in 1660 seems plausible. The preceding century had seen unprecedented demographic growth in England and Wales, but London's population had grown much faster than the rest and continued to rise even when national population totals stalled and began to decline from the 1650s.¹³

London's inhabitants were of varied origins: the capital's population growth was fuelled by migration, and the London-born formed a minority of the adult population.¹⁴ Migrants from the English provinces still predominated, but Welsh, Scots, Irish, French and Dutch swelled their numbers. Regular migration flows may have been disrupted in the 1640s, but the civil wars brought many refugees, especially from Ireland; Scottish soldiers, divines and politicians headed for Westminster; discharged soldiers also drifted towards London.¹⁵ The Protectorate lifted restrictions on Jewish settlement, and a small colony established itself in the 1660s.¹⁶ French and Dutch Protestants had made a major contribution to London's population in the sixteenth century; their communities would be replenished and expanded by a new influx in the 1670s and 1680s as religious toleration withered in France and links with the Dutch Republic strengthened.¹⁷ And small numbers of non-European people – forced or voluntary migrants – were also to be found in London, fast becoming a centre of global commerce.¹⁸

Comparatively few of these recent Londoners can be distinguished in the Hearth Tax returns, which record the names of heads of households only. From the middle ages London surnames had included place-names from the English regions, but by this date such surnames could not be an indicator of recent migration. Some taxpayers with Welsh, Scottish, French and Jewish names may be identified, though again their date of arrival is not known. Householders called Lloyd, Floyd, Owen, Griffiths, and similar names were scattered across

¹³ Harding, 'The population of early modern London'.

¹⁴ P.Earle, *A City full of people. Men and women of London 1650-1750* (London, 1994), pp. 47-8.

¹⁵ xxx

¹⁶ A.S.Diamond, 'The community of the resettlement, 1656-1684: a social survey', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 24 (1974), pp. 134-50.

¹⁷ I.Sculoudi, 'Alien immigration into, and alien communities in London, 1558-1640', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London* 16 (1938), pp. 27-49; D.Gwynn, *Huguenot Heritage. The history and contributions of the Huguenots in Britain*, London, 1985), pp. 35-41.

¹⁸ Pepys, *Diary*, 1662, p. 95; F.Shyllon, *Black people in Britain, 1555-1837* (Oxford, 1977), pp. 11-12, 77. Cf. C.Fox, *Londoners* (London, 1987), pp. 245-8.

the city in 1662/1666, but the same names also occur in earlier baptismal registers.¹⁹ The incipient Jewish community in the vicinity of St James Duke's Place is signalled by 'The Jews Sinagouge' and a handful of householders with first names such as Moses or Emmanuel (423, 425-9),²⁰ while the cosmopolitan nature of the mercantile community is indicated by the presence in St Katherine Coleman of Thomas Papillon, Diego Rodriguy Arias, and perhaps Jacob Lacie (33, 37).²¹

However, it was in the nature of much migration that incomers were absorbed into existing households, as apprentices, servants, and lodgers, or in some cases into institutions such as the Inns of Court. Young single men and women predominated among British migrants, usually in pursuit of an apprenticeship or employment in domestic service; though others came in family groups, particularly those from abroad, many of these would have started their London life as inmates, lodgers, and subsidiary households.

Socially and economically, Restoration London's population ranged from the very wealthiest to the destitute, and from the blue-blooded to the nameless. The aristocrats formed a tiny, if gilded, minority, and certainly the great majority – three quarters or more - were working people, artisans, labourers, the casually employed, and the poor. But London in this period was notable for the growth of a 'middling sort' – individuals and families who lived comfortably on earnings from business, the professions, or officeholding, in well-appointed homes, with access to the capital's array of consumer goods, entertainment, and sociability. Peter Earle estimated that in the early eighteenth century perhaps a fifth to a quarter of London households – some 25,000 families - belonged to this middle station.²² Their proportion and number would have been lower in 1660, given the growth of the professions and government service in the later seventeenth century, and the boom in commerce and retail, but there must still have been a substantial middling group. The wealthiest of these shaded into the urban gentry (many of the merchant class claimed gentility in the Heralds' last visitation of 1687),²³ the most modest were barely more than shopkeepers. Samuel Pepys, upwardly-mobile government servant, belonged to the middling sort in the 1660s, even if he subsequently rose higher; Richard Smith, retired city lawyer and diligent book-collector,

¹⁹ See **Index of Names**; E.Jones, 'The Welsh in London in the 17th and 18th centuries', *Welsh History Review*, 10 (1981) 461-79.

²⁰ Cf. Diamond, 'The community of the resettlement', pp. 134-50.

²¹ See Perry Gauci, 'Papillon, Thomas (1623–1702), merchant and politician', *ODNB*; TNA, PROB 11/354 f. 212v, will of Diego Rodrigues Aires of Hackney, merchant stranger, 1677.

²² Earle, *The Making of the English Middle Class*, pp. 3-16; idem, 'The middling sort in London', in *The middling sort of people. Culture, society and politics in England, 1550-1800*, ed. J.Barry and C.Brooks (Basingstoke, 1994), pp. 141-58. See also Warren, below, pp. **xx**.

²³ *The Visitation of London begun in 1687*, ed. T.C.Wales and C.P.Hartley (London, Harleian Society, 2004).

resident of Moorfields, is a good example of a middling Londoner; Katherine Austen of Hoxton, a barrister's widow anxiously striving to preserve her children's inheritance, would also count; but Nehemiah Wallington, the Puritan turner and autobiographical writer, had lived and died in circumstances rather more modest.²⁴

As the wide social range would suggest, Londoners lived in a variety of types of household. For the most part, contemporaries and historians reckoned the household to include family members and dependent apprentices and servants, but not independent individuals who might be lodging under the same roof. John Graunt, in 1662, described the same unit as a 'family', supposing that 'there were about eight Persons in a Family, one with another, viz. the Man, and his Wife, three Children, and three Servants, or Lodgers'.²⁵ The Hearth Tax, focusing on properties, identifies a single householder liable for tax and is usually unclear about the autonomous lodger.²⁶ The statistician Gregory King estimated mean household size for London Hearth Tax units as ranging from 'almost 4¾' to 'almost 6' persons.²⁷ More detailed data on household size and structure from the 1690s suggest means for that period varying locally from 4.5 to 7.5, with actual household units ranging from one person living alone to over fifteen. Analysis of the same data shows that conjugal-biological family groups were small, with many one-parent families and comparatively few children; co-resident kin and 'extended' families were not common. Many households, especially in the wealthier centre parishes of the city, were enlarged by the presence of servants (mostly female) and apprentices (mostly male).²⁸ It seems likely that these general patterns prevailed in the 1660s as well; it is therefore very probable that most Londoners in the 1660s shared a house, if not a household, with upwards of half a dozen people, many of them unrelated, especially if we take into account the frequency of widowhood and remarriage.

²⁴ C.S.Knighton, 'Pepys, Samuel (1633–1703), naval official and diarist'; Vanessa Harding, 'Smith [Smyth], Richard (*bp.* 1590, *d.* 1675), law officer and book collector'; Sarah Ross, 'Austen [*née* Wilson], Katherine (*b.* 1629, *d.* in or before 1683), diarist and poet'; P.S. Seaver, 'Wallington, Nehemiah (1598–1658), turner and diarist': all *ODNB*. See **350** (Navy Office, for Samuel Pepys); **925** (Richard Smith); **1072** (Katherine Austyn [sic]). Nehemiah Wallington died in 1658.

²⁵ Graunt, *Natural and political observations*, p. 59.

²⁶ A rare exception is the reference in 1662 to 'Michael Jones & Sir William Mericke and other lodgers in their house' in St Mary Magdalen south precinct, Castle Baynard Ward (**1692**).

²⁷ 'Gregory King on the state of England in 1695', in *Seventeenth-Century Economic Documents*, ed. Joan Thirsk and J.P.Cooper (Oxford, 1972), pp. 770-90 at p. 772.

²⁸ P.Baker and M.Merry, '“For the house her self and one servant” : Family and Household in late seventeenth-century London', *London Journal* 34.3 (2009), pp. 205-32.

Marriage and fertility patterns in early modern London have been the subject of detailed study, though greater attention has been paid to the period before 1650.²⁹ In the later seventeenth/early eighteenth centuries men of the wealthier merchant class married late, at around 30, to much younger brides. The age-gap was generally much narrower for artisans and handicraftsmen, who usually married for the first time in their mid-twenties to women only a year to two younger,³⁰ though there were some intriguing variations: mariners in the East End married distinctly younger-than-average brides.³¹ Some men married slightly older women, and there are real-life examples of the stock figure of the former apprentice marrying his master's widow.³² Younger brides normally meant more births to a marriage, and birth intervals were shorter in wealthier city-centre parishes than in suburban ones, which may reflect the practice of sending infants away to nurse, either elsewhere in the city or in country parishes nearby, allowing mothers to conceive again more quickly.³³ Many women went on bearing children into their late 30s or early 40s, and the number of children born to a long marriage could be quite high. But high infant mortality meant that few if any parents were able to bring all their children safely to adulthood; Graunt estimated that only 40 per cent of London-born children survived to age 16.³⁴ But while the proportion of children in London's population was comparatively low, there were large numbers of adolescents and young adults, 15-25 being the prime age for migration to London. Apprentices formed a substantial sector of the population, though declining in relative terms as other patterns of migration increased; the increase in domestic service meant that by the end of the century, and possibly by the 1660s, there were more women than men in the London population.³⁵

London's mortality regime, killing adults in every decade of life from a variety of causes, meant that many marriages were short-lived – an overall average of perhaps ten years - something that also contributed to the capital's low rate of reproduction.³⁶ A large proportion of older adults must have been widowed at least once, even if they had

²⁹ Roger Finlay, *Population and metropolis : the demography of London, 1580-1650* (Cambridge, 1981), pp. 133-50; Vivien Brodsky Elliott, 'Single women in the London marriage market, 1598-1619', in *Marriage and society: studies in the social history of marriage*, ed. R.B. Outhwaite (London, 1981), pp. 81-100.

³⁰ Earle, *The Making of the English Middle Class*, pp. 181-5.

³¹ J. Boulton, 'London widowhood revisited: the decline of female remarriage in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries', *Continuity and Change*, 9.3 (1994), pp. 421-50 at pp. 334-5

³² Boulton, 'Widowhood revisited', p. 336.

³³ Gill Newton, 'Infant Mortality Variations, Feeding Practices and Social Status in London between 1550 and 1750', *Social History of Medicine*, 24.2 (2011), pp. 260-280.

³⁴ Graunt, *Natural and political observations*, p. 61.

³⁵ M. Kitch, 'Capital and kingdom: migration to later Stuart London', in *London 1500-1700*, ed. Beier and Finlay, pp. 224-51; *London inhabitants within the walls, 1695*, ed. D.V. Glass (London Record Society, 1966); P.E. Jones & A.V. Judges, 'London population in the late seventeenth century', *Economic History Review*, 6 (1935-6), pp. 45-63.

³⁶ Earle, *City Full*, p. 162.

subsequently found new spouses. King estimated that widows comprised 7 per cent of London's population in 1695 and widowers 2 per cent.³⁷ The percentage of the widowed, male or female, who remarried cannot be calculated, but in 35-45 per cent of recorded marriages in a range of seventeenth-century samples one or both of the partners had been married before.³⁸ As far as can be seen, more widowers than widows remarried, and they did so sooner.³⁹ The propensity for widows to remarry seems to have declined over the seventeenth century. Whether this was due to declining opportunity, or to choice and the existence of viable economic alternatives to remarriage is debated.⁴⁰ Not all those who might have remarried thought it appropriate or desirable to do so: Katherine Austen, widowed at 30 in 1658 and beset by troubles and lawsuits over her children's inheritance, considered after searching debate with herself that she should not remarry, even when a plausible suitor presented himself. Her responsibilities towards her late husband, her children, and God constituted a viable alternative mode of being and sustained her in her difficulties.⁴¹ The Hearth Tax returns do not distinguish married from unmarried male householders, but they do show that a significant minority of households were headed by women, usually identified as widows. stats?

[Fig 2 around here?]

Health and disease

Disease and death were constantly reshaping the metropolitan population. One seemingly inevitable feature of London's early modern growth is that it became a worse, a less healthy, place to live. Population growth entailed increased settlement densities, more overcrowding, and poorer accommodation and environmental quality, but a range of other factors also contributed: increasing levels of poverty, the susceptibility of migrants to urban diseases, childcare practices such as wetnursing, health policies in relation to plague. Changing patterns of disease must also be considered.

³⁷ 'Gregory King on the state of England in 1695', p. 773.

³⁸ Vivien Brodsky, 'Widows in late Elizabethan London: remarriage, economic opportunity and family orientations', in *The World We Have Gained: Histories of Population and Social Structure*, ed. Lloyd Bonfield, Richard M. Smith, and Keith Wrightson (Oxford, 1986), pp. 122-54; Boulton, 'Widowhood revisited'.

³⁹ Brodsky, 'Widows'.

⁴⁰ Barbara J. Todd, 'The remarrying widow: a stereotype reconsidered', in *Women in English Society 1500-1800*, ed. Mary Prior (London, 1985), pp. 54-92; Boulton, 'Widowhood revisited'; Barbara J. Todd, 'Demographic determinism and female agency: the remarrying widow reconsidered ... again...', *Continuity and Change*, 9:3 (1994), pp. 421-50.

⁴¹ Sara Heller Mendelson, 'Stuart women's diaries and occasional memoirs', in *Women in English Society*, ed. Prior, pp. 181-210; Raymond A. Anselment, 'Katherine Austen and the Widow's Might', *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 5.1 (2005), pp. 5-25.

It seems likely that early modern London's 'demographic regime' had two main phases. Up to the mid-seventeenth century it appears that births matched or occasionally exceeded deaths, at least outside epidemics, though probably not by a great deal.⁴² From the mid-seventeenth century, London entered a phase of 'natural decrease', during which deaths exceeded births and migration alone was responsible for the capital's continued strong growth, lasting till the end of the eighteenth century.⁴³ The worsening health of London in the seventeenth century can be objectively charted, in rising levels of mortality and declining life-expectancies, while the meaning of the experience for Londoners is documented in thousands of sources from wills to parish records.

Life-expectancy is a complex measure of chances, and for this period life expectancy at birth must always be compared with life-expectancy on reaching adulthood, and set against the representativeness of the sample. Roger Finlay's calculations for the period 1580-1650 reveal a model of life-expectancy at birth of 29 to 36 years (and considerably less in poorer parishes);⁴⁴ he points to evidence that 'the expectation of life ... deteriorated in London during the course of the seventeenth century'.⁴⁵ Infant mortality seems to have increased, with adverse effects on overall life-expectancy, though the prospects for adult survival may have gradually improved.⁴⁶ In the 1660s London was on the cusp between these two phases: infant mortality was high, but not as high as it was to become; plague, which killed across the age-range, was still present, though it was to disappear by 1670; smallpox, which tended to kill the under-30s, was cyclical but becoming increasingly virulent.⁴⁷

John Graunt's analysis of the data as to cause of death from the annual Bills of Mortality over the period 1629-36 and 1647-60 reveals both the principal causes of death in mid-seventeenth century London, and his reflections on mortality patterns in general.⁴⁸ [See Fig 3] After evaluating the quality of the data and possible shortcomings, he concluded that

⁴² C.Galley, *The demography of early modern towns: York in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries* (Liverpool, 1998), pp. 16-17.

⁴³ *Ibid.*; John Landers, *Death and the metropolis : studies in the demographic history of London, 1670-1830* (Cambridge, 1993).

⁴⁴ Finlay, *Population and Metropolis*, p. 108.

⁴⁵ Finlay, *Population and Metropolis*, p. 109.

⁴⁶ Landers, *Death and the metropolis*, p. 158. The sample populations came from Southwark and the city's north-western suburbs, and recorded over 1,100 births between 1650 and 1699: *ibid.*, pp. 131-4.

⁴⁷ Graunt, *Natural and political observations*; Landers, *Death and the metropolis*; H.Meier, 'Smallpox in Stuart London: causes and effects of an emerging disease' (unpublished DPhil thesis, Oxford University, 2009).

⁴⁸ Graunt, *Natural and political observations*, pp. 349-52, 369, table f.p. 406. Graunt's totals, excluding those for the plague year of 1636, form the basis of the following calculations. The total number of deaths excluding those in 1636 is 20,5891.

‘about thirty six per centum of all quick conceptions, died before six years old’.⁴⁹ For babies the largest number of deaths were in the Bills categories 'abortives and stillborn' and 'chrisoms and infants'; the much smaller categories of 'overlain and starved at nurse', and perhaps 'smothered and stifled', also apply. Deaths of infants and small children might also be attributed to colic and wind; convulsions (the largest category); livergrown, spleen and rickets; '[breeding of the] teeth' (a common term, placing the event in time rather than offering a real cause); thrush; and worms. The higher infant mortality rates in riverside parishes, and the late-summer peak in infant and child deaths, suggest that many of these resulted from water-borne and gastric infections.⁵⁰ Maternal deaths in childbed stood at about 2 per cent of all births and 2.5 per cent of all female deaths in 1661-4, but of course made up a much higher proportion of deaths of women in their 20s, 30s, and 40s.⁵¹

[Fig 3 around here]

For broader mortality patterns, Graunt distinguished between what he called ‘Chronicall distempers’ and ‘Epidemicall’ diseases. He regarded the former as more indicative of the healthfulness or otherwise of a locality or region, comparatively constant from year to year rather than cyclical or epidemic. ‘Chronicall distempers’ included gastric and respiratory complaints, as well as ‘Ague and Fever’. Gastric complaints - ‘Flux, bloody flux and scouring’ and ‘griping in the guts’, probably both dysentery or dysentery-like attacks - seem to have been particularly severe in the third quarter of the seventeenth century, accounting for over 12 per cent of non-plague deaths in the 1660s to 1680s.⁵² Respiratory ailments (cold, cough, ‘tissick’, consumption, and pleurisy) were even more significant killers, responsible for over 20 per cent of deaths c. 1660; they may be due in part to increasing air pollution from coal smoke, as John Evelyn argued in his *Fumifugium* (1661), but no doubt also owed much to overcrowded and poor quality housing in which such infections could spread easily.⁵³ Deaths attributed to ague and fever – probably including both malaria and influenza – varied more from year to year, but accounted for nearly 15 per cent of

⁴⁹ Graunt, *Natural and political observations*, p. 14.

⁵⁰ Finlay, *Population and Metropolis*, pp. 103-4; Roger Finlay, ‘Gateways to death? London child mortality experience 1570-1653’, *Annales de Démographie Historique* (1978), pp. 105-34; Jeremy Boulton, *Neighbourhood and society: a London suburb in the seventeenth century* (Cambridge, 1987), p. 56; Landers, *Death and the metropolis*, pp. 239-40.

⁵¹ Figures calculated for 1661-4 as baptisms may be understated before 1660: *A collection of the Yearly Bills of Mortality*. Roger Schofield estimated the childbed mortality rate among adult women at around 5 per cent across England: R.Schofield, ‘Did the mothers really die? Three centuries of maternal mortality in *The world we have lost*’, in *The world we have gained*, ed. Bonfield, Smith, and Wrightson, pp. 231-60.

⁵² *A collection of the Yearly Bills of Mortality*; Vanessa Harding, ‘Housing and health in early modern London’, in V.Berridge and M.Gorsky, eds., *Environment, health and history* (Basingstoke, 2011), pp. x

⁵³ Harding, ‘Housing and health’.

deaths in the early 1660s, with a peak of 17.65 per cent in 1662, when 3,490 people died of this cause.

Graunt's 'epidemicall' diseases included 'Purples, Spotted-Feaver' (typhus), smallpox, and measles. They killed significant numbers in most years, with regular peaks, suggesting they were both endemic and epidemic. Smallpox was present in mid-seventeenth-century London, and seems to have established itself as both endemic and epidemic by the 1650s, with a three- to four-year cycle; its virulence increased over the 1660s and 1670s. Typhus was similarly variable but much less devastating, averaging 1 per cent of non-plague deaths.⁵⁴

But the most virulent and destructive epidemic disease in 1660s London was still plague, and the epidemic of 1665 caused the heaviest mortality of any visitation. Between December 1664 and December 1665, 68,596 deaths due to plague were reported, together with a significant increase in deaths attributed to fevers other than plague. Plague thus accounted for over 70 per cent of deaths in that year, with an overall Crisis Mortality Ratio (CMR) of 6.0.⁵⁵ The epidemic displayed a characteristic seasonality, barely visible before late June, rising rapidly to its terrifying peak in the first half of September, when 7,000 deaths were reported in a single week and 126 parishes were infected, and declining steeply to the end of the year. The disease lingered into 1666, when over 2,000 deaths were reported, but there were only thirty-five such deaths in 1667, fourteen in 1668, three in 1669, and none in 1670.⁵⁶

However, as Paul Slack and Justin Champion have documented, the epidemic had an uneven impact across the metropolis: parishes within the walls, and the Westminster parishes, with CMRs of 4.6 and 5.0, were less severely affected than extramural and outlying parishes with a CMR of 6.6. Nearly 30,000 of the plague deaths occurred in the parishes just outside the city walls (8,069 in St Giles Cripplegate alone), and over 20,000 in more distant parishes.⁵⁷ The relatively lower death-toll in the intramural city and Westminster parishes probably owes much to the propensity of the better-off to flee London as the epidemic took

⁵⁴ Andrew B. Appleby, 'Nutrition and disease: the case of London, 1550-1750', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 6 (1975), pp. 1-22, at pp. 20-1.

⁵⁵ Graunt, *Natural and political observations; A collection of the Yearly Bills of Mortality*; J.A.I. Champion, *London's dreaded Visitation. The social geography of the Great Plague in 1665* (Historical Geography Research Series 31, 1995), Table 3 p. 27, Table 4 p. 29. The Crisis Mortality Ratio is calculated by dividing the figure for deaths in 1665 by the mean annual figure for the years 1655-64.

⁵⁶ *A collection of the Yearly Bills of Mortality*. Cf. A.L. Moote and D. Moote, *The Great Plague. The story of London's most deadly year* (Baltimore and London, 2004).

⁵⁷ Paul Slack, *The impact of plague on Tudor and Stuart England* (London, 1985); Champion, *London's dreaded Visitation*, pp. 33-41; *A collection of the Yearly Bills of Mortality*.

hold, contributing to a broad correlation between wealth and poverty and the incidence of disease. Even within the city, parishes with a mean of three or fewer hearths per household had higher CMRs than parishes where houses were on average larger. Nevertheless the picture is complex, and it was not simply that smaller – hence by implication poorer – households were necessarily harder hit than larger ones, regardless of location and environmental context.⁵⁸

The Hearth Tax assessment of Lady Day 1666, therefore, depicts a city struggling to recover from the loss of perhaps a sixth of its population. Empty houses and uncollectable assessments can be found across the metropolis, even in the wealthiest of parishes. There were five empty units in All Hallow Honey Lane, out of thirty-nine in all (**317**); fourteen out of sixty-one in the adjacent St Mary Magdalen Milk Street (**124-5**). These empty houses were generally small and situated in alleys and back streets; a similar situation prevailed in the suburbs, where the assessors also reported ‘shut’ and ‘no distress’ against numerous units. Nearly a quarter of hearths in Whitechapel, Wapping and Stepney, and rather more than a quarter of dwellings, were unoccupied at Lady Day 1666 (**1164-5, 1264-5**). But houses might be shut for other reasons, and poverty and lack of assets existed before the plague. There was probably also considerable turnover towards the lower end of the rental market, and even more among lodgers, though this is hard to trace as most records of property focus on those with a permanent or long-term investment.⁵⁹ In any case, plague seems rarely to have wiped out whole households; it was much more common for only one or two in a household to die, though loss or long illness of the breadwinner might well force a family to move, as might general economic distress.⁶⁰ But wealthy families who fled the plague were likely to return to the same properties they left, and to do so before the end of 1665.⁶¹ Graunt said that the city’s population was replenished by migration within two years of an epidemic,⁶² and undoubtedly the process was already under way by early 1666.

⁵⁸ Champion, *London’s dreaded Visitation*, pp. 40-52, 64-75.

⁵⁹ See Guillery, below, pp. xx; cf. William C. Baer, ‘Housing the poor and mechanic class in seventeenth-century London’, *London Journal*, 25:2 (2000), pp. 13-39; *idem*, ‘Landlords and tenants in London, 1550-1700’, *Urban History*, 38:2 (2011), pp. 234-55.

⁶⁰ Champion, *London’s dreaded Visitation*, pp. 70, 82-7.

⁶¹ Pepys, *Diary, 1665*, pp. 314, 328, 341; Daniel Defoe, *A journal of the plague year*, ed. Paula R. Backscheider (New York and London, 1992), pp. 176-80.

⁶² Graunt, *Natural and political observations*, pp. 37-8.

The economy of early modern London

Early modern London's demographic growth and change had economic causes and consequences. Migrants were drawn or driven to the capital because of the better opportunities it offered, for subsistence or improvement, and London's growth itself contributed to profound changes in the national economy. By 1660 London was the central pole of a widening empire, including Scotland, a more effectively subjugated Ireland, and a far-reaching network of colonial settlements and trading posts. The expanded national economy could now support this huge urban centre, without starving and with an appreciably increased standard of living for many. Despite fears and complaints about London's dominance, it seems clear that the very concentration of wealth and activity there - an extreme division of labour on a national scale - was a factor promoting economic development elsewhere.⁶³

Overseas trade

The driver of the economy was overseas trade, generating substantial individual and corporate fortunes and promoting complementary activities - domestic distribution, the processing of imported raw materials, shipbuilding and maritime industrial production, financial services. The growth of overseas trade over the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was out of proportion even to London's enormous demographic growth: the value of imports to London in 1500 was around £80,000, but by 1700 it was probably over £4.5m, of which about one third consisted of goods imported and re-exported.⁶⁴ Even allowing for substantial inflation, and for the fact that imports undoubtedly grew more than domestic exports, this is still a remarkable increase.⁶⁵

The later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries saw a reorientation of English trade away from its traditional continental destinations and towards a wider world. Numerous regulated and joint-stock companies were formed to exploit new opportunities, though only a handful were successful and long-lasting. The Levant and East Indies merchants became an exclusive and extremely wealthy group, with a limited number of active traders and a handful

⁶³ E.A.Wrigley, 'A simple model of London's importance in changing English society and economy, 1650-1750', *Past and Present*, 37 (1967), pp. 44-70; John Chartres, 'Food consumption and internal trade', in *London 1500-1700*, ed. Beier and Finlay, pp. 168-96.

⁶⁴ B.Dietz, 'Overseas trade and metropolitan growth', in *London 1500-1700*, ed. Beier and Finlay, pp. 115-40, at p. 120, Fig 2, and p. 124-5, Table 10; R.Davis, 'English foreign trade, 1660-1700', in *Essays in economic history*, vol. 2, ed. E.M.Carus Wilson (London, 1954-62), pp. 257-72.

⁶⁵ Monetary and cost-of-living inflation over the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was high, but the prices of many imported commodities such as pepper or tobacco had fallen substantially. Cf. R.B.Outhwaite, *Inflation in Tudor and early Stuart England* (second edition, London, 1982).

of dominant figures. By 1640, nearly half the Court of Aldermen were Levant traders or East India Company directors or both.⁶⁶ The East India Company had its headquarters from 1648 in an 18-hearth house on Leadenhall Street (**400**), formerly occupied by Lord Mayor Sir William Craven.⁶⁷

In 1660, Europe was emerging from a mid-century trade slump; London was poised for a new boom, lasting till the 1690s, during which aggressive entrepreneurs and a supportive government would enable it to outpace the collective achievement of the Dutch cities, led by Amsterdam. The second half of the seventeenth century saw the vigorous implementation of policies to promote English trade at the expense of the Dutch, with the establishment of the Council of Trade in 1650, the Navigation Acts of 1651 and 1660, and the three Anglo-Dutch Wars of 1652-4, 1665-7, and 1672-4.⁶⁸ Even near the beginning of this period, in 1660, London's imports were worth about £3.5m, nearly a quarter by value of which came from India, America and the West Indies; exports, still predominantly woollen cloth, were worth some £3m.⁶⁹

The impact of the geographical expansion of trade on London was obvious. Londoners grew accustomed to a profusion of spices, fruits, sugar, sweet wines and tobacco, and prices fell as imports soared.⁷⁰ The trade in raw and woven silk expanded. In 1666 the small parish of All Hallows Honey Lane, in the centre of the luxury textile area of Cheapside, housed eleven 'silkmens' (retailers) of silk goods; another seven lived along the adjoining stretch of the street in the parish of St Mary le Bow. Taxpayers in the two parishes also included a coffee-man and two tobacconists (**314-17**). Processing industries such as sugar-boiling were established, some of them in the city (**49, 51, 59**; cf. **33, 516, 919, 961, 1058, 1222**) while Spitalfields (**1198-1211**) began to be known for its silk-throwing and weaving, supported by French craftsmen.

⁶⁶ Robert Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution. Commercial change, political conflict and London's overseas traders, 1550-1653* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 22, 76, and ch. 2., passim.

⁶⁷ Vanessa Harding and Priscilla Metcalf, *Lloyds at Home, the background and the buildings* (London, 1986), pp. 51, 56-8.

⁶⁸ C.G.A. Clay, *Economic expansion and social change: England 1500-1700*, vol. 2, *Industry, trade and government* (Cambridge, 1984), pp. 141-202.

⁶⁹ Davis, 'English foreign trade', p. 268; *idem*, *A commercial revolution. English overseas trade, 1500-1700* (London, 1967), p. 55; Dietz, 'Overseas trade', pp. 122, 131. Cf. Perry Gauci, *The politics of trade: the overseas merchant in state and society, 1660-1720* (Oxford, 2001); *idem*, *Emporium of the world: the merchants of London, 1660-1800* (London, 2007).

⁷⁰ Dietz, 'Overseas trade', passim but esp. table 10, pp. 124-5; Philip Lawson, *The East India Company: a history, 1600-1853* (London, 1993), p. 25; Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution*, p. 27; Clay, *Economic expansion and social change*, vol. 2, *Industry, trade and government*, pp. 124, 156; Jordan Goodman, *Tobacco in history: the cultures of dependence* (London, 1993).

Equally significantly, the east end of the metropolis – the parishes of Whitechapel and Stepney, including the hamlets of Wapping, Ratcliff, and Blackwall - developed as hub of maritime industrial activity. The East India Company built some seventy-six ships at its own shipyards at Blackwall and Deptford before 1640,⁷¹ and both the individual size and the total number of ships in the English merchant fleet increased dramatically over the seventeenth century.⁷² Demand, employment, and profits varied with peace and war, but shipbuilding, outfitting and victualling still provided a large amount of local employment, directly and indirectly, for seventeenth-century east London.⁷³ According to Michael Power, 6 per cent of Stepney men were employed in shipbuilding and its associated crafts. There was an even greater demand for seamen, who made up between one-third and half of Stepney's working population. Since the parish's total population could have reached 30,000 by 1650, and continued to grow to 50,000 by 1700, this represents an appreciable proportion of the London workforce. In 1665, petitioners for a market in Stepney urged the needs of '12,000 seamen, rope-makers or others using poor manufactures, as ribbonmakers, silkweavers, knitters and the like'.⁷⁴ If trade-related activities such as dock-work, portering, warehousing, and coopering, and especially the work of feeding and clothing the sailor population, which provided much occupation for women, are taken into account, Davis's estimate that a quarter of the capital's inhabitants were dependent on the activity of the port for their employment does not look like an exaggeration.⁷⁵

Though its effects were widespread, the port of London as an entity was strictly defined in extent. In the sixteenth century activity concentrated on the 'legal quays' between London Bridge and the Tower, and the royal Custom House which lay on the same stretch of waterfront. As the volume of trade increased, a number of 'sufferance wharves' on the south bank and further downstream were licensed, though the Custom House (344) remained the centre of regulatory activity. Overseas shipping was paralleled if not exceeded by a bulky coastal trade, supplying London with food, especially grain and fish, and coal, as well as goods for export; the upper Thames was also a source of firewood and building materials.⁷⁶

⁷¹ Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution*, p. 49.

⁷² Dietz, 'Overseas trade', p. 128, Table 1.

⁷³ R.Davis, *The rise of the English shipping industry in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries* (Newton Abbot, 1962), pp. 54-7; *The Register of Letters &c: of the Governour and Company of Merchants of London Trading into the East Indies, 1600-1619*, ed. G.C.M.Birdwood and W.Foster (London, 1893), pp. 95-6.

⁷⁴ M.J.Power, 'The East London working community in the seventeenth century' in *Work in towns, 850-1850*, ed. P.J.Corfield and D.J.Keene (Leicester, 1990), pp. 103-20, esp quotation on p. 113.

⁷⁵ Davis, *check*; Earle, *City Full*, pp. 74-82, 116, 139-43.

⁷⁶ *The Port and Trade of Elizabethan London*, ed. B. Dietz (London Record Society, 1971), pp. 156-67; J.Chartres, 'Trade and shipping in the port of London. Wiggins Quay in the later seventeenth century', *Transport History* 3rd ser., 1 (1980-1) pp. 29-47. Cf. R.Jarvis, 'The metamorphosis of the port of London', *London Journal*, 3.1 (1977), pp. 55-72.

Wholesale grain markets were established at Queenhithe and Billingsgate, and a salt market near the former.⁷⁷ An enormous volume of goods, therefore, passed across the city's wharves, in both directions. There was fierce competition to control the transport industry, both on land and on the river, with large-scale interests like the Woodmongers' Company and the Wharfingers, owners of the legal quays, versus collectives of carmen, porters, watermen and lightermen.⁷⁸

The growth of the financial centre

One direction in which commercial enterprise in London was diversifying extensively in the later seventeenth century was that of financial dealing.⁷⁹ Several different streams ran together in this: the increased demand for credit and exchange arising from the growth of inland and overseas trade; the need for marine insurance; profits from trade seeking investment opportunities; the land market and the needs of the provincial gentry. A powerful motor was the rise of the state, and the growing scale and complexity of government finance, to which London mercantile wealth had always made an important contribution. Later seventeenth-century London fits a classic scenario in which financial markets offering public credit tend to be located in areas of intense economic activity, with flourishing regional economies producing surplus capital for investment.⁸⁰

[Fig 4 around here]

The alliance of commerce and finance in seventeenth-century London was embodied in the Royal Exchange, the magnetic pole of activity, encounter, and news dissemination. Opened by the queen in 1570, it developed into one of the most significant spaces in early modern London. It was designed as a meeting-place, with an open courtyard and sheltered

⁷⁷ *Hugh Alley's Caveat: the markets of London in 1598*, ed. Ian Archer, Caroline M. Barron and Vanessa Harding (London Topographical Society, 1988), p. 9.

⁷⁸ W.M. Stern, *The porters of London* (London, 1960); idem, 'The Company of Watermen and Lightermen of the City of London', *Guildhall Studies in London History* 5 (1981), pp. 36-41; Craig Spence, *London in the 1690s: a social atlas* (London, 2000), p. 32; C.R. Kyle, 'Parliament and the politics of carting in early Stuart London', *London Journal* 27.2 (2002), pp. 1-11; Chartres, 'Trade and shipping', esp. pp. 33-8.

⁷⁹ For this section, see Henry Roseveare, *The financial revolution, 1660-1760* (London, 1991); A.V. Judges, 'The origins of English banking', *History* 16 (1931), pp. 132-45. The centrality of inland trade and the metropolitan market is stressed in E. Kerridge, *Trade and banking in early modern England* (Manchester, 1988).

⁸⁰ M. Körner, 'Public credit', in *Economic systems and state finance* ed. R. Bonney (European Science Foundation/Oxford, 1995), chapter 14. Cf. P.K. O'Brien and P.A. Hunt, 'The rise of the fiscal state in England, 1485-1815', *Historical Research* 66 (1993), pp. 129-76, which shows the sharp acceleration of the later seventeenth century.

'walks'. Great numbers of merchants assembled at regular hours ('Change-time'), congregating at defined stations for particular trades, such as 'the Barbadoes walk', and doing business in public. Entrepreneurs and traders advertised their availability at the Exchange, and it became a hub of information, commercial, political, and merely trivial. The building's centrality to London's business world is underlined by the speed and scale with which it was rebuilt after the Fire of 1666, and by the extent to which related activities and opportunities clustered round it.⁸¹

The growth of inland and overseas trade generated a demand for specialised financial services, including exchange, credit, and marine insurance. Merchants had necessarily developed skills in these areas from the middle ages, but on a limited scale; the huge expansion in the volume, value, distance, and duration of trade changed the nature of all these. The inland bill of exchange and the 'bill on London' were particularly important and useful for country clothiers and distributors, and the demand widened beyond the business community as both government and private gentry looked for ways to transfer funds to and from London. London goldsmiths, active in currency and precious-metal exchange, increasingly accepted deposits and lent privately as well. The divergence of the 'new mystery of goldsmiths near the exchanges' from the old craftsman-goldsmiths was obvious by the early seventeenth century. London goldsmith-bankers like Sir Thomas Vyner or Edward Blackwell had long client-lists in the 1660s and 1670s, ranging from tradesmen to esquires and gentlemen. Although over two-thirds of Vyner's clients were Londoners, his large provincial clientele demonstrates that London banking was a national, not a local, facility.⁸² In their dealings with a private and country constituency, goldsmith-bankers overlapped with another group of financial professionals developing in the seventeenth century, the scriveners, who combined a knowledge of the land market with contacts in the city. They were particularly active in the mortgage market, raising money for landed clients on the security of their estates and becoming moneylenders and even financial agents themselves. The upheavals of the Civil War, with fines, sequestrations, and land sales, boosted their activities in the mid-seventeenth century. One dealer on a very large scale in the 1650s was Robert

⁸¹ See essays in *The Royal Exchange* ed. in Ann L. Saunders (London, 1997), especially M.Harris, 'Exchanging information: print and business at the Royal Exchange in the late seventeenth century', pp. 188-97, and N.Glaisyer, 'Merchants at the Royal Exchange, 1660-1720', pp. 198-203.

⁸² Kerridge, *Trade and banking in early modern England*; Roseveare, *Financial revolution*, pp. 19-20; G.E.Aylmer, 'Sir Thomas Vyner, first baronet (1588-1665), goldsmith and banker', *ODNB*; idem, 'Edward Backwell (c. 1619-83), goldsmith and banker', *ODNB*. 'Thomas Viner' had a 20-hearth dwelling in Hackney in 1664 (**1573**); a 'Lady Viner', possibly his widow, had a 20-hearth dwelling in Acton in 1666 (**1450**), but also owned property in the city (**87, 108**). Edward Backwell esq. had a 13-hearth house in Lombard Street in 1666 (**40**) and, as 'Alderman Backwell', a 14-hearth house in Fulham (**1471**).

Abbott (d. 1658), who held client deposits in excess of £1m ; the successor firm of Clayton and Morris dealt on an equal scale in the 1660s and still greater in the 1670s.⁸³

In overseas trade, several related markets developed, notably in marine insurance and commodity futures. Some kind of laying-off of risk had been practised for centuries, but the greater risks of an expanded global network of trade were a stimulus to merchants to insure 'when they make any great Adventure (especially into remote Parts)'.⁸⁴ Both insurance and commodity futures markets depended on intelligence, and services to all three developed rapidly from the mid-seventeenth century, though in the 1660s the great age of the coffee-house was yet to come: Jonathan's Coffee House in Exchange Alley opened for business in about 1680, while Edward Lloyd opened his first coffee-house in Tower Street in the early 1680s.⁸⁵

Government finance was central to the 'financial revolution' of the late seventeenth century, both economically and politically. Government borrowing had a long history, and London merchants had been an important source of loans and liquidity for national governments since the middle ages.⁸⁶ 'Merchant financiers' dealt in government bills and tallies and developed ways of raising money in anticipation of demand. The increased demands of Parliament and governments in the Interregnum accelerated the development of government credit, and a handful of major players emerged, including the prominent goldsmith-bankers Sir Thomas Vyner and Edward Backwell already mentioned. Both of these survived the Restoration to become pillars of the royal finances in the 1660s. 'The [king's] bankers did not consist of above the number of five or six men', wrote the earl of Clarendon of this period. 'They were for the most part goldsmiths, men known to be so rich, and of so good reputation, that all the money of the kingdom would be trusted or deposited in their hands'.⁸⁷ Sir Thomas Vyner's nephew (Sir) Robert, who inherited most of his business, was

⁸³ D.C.Coleman, 'London scribes and the estate market in the later seventeenth century', *Economic History Review* 2nd. series 4 (1951), pp. 221-30; F.T.Melton, 'The Clayton papers', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 52 (1979), pp. 91-9; *idem*, *Sir Robert Clayton and the origins of English deposit banking, 1658-1685* (Cambridge, 1986); *idem*, 'Clayton, Sir Robert (1629-1707), banker and politician', *ODNB*; Roseveare, *Financial revolution*, pp. 12, 20-1. John Morris and Robert Clayton jointly held a 7-hearth house in Cornhill Ward in 1662: **1656**.

⁸⁴ Quoted in T.Sibbett, 'Early Insurance and the Royal Exchange', in *The Royal Exchange*, ed. Saunders, pp. 79, 81.

⁸⁵ J.J.McCusker, 'The business press in England before 1775', in *Essays in the economic history of the Atlantic World* ed. J.J.McCusker (London and New York, 1997), pp. 145-76; B.Lillywhite, *London Coffee Houses. A reference book of Coffee Houses of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries* (London, 1963), pp. 305-9; Brian Cowan, *The social life of coffee: the emergence of the British coffeehouse* (New Haven and London, 2005).

⁸⁶ R.Ashton, *The Crown and the Money Market, 1603-1640* (Oxford, 1960); W.R.Bisschop, *The rise of the London money market, 1640-1826* (London, 1910, reprinted 1968).

⁸⁷ Quoted in Roseveare, *Financial revolution*, pp. 76-7.

one of the farmers of the Hearth Tax in the later 1660s.⁸⁸ In practice, such men mediated between government and the sources of finance in the city, so the impact of government borrowing was widespread, and helped to create a market in investment opportunities.

Manufacturing and retail

A high proportion of the population of any pre-industrial town or city was bound to be engaged in producing the 'basic necessities' of life - food and drink, clothing, and shelter.⁸⁹ London was a huge city and its needs were correspondingly great; however much it could draw from the provinces it had to satisfy at least some of its own demands. Inevitably, therefore, many Londoners were engaged in processing and supplying food and drink, clothes, textiles, furnishings, tools and other material goods to the rest of the population, or in building and repairing their houses. But in addition, Londoners produced for a wider market: crucially, they were at the centre point of an exchange between the national and international economies. They produced some kinds of goods for a national market, and others for export, and they processed incoming goods for redistribution within and beyond the capital, and for re-export.

The city's Livery Companies, building on their medieval or sixteenth-century origins and charters, still played a part in the organisation and control of some branches of manufacture, even if in the mercantile trades their function had become limited to the political and social. The Turners' Company, for example, still loomed large in Nehemiah Wallington's practice of his trade.⁹⁰ The model of traditional company organisation remained attractive, to the City and the Crown as well as to craft practitioners. New companies continued to be formed for new manufactures and specialisms such as clockmaking (chartered in 1631), needlemaking (1656), and feltmaking (1667). Over seventy city companies were in existence in the late seventeenth century, with thousands of members between them. Many had a permanent and visible presence in the city in their halls, foci for collective sociability as well as discipline, and storehouses of corporate identity and memory.⁹¹

⁸⁸ G.E. Aylmer, 'Sir Robert Vyner, baronet (1631-88), goldsmith and banker', *ODNB*. He occupied a house with 11 hearths in Lombard Street in 1666: 39. For Vyner as receiver, see 1427. Hollar's map of London [Fig. 1] is dedicated to Sir Robert Vyner.

⁸⁹ N.Goose, 'English pre-industrial urban economies, in *The Tudor and Stuart town, A reader in English urban history, 1530-1688* ed. J.Barry (Harlow, 1990), pp. 63-73.

⁹⁰ Paul Seaver, *Wallington's world: a puritan artisan in seventeenth-century London* (London, 1985), pp. 112-42

⁹¹ John Strype, *A survey of the Cities of London and Westminster* (London, 1720) [online at <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/strype/>], Book 5, chapters 10-15. Strype lists 82 companies and, citing an earlier list, notes that some 61 of these had a hall or premises: Book 5, pp. 247-9. At least eighteen livery halls are noted in the surviving 1666 Hearth Tax returns, and seven in the returns for 1662 printed here: see [Index of ????](#).

Nevertheless, company membership was in relative decline over the seventeenth century. In crude terms, the companies lost their claim to monopoly control of skilled employment opportunities, as their numbers and membership failed to keep up with the rapid demographic growth of the capital. Probably fewer than a quarter of adult male Londoners were citizens and company members in the 1660s. Tens of thousands of men and women practised crafts, opened shops, and traded retail and wholesale in the late-seventeenth-century metropolis without reference to the companies. Classic explanations of the 'decline' of guilds and companies in the early modern period focused on institutional rigidity, and self-defeating hostility to changing economic realities in the outside world, but in reality few institutions were able to adapt to the pace and scale of London's demographic and geographical growth, and the companies operated in an increasingly difficult environment. A profusion of new manufactures, new modes of production, and more service and casual employment changed the nature of work and challenged the assumed primacy of the domestic workshop. The balance of costs and benefits became less favourable to membership; its attractions must surely have been weakened as the companies proved powerless to protect members against trade slump, or against capitalistic exploitation. The less able the companies were to enforce regulation, the less incentive there was for anyone to submit to discipline.⁹² The growth of new forms of economic organisation - the regulated trading companies, joint-stock enterprises, consortia of monopolists or patentees like the soapmakers or the starchmakers - cut across loyalties to traditional guilds and companies and provided alternative circles of association and interaction.⁹³

Nevertheless, small-scale manufacture still flourished in the city in the 1660s, often in symbiosis with specialist retail or dealing. Craftsmen tended to be located in side-streets and alleys, while dealers took main-street frontages. In a group of Cheapside parishes, tailors, calendarers, hotpressers, bodicemakers and the like mostly lived in side streets and courts, while mercers, drapers, bodice-sellers and silkmen occupied the retail frontages (312-17).⁹⁴ As this suggests, manufacturing diversified into numerous specialisms, each often only part of a longer production line. Over 200 distinct occupations were recorded in only twenty parishes in the 1666 Hearth tax assessment, the great majority with fewer than ten practitioners.⁹⁵ The Poll Tax returns for 1692 note 773 occupations, again in many cases with only a handful of

⁹² J.R. Kellest, 'The breakdown of guild and corporation control over the handicraft and retail trades of London', *Economic History Review* 2nd ser. 10 (1957-8), pp. 381-94; M.Knights, 'A City revolution: the remodelling of the London livery companies in the 1680s', *English Historical Review* 112 (1997), pp. 1141-1178.

⁹³ F.J.Fisher, 'Some experiments in company organisation in the early seventeenth century', *Economic History Review* 4 (1933), pp. 177-94.

⁹⁴ Power, 'Social topography', pp. 209-15.

⁹⁵ Power, 'Social topography', pp. 213-15.

practitioners.⁹⁶ Not all of the occupations were in manufacturing or production, but over all this must reflect the diverse and specialised nature of consumer demand in late seventeenth-century London (including its export markets) for particular items of clothing, personal adornment, domestic furnishing and decoration, and leisure pursuits.⁹⁷

Suburban manufacture was often different, both in materials and organisation, from that in the city centre. If craftsmen within the walls concentrated on the final stages of production, suburban manufacture included primary processing of raw materials and a wide range of complementary specialisms. Suburban production tended to be either small-scale and fragmented, with numerous small practitioners, or alternatively large and semi-industrial in organisation. Nearly a quarter of the adult male population of St Giles Cripplegate parish between 1654 and 1693 was involved in the production of textiles and clothing. The most numerous reported occupations in the burial registers were weaver (864 of 10,502 masters) and tailor (547), with another 110 clothworkers and a number of specialisms such as silk-thrusting, framework knitting, and dyeing. Leather crafts were also very significant, with 567 cordwainers (shoemakers) and 333 glovers. Most of these would have worked in small domestic premises; though technically independent, it is likely that most were dependent on larger entrepreneurs for the supply of materials and the purchase of their products.⁹⁸ In that sense, they were part of an emerging larger-scale industrial organisation, interdependent in activity even while dispersed in location. The household-based workshop remained the commonest unit of production into the eighteenth century, and with larger workforces being 'brought together by an entrepreneur who coordinated the efforts of several workshops'.⁹⁹ Government contracting served as an important stimulus to this kind of entrepreneurship: the London shoemaker William Saul contracted to supply 4,600 pairs of leather shoes for the army in 1659, and the London draper Joshua Woolnough 2,300 shirts; John Harvy and Richard Downes supplied 2,300 pairs of stockings and 2,300 coats and breeches. Fulfilling

⁹⁶ J.Alexander, 'The economic and social structure of the City of London, c. 1700' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 1989); *idem*, 'The economic structure of the city of London at the end of the seventeenth century', *Urban History Yearbook 1989*, pp. 47-62; *idem*, 'The city revealed: an analysis of the 1692 Poll tax and the 1693 4s. Aid in London', in *Surveying the people. The interpretation and use of documentary sources for the study of population in the later seventeenth century*, ed. K.Schurer and T.Arkill (Oxford, 1992), pp. 181-200; Spence, *Social Atlas*.

⁹⁷ Spence, *Social Atlas*, esp. pp. 128-49. Cf. Nuala Zahedieh, 'London and the colonial consumer', *Economic History Review* 2nd ser., 47 (1994), pp. 239-61; Lorna Weatherill, *Consumer behaviour and material culture in Britain, 1660-1760* (London, second edition 1996), esp. pp. 43-90.

⁹⁸ T.R.Forbes, 'Weaver and cordwainer : occupations in the parish of St Giles without Cripplegate, London, in 1654-1693 and 1729-1743', *Guildhall Studies in London History* 4:3 (1980), pp. 119-32. No occupations are recorded for this parish (880-1013) in the 1666 Hearth Tax.

⁹⁹ D.Keene, 'Continuity and development in urban trades: problems of concepts and the evidence', in *Work in towns, 850-1850*, ed. Corfield and Keene, pp. 1-16. Cf. David Corner, 'The tyranny of fashion: the case of the felt-hatting trade in the 17th and 18th centuries', *Textile History* 22 (1991), pp. 156-78; J.Goodman and K.Honeyman, *Gainful pursuits. The making of industrial Europe 1600- 1914* (London, 1988).

contracts of this size must have involved a large outlay of capital and considerable organisation.¹⁰⁰

The new suburban industries of later sixteenth and seventeenth century London that concentrated a large workforce on a single site included sugar-refining, brewing, glassmaking, alum-processing, gunpowder making, and of course shipbuilding.¹⁰¹ Several of these industries were founded or run by immigrants, and all required space, water or fuel or both, and quite a large supply of labour, all of which were available more freely or cheaply in the suburbs. They were also often new in the sense of exploiting new technology or commodities new to London. Typically, they showed a sharper distinction between capital and labour, with employers, managers, and waged labour. Entrepreneur distillers, dyers, tobacco- and sugar-refiners, soapmakers and brewers were among the wealthiest citizens, other than merchants, in later-seventeenth-century London.¹⁰² To take only one example, beer-brewing benefited from new technology and economies of scale and expanded rapidly over the period; beginning as an alien skill and enterprise, it had been largely taken over by Englishmen by the 1590s.¹⁰³ The burial registers of later-seventeenth-century Cripplegate record ninety-five master brewers, some of whom may have had quite modest operations, and 624 brewers' servants, presumably waged labourers in larger breweries.¹⁰⁴ By the late seventeenth century there were major breweries in most suburbs, each representing a concentration of capital, plant and labour on one site, and also necessitating a network of distribution to the capital's numerous taverns and alehouses.¹⁰⁵

The diversification of manufacturing noted above was obviously associated with the expansion of retailing and consumption, and this in turn with the residential development of the West End and the London season, one of the most striking and significant phenomena of the period. The growth of the London 'middling sort' was one contributor to this; in addition, more and more of the country gentry visited London for part of the year, and quite a large

¹⁰⁰ *Seventeenth-century economic documents*, ed. Thirsk and Cooper, p. 370. None of these four can be securely identified in the Hearth Tax returns in this volume.

¹⁰¹ J.U.Nef, 'The progress of technology and the growth of largescale industry in Great Britain, 1540-1640', *Economic History Review* 5 (1934), pp. 3-24. Cf. Power, 'East London working community'; Spence, *Social Atlas*, pp. 115-18.

¹⁰² Earle, *Making of the English Middle Class*, p. 32.

¹⁰³ L.B.Luu, 'Skills and innovations: a study of the working stranger community in London, c. 1550-1600' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of London 1997).

¹⁰⁴ Forbes, 'Weaver and cordwainer', pp. 121, 127.

¹⁰⁵ D.Coleman, *The economy of pre-Industrial England, 1450-1750* (Oxford, 1977), p. 120; Spence, *Social Atlas*, pp. 32, 116; Earle, *Making of the English Middle Class*, p. 33; Power, 'East London working community', p. 111. Cf. Chartres, 'Food consumption and internal trade', pp. 168-96.

number came to reside there permanently.¹⁰⁶ Shopkeeping and retailing were important occupations across the metropolis, but high-class and luxury retail were increasingly drawn from the city towards the west end. Businesses such as dressmaking and wigmaking clustered near their customers, while accessories such as shoes, hats, and gloves, made elsewhere, were retailed there.¹⁰⁷ Makers of fashionable furniture and furnishings also needed to display their wares and attract customers. The cabinet- and looking-glass-maker Edward Traherne may be the 'Mr Treherne' on the south side of the Strand in 1666 (**803**); he moved to Bedford Street, Covent Garden, in 1667, presumably in pursuit of trade. He had an extensive business based on both direct manufacturing and subcontracting, and a client list including prominent figures at court; his stock of materials, tools and stock in trade were valued at £1,168 at his death aged only 38 in 1675.¹⁰⁸ Upholders or upholsterers, who supplied soft furnishings and an increasingly wide range of interior decoration services, were also found in the Strand/Covent Garden area.¹⁰⁹

The Fire certainly contributed to the westward shift of several kinds of consumer-oriented business, but the Strand was already a favoured location for retail outlets, close to the houses of the nobility and to the New Exchange, a centre for luxury shopping since its opening in 1609. Its original orders specified that the only persons allowed to keep shops there were 'haberdashers, stocking-sellers, linen-drapers, seamsters, goldsmiths, jewellers, milliners, perfumers, silk mercers, tiremakers, hoodmakers, stationers, booksellers, confectioners, girdlers and those who sold china ware, pictures, maps or prints'.¹¹⁰ At that time it was said to sell everything from 'veary fine China stuffles' to 'Indian Mice', from 'Flowrs of silke' to 'Mosaick fishes'.¹¹¹ It enjoyed a revival in the 1660s and 1670s, and was a popular destination for fashionable strollers and shoppers. Pepys visited on several occasions; in October 1666 he brought his wife and friends there and bought several pairs of gloves.¹¹²

¹⁰⁶ Cf. F.Heal, *Hospitality in early modern England* (Oxford, 1990), esp. pp. 141-53; L.Stone, 'The residential development of the West End of London in the seventeenth century', in *After the Reformation. Essays in honor of J.H.Hexter*, ed. B.C.Malament (Pennsylvania, 1980), pp. 167-212.

¹⁰⁷ Earle, *City Full*, pp. 274-5; Boulton, *Neighbourhood and society*, p. 71; Corner, 'The tyranny of fashion', pp. 157-8; Forbes, 'Weaver and cordwainer'.

¹⁰⁸ L.Lindey, 'Edward Traherne: A study of the furniture trade in Restoration London' (unpublished MA thesis, Royal College of Art 2003), and personal communication on work in progress.

¹⁰⁹ Earle, *City Full*, pp. 274-5.

¹¹⁰ *Survey of London*, vol. 18, *St Martin in the Fields II: The Strand* (London, 1937), pp. 94-5.

¹¹¹ Ben Jonson, *The entertainment for Britain's Burse*, quoted in I.Archer, 'Material Londoners?', in *Material London, c. 1600*, ed. L.C.Orlin (Philadelphia, 2000), pp. 174-192; cf. L.L.Peck, 'Building, buying and collecting in London, 1600-1625', in *ibid.*, pp. 268-89.

¹¹² *Survey of London*, vol. 18, *St Martin in the Fields II: The Strand*, pp. 94-5; C.Walsh, 'Social meaning and social space in the shopping galleries of early modern London', in *A nation of shopkeepers: five centuries of British retailing* ed. J.Benson and L.Ugolini (London, 2002), pp. 52-77; Pepys, *Diary, 1666*, p. 344.

Professions and services

Restoration London had a substantial service sector and an important and growing class of professionals. While straightforward domestic service was both widespread and on the increase, there was also an increase in the provision of personal services, as some domestic tasks like the making of clothes were outsourced. The growth of the needle trades has been noted; many women were also employed in laundry, charring, and nurse-keeping or sick-nursing.¹¹³

The provision of food and drink was widespread across the metropolis, even if the character of the establishments varied from area to area. London was notorious for the number of inns and alehouses, especially in the suburbs. In 1630-1 there were 26 alehouses in Wapping, 306 in Finsbury, and 551 in Westminster; in the city itself there were 924 licensed alehouses in 1657.¹¹⁴ Inns, as John Chartres notes, were the top level of the capital's drink and victualling outlets, with direct employment for a number of servants indoors and out, but they served a multiplicity of functions. Each represented 'the location of a confederacy of business interests', and created a localised vortex of related activities, including markets and services for the travellers - migrants, carriers, merchants, chapmen, market folk - who passed through them. Coaching and carrying inns ringed the city, on and near the main roads; the area within and outside Aldersgate and near Smithfield had a particular concentration, but so too did Bishopsgate, Aldgate, and Southwark.¹¹⁵

Medicine bridges the professions and service, and medical personnel in London ranged from the elite and exclusive Royal College of Physicians through barber-surgeons (incorporated as a city livery company), licensed midwives, a host of unlicensed and irregular medical practitioners, and nurse-keepers.¹¹⁶ Contemporary sources indicate that middling and even quite modest Londoners called in medical assistance, drawing also on the services of apothecaries (who were not meant to prescribe, but in practice often did so), but there was also much self-medication. Apothecaries supplied a wide range of ingredients, and there was an increasing array of patent medicines on the market. It could be very good business: some apothecaries accumulated large fortunes and may have run sizeable enterprises, like John

¹¹³ Peter Earle, 'The female labour market in London in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries', *Economic History Review* 2nd Ser. 42 (1989), pp. 328-53.

¹¹⁴ Peter Clark, *The English Alehouse a social history, 1200-1830* (London, 1983), p. 49.

¹¹⁵ J. Chartres, "'The capital's provincial eyes': London's inns in the early eighteenth century", *London Journal* 3.1 (1977), pp. 24-39; Boulton, *Neighbourhood and society*, pp. 67-70, 79.

¹¹⁶ Margaret Pelling and Charles Webster, 'Medical practitioners', in *Health, medicine and mortality in the sixteenth century*, ed. C. Webster (Cambridge, 1979), pp. 164-235; Doreen A. Evenden, *The midwives of seventeenth-century London* (Cambridge, 2000).

Morecroft, who left £5,000 and several properties in Fleet Street to his sons in 1653.¹¹⁷ A small but distinct genre of vernacular medical literature emerged in the sixteenth century and expanded in the seventeenth.¹¹⁸ Nicholas Culpeper made it his mission to break down the College of Physicians' monopoly of expert information, translating the official *Pharmacopoeia Londinensis* in 1649 and establishing a valuable name for his publications, while others also targeted the same market.¹¹⁹

From the late middle ages, the Inns of Court, situated between the city and Westminster, served as both a training-ground for would-be lawyers and government servants and a finishing-school for gentlemen. Between 1590 and 1639, over 10,000 young men entered the Inns, more than 90 per cent of them coming from outside London.¹²⁰ Even if most of these stayed only a few years, London was an important destination for practising lawyers. Geoffrey Holmes argues that the period 1660-89 was 'the most dynamic and productive period' for the common law, with nearly 2,000 men called to the bar, half as many again as in 1610-39. All the great opportunities for private practice and official appointments were in London, and the capital must have had several thousand lawyers and legal practitioners in the later seventeenth century. Few could equal the career of Edmund Saunders, a self-propelled migrant from Gloucestershire who worked his way as a clerk and then law student and rose to be Chief Justice of King's Bench under Charles II, but the possibility of such success existed and the profits from a 'prosperous, full-time metropolitan practice' were substantial. For those who did not attain that, there were other opportunities for a reasonably rewarding career, including hundreds of clerkships and minor official posts at the central law courts.¹²¹

¹¹⁷ Margaret Pelling, *Medical Conflicts in Early Modern London: Patronage, Physicians, and Irregular Practitioners 1550-1640* (Oxford, 2004); Margaret Pelling and Frances White, 'Database of Physicians and Irregular Medical Practitioners in London 1550-1640', <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=107>; Patrick Wallis, 'Apothecaries and the Consumption and Retailing of Medicines in Early Modern London', in *From physick to pharmacology: five hundred years of British drug retailing*, ed. Louise Hill Curth (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 13-27; *Calendar of wills proved and enrolled in the court of Husting London, 1258-1688*, ed. R.R.Sharpe (2 vols., London, 1889-90), vol. ii, p. 768

¹¹⁸ Slack, P., 'Mirrors of health and treasures of poor men: the uses of the vernacular medical literature of Tudor England' in *Health, medicine and mortality*, ed. Webster, pp. 237-73; Mary Fissell, 'The marketplace of print' in *Medicine and the market in England and its colonies, c.1450-c.1850*, ed. Mark S. R.Jenner and Patrick Wallis (New York, 2007), pp. 108-32.

¹¹⁹ Patrick Curry, 'Culpeper, Nicholas (1616-1654), physician and astrologer', *ODNB*; Fissell, 'The marketplace of print'; Elaine Leong and Sara Pennell, 'Recipe collections and the currency of medical knowledge in the early modern "medical marketplace"', in *Medicine and the market*, ed. Jenner and Wallis, pp. 133-52.

¹²⁰ W.R. Prest, *The Inns of Court under Elizabeth I and the early Stuarts, 1590-1640* (London, 1972), pp. 5, 7, table 6 p. 33.

¹²¹ G.Holmes, *Augustan England. Professions, state and society, 1680-1730* (London, 1982), pp. 19, 137-9, 146; *Seventeenth-century economic documents*, ed. Thirsk and Cooper, pp. 769, 780-1; Stuart Handley, 'Saunders, Sir Edmund (d. 1683), judge and law reporter', *ODNB*.

Government service likewise always attracted educated and able men from both London and the country. Its great expansion in the late seventeenth century offered a wide range of career opportunities as well as an increased number of more menial and clerical posts.¹²² Post-Restoration London remained a rich field of opportunity for the ambitious cleric and the able preacher. London's parish livings were well worth having, there were stalls and offices at St Paul's and Westminster Abbey, and there were numerous lectureships and 'many lucrative chaplaincies'.¹²³ In addition, the restored episcopate needed to attend parliament, and some bishops and senior clergy maintained permanent residences in or near London.¹²⁴

Broader interpretations of 'service' could include the provision of education, entertainment, and intellectual pursuits. Gentry residence in London was surely both part cause and part effect of the growth of the Inns of Court: parents recognised the value of a London education, in all senses, for their sons, while young gentlemen were introduced to the capital and its opportunities and pleasures, and were unwilling to give these up completely in later life.¹²⁵ London theatres had been suppressed, if not entirely eliminated, in 1642, but playhouses reopened after the Restoration, along with new venues for music.¹²⁶ Musicians, music-masters, and dancing-masters appeared alongside more traditional schoolmasters and schoolmistresses.¹²⁷ London's printers, binders and booksellers multiplied and flourished, located around St Paul's Churchyard and in Little Britain in particular (**287-9, 292-6, 301-3**).¹²⁸ The city lawyer Richard Smith, in his retirement, was 'constantly known every day to walk his rounds through the [book] shops', and numbered dozens of booksellers among his acquaintance. By the time of his death in 1675 he had built up a library of some 7,000 works, the sale of which was eagerly attended in 1682.¹²⁹

¹²² Holmes, *Augustan England*, pp. 239-61; Earle, *City Full*, pp. 87-88.

¹²³ Holmes, *Augustan England*, pp. 98-9.

¹²⁴ The bishop of London's palace at Fulham had 47 hearths in 1666 (**1470**); the bishop of Winchester had a property with 31 hearths in Chelsea (**1451**); the bishop of Chichester answered for a 9-hearth empty house by St Paul's (**94**).

¹²⁵ Cf. F.J.Fisher, 'The development of London as a centre of conspicuous consumption in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 4th ser., 30 (1948), pp. 37-50.

¹²⁶ Cf. e.g. Mark S. Dawson, *Gentility and the comic theatre of late Stuart London* (Cambridge, 2005).

¹²⁷ Cf. *London inhabitants within the walls, 1695*, ed. Glass.

¹²⁸ Peter W.M. Blayney, *The bookshops in Paul's Cross churchyard* (Bibliographical Society, Occasional papers 5, 1990).

¹²⁹ Vanessa Harding, 'Mortality and the mental map of London: Richard Smyth's *Obituary*', in *Medicine, mortality and the book trade* ed. R.Myers and M.Harris (Cheam: St Paul's Bibliographies, 1998), pp. 49-71.

Middlesex in the mid-seventeenth century¹³⁰

Medieval London's dominance had precluded the growth of any sizeable independent town in its immediate vicinity, though Westminster developed as a distinct entity with unique functions. However, early modern Middlesex prospered in serving the capital's various needs and its villages were numerous and populous. Middlesex looked towards London, geographically and economically, although the city was situated almost at the south-east corner of the county: the county's major roads radiated from London, its terrain sloped southward to the Thames, its rivers and streams flowed down to the Thames or into its tributaries the Colne and Lea to west and east.

If the definition of London was somewhat blurred, so too was the relationship between London and the county.¹³¹ From the middle ages, two sheriffs served for both London and Middlesex, but the office was a key stage on the *cursus honorum* of the City of London, and the men who held it were citizens and normally destined for higher office there.¹³² The Mayor and Aldermen held the conservancy of the Thames, which formed the southern boundary of the whole of the county of Middlesex, and frequently engaged with the inhabitants of Chelsea, Hammersmith, and other riparian villages on conservancy business.¹³³ The jurisdiction of the Criminal Court at the Old Bailey, located within the city and featuring the Mayor and Aldermen as magistrates, covered all of Middlesex; though Middlesex had its own Sessions of the Peace, these were commonly held at Hicks Hall in Clerkenwell and most of their business arose from the metropolitan area.¹³⁴ Middlesex did however maintain its independence from London as far as parliamentary representation goes, coming much more under the influence of the court than the City.¹³⁵

¹³⁰ The volumes of VCH Middlesex cover the history and development of all the non-metropolitan Middlesex parishes. They are available online at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/catalogue.aspx?type=1&gid=66>. Page references given below are to the textual units of the British History Online transcription.

¹³¹ Cf. the Editorial note in *VCH Middlesex*, vol. I (1969), pp. 15-16.

¹³² A.B.Beaven, *The Aldermen of the City of London. Temp. Henry III – 1912* (London, 1908) [online at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=558>].

¹³³ Cf. e.g. *Analytical index to the series of records known as the Remembrancia - 1579-1664*, ed. W. H. and H. C. Overall (London, 1878) [online at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=581>], pp. 499-517.

¹³⁴ *Middlesex county records: Volume 3: 1625-67*, ed. J.C Jeaffreson (London, 1888) [online at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=553>]; R.B.Shoemaker, *Prosecution and punishment : petty crime and the law in London and rural Middlesex, c.1660-1725* (Cambridge, 1991).

¹³⁵ See History of Parliament, <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1604-1629/constituencies/middlesex>; <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1660-1690/constituencies/middlesex>. For a brief account of Middlesex's politics and taxation, see *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 2, pp. 15-60.

The historic county comprised 179,590 acres (72,677 Ha) in 1831,¹³⁶ and extended some 27 miles (44 km) south-west to north-east and 12 miles (19 km) north-west to south-east. In terms of population it was dwarfed by the metropolis. In 1666, Middlesex outside the area of the London Bills of Mortality returned xxx hearths and xxx houses or dwelling units. The largest settlement outside the metropolitan sprawl was probably Brentford, with nearly 400 houses in Old and New together in 1664; Uxbridge and Staines each had between 200 and 240 houses. No other single settlement came close, though many parishes contained more houses in scattered hamlets and villages.¹³⁷ All these lay on radial roads from London, as noted in Ogilby's *Britannia* (1675), and drew business from marketing, transport and carrying. The first significant town to the north of London was Barnet, some ten miles (16 km) from London, in a loop of Hertfordshire surrounded on three sides by Middlesex.¹³⁸ In the late seventeenth century, when settlements had undoubtedly increased, Richard Blome listed the towns along the Thames above London: Chelsea ('not large'); Fulham ('a pretty large town'); Brentford Old and New, the former 'meanly inhabited', but the latter 'a considerable Market Town, well inhabited'; Isleworth, 'a large town', 'well built'; Twickenham 'a good and handsome Country Town, of a good Resort'; Hampton Town, 'indifferent large'; Staines 'another small Market town [...] of better Resort'. Lesser settlements like Thames Ditton, Sunbury, Shepperton, and Laleham were dismissed as of little account.¹³⁹

Medieval and sixteenth-century Middlesex was substantially agricultural, with productive manors but few market towns (possibly only Brentford, Staines, Uxbridge, and Harrow).¹⁴⁰ John Norden in his *Speculum Britanniae* (1593) noted the excellent wheat grown between Heston and Harrow and as far as Pinner and praised the 'comfortable aboundance, of all kinde of graine' in the fields about Harrow; Thomas Fuller in 1662 concurred that 'the best [wheat] in *England* groweth in the Vale lying *South of Harrow-the-Hill*'.¹⁴¹ The price of wheat in the markets of Brentford and Uxbridge helped to determine the assize of bread in

¹³⁶ Census of Great Britain, 1831: *Enumeration Abstract. Vol. I, 1831*, BPP 1833 XXXVI (149), pp. 376-7 [online at <http://www.histpop.org/>]

¹³⁷ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 3, pp 22-5; *ibid.* vol. 4, 55-69; *ibid.* vol. 5, pp 212-18; *ibid.* vol. 7, pp. 54-86, 105-120. Totals for 1666 vary from these: see below.

¹³⁸ John Ogilby, *Britannia, volume the first, or, An illustration of the Kingdom of England and dominion of Wales* (London, 1675), pp. 2, 42: viewed on Early English Books Online [<http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>]; hereafter EEBO].

¹³⁹ Strype, *A survey of the Cities of London and Westminster*, Bk. 1 ch. 11, pp. 44-5 [online at <http://www.hrionline.ac.uk/strype/>].

¹⁴⁰ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 2, pp. 61-101.

¹⁴¹ John Norden, *Speculum Britanniae. The first parte an historical, & chorographical discription of Middlesex* (London, 1593), p. 11; Thomas Fuller, *The history of the worthies of England who for parts and learning have been eminent in the several counties*, (London, 1662), p. 176: both viewed on EEBO.

early seventeenth-century London. Even by the late eighteenth century the outer parts of the county still grew grain, often in unenclosed open fields.¹⁴² But the huge demands of the early modern metropolis dictated, at least for inner and riverside Middlesex, a shift towards the pastoral, dairying, and market-gardening enterprises that benefited most from proximity to their consumers.

Although Norden considered the county's potential for growing 'sundrie fruites, and other commodities' to be commercially neglected, he also noted that the wives of Middlesex husbandmen 'in the body or hart of the Shire [...] twice or thrice a weeke convyeth to London mylke, butter, cheese, apples, peares, frumenty, hens, chyckens, egges, baken, and a thousand other country drugges'.¹⁴³ Market women dealing in fruit, herbs, and white meats appear under the banner of Middlesex in Hugh Alley's depictions of the city's markets in 1598.¹⁴⁴ North and east of the city and in central Middlesex, grazing and dairying increased in importance. 'The general trend [...] throughout Middlesex, was away from the mixed farming of the Middle Ages to grassland'; by the mid-seventeenth century several manors in Hampstead had little if any land under arable cultivation but many acres of meadow and pasture.¹⁴⁵ London butchers rented grazing in Islington and Stoke Newington and in Hampstead parish.¹⁴⁶ Rents for grassland in Hornsey in 1681 were twenty times their level in 1569; hay was grown for sale in the city in Hornsey and Friern Barnet.¹⁴⁷ Woodland and waste seem to have been sacrificed as the demand for land increased.¹⁴⁸

Mixed and pastoral farming were characteristic of central and outer Middlesex; by the mid-seventeenth century intensive market gardening was well established in the zone around the metropolis. It flourished in the outer parts of the parishes 'within the Bills' - the Neat House Gardens, in the area of modern Pimlico, lay in the parish of St Martin in the Fields (764) - but it also extended further, especially along the Thames, which offered easy transport to market and access to the supply of urban night-soil. It was 'credibly' reported in 1635 that Chelsea, Fulham and Kensington annually supplied the metropolis with over 24,000 cartloads

¹⁴² F.J.Fisher, 'The development of the London food market in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', *Economic History Review* 5 (1935), pp. 46-64.

¹⁴³ Norden, *Speculum Britanniae*, p. 11; Fisher, 'The London food market', quoting on pp. 55-6 Norden, 'The meanes most usuall how the people of Myddlesex doe live'. Cf. P. McGrath, 'The marketing of food, fodder and Livestock in the London area in the seventeenth century' (unpublished MA thesis, University of London, 1948); L. Martindale, 'Demography and land use in late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Middlesex' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 1968).

¹⁴⁴ *Hugh Alley's Caveat*, ed. Archer, Barron, and Harding, pp. 59, 61, 65, 69, 77.

¹⁴⁵ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 9, pp. 111-30

¹⁴⁶ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 8, pp. 69-86, 184-94; *ibid.*, vol. 9, pp. 111-30.

¹⁴⁷ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 6, pp. 17-23, 149-57.

¹⁴⁸ E.g. *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 9, pp. 111-30.

of roots – ‘parsnipps, turnopps, carriotts, and the like’. In the late seventeenth century the Neat Houses were described as ‘a Parcel of Houses taken up by Gardiners for planting of Asparagus, Melons, Cucumbers, Artichokes, &c. which find good Vent at London, and for which they are of Note’.¹⁴⁹ It was possible to make a decent, if not always secure, living from quite small plots of land, if well manured and intensively cultivated. The Gardeners’ Company, with jurisdiction extending six miles (9.6 km) from London, established a maximum size of ten acres (4 Ha) for its members in 1605; individual gardens at the Neat Houses varied from one to seven acres (0.4 – 2.8 Ha) in 1675, with rents of £6-8 per acre (c. £15-20 per Ha), several times arable rents.¹⁵⁰ London market-gardeners practised rotation, mixed sowing, and hand-digging and weeding, protected tender crops against frost, and raised crops out of season for a premium. Their practices were commended by contemporary writers on horticulture.¹⁵¹ Orchard fruit-growing may have been more common in areas away from the Thames, lacking its transport advantages.¹⁵²

Outside the metropolis, early modern Middlesex had few industries. Brick- and tile-making was probably the most important of these, profiting by the widespread brickearth and serving London as well as the localities.¹⁵³ Several seventeenth-century paper mills are noted in west Middlesex,¹⁵⁴ but it was not till the late seventeenth or early eighteenth centuries that pottery, porcelain and glass manufactures were established at Fulham, Bow, and Chelsea.¹⁵⁵ Brewing on a small scale, for local consumption, was probably widespread, but the largest such enterprises clustered round the city.¹⁵⁶ Inns and taverns, transport and carting, were important across the county.

By the seventeenth century, however, another major and competing land use had emerged, mostly in central and riverside Middlesex, in the appearance of second or retirement residences for wealthy Londoners and ‘country’ homes for those who wished to live near but not in the capital. Norden noted that Middlesex was ‘plentifullie stored, and as it seemeth

¹⁴⁹ Strype, *A survey of the Cities of London and Westminster*, Bk. 1 Ch. 10, p. 43.

¹⁵⁰ Fisher, ‘The London food market’, pp. 54-5; M.Thick, *The Neat House Gardens. Early market gardening around London* (Totnes, 1998).

¹⁵¹ Thick, *The Neat House Gardens*, esp. pp. 61-76. Cf. Robert Sharrock, *The history of the propagation & improvement of vegetables* (Oxford, 1660); Leonard Meager, *The English Gardener, or, A sure guide to young planters and gardeners* (London, 1670); both viewed on EEBO.

¹⁵² E.g. *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 8, pp. 184-94.

¹⁵³ M.Robbins, *Middlesex*, p. 49; *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 3, pp. 114-19; *ibid.*, vol. 4, pp. 45-8; *ibid.*, vol. 5, pp. 313-17; *ibid.*, vol. 7, pp. 131-44; *ibid.*, vol. 8, pp. 69-76; *ibid.*, vol. 9, pp. 51-60; *ibid.*, vol. 11, pp. 19-52, 52-63; ; *ibid.*, vol. 12, pp. 156-65.

¹⁵⁴ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 3, pp. 42-3, 43-5, 112-14, 114-19, 247.

¹⁵⁵ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 2, pp. 142-55; *ibid.*, vol. 12, pp. 156-65.

¹⁵⁶ See above.

beautified, with manie faire, and comely buildinges, especially of the Merchants of *London*, who haue planted their houses of recreation not in the meanest places'.¹⁵⁷ One such was Swakeleys, in Ickenham, bought by Alderman Edmund Wright in 1629, and rebuilt by him c. 1629-38. It may have been occupied by the banker Robert Clayton in the early 1660s, but was bought by (Alderman) Sir Robert Vyner in 1665; it must be the house of 32 hearths listed under the latter's name in 1666 (**1341**).¹⁵⁸

Wealthy Londoners held property in many parts of Middlesex. At least one in ten of the 1,348 men who held the office of alderman, deputy, or common councilman between 1660 and 1689 had property in Middlesex at the time of their death.¹⁵⁹ In 1666 former Alderman Edward Backwell, the banker, was taxed on a house in Fulham (**1471**); former Alderman Edward Trussell and the long-serving Alderman Maximilian Bard (Beard) each had one in Hammersmith (**1482, 1488**); former Alderman Thomas Hussey had a property in Hampstead (**1432**).¹⁶⁰ But the city remained a strong attraction. The parish of Hackney, to take one example, was within an easy ride of the city, and attracted city men from the sixteenth century. 'Londoners were the main local benefactors [to the parish] and gained still more prominence during the 17th century'. By the early seventeenth century, 'prominent merchants were so numerous' that local government and the tax base were distorted.¹⁶¹ The Rowe family were long-term residents of Shacklewell: Sir Thomas, buried at Hackney in 1570, his son Sir Henry (d. 1612), both Lord Mayors of London, Henry's son Alderman Sir Henry Rowe (d. 1661), and his son Henry Rowe, with a 25-hearth house in 1664 (**1578**).¹⁶² The goldsmith-banker Sir Thomas Vyner, late Lord Mayor, occupied a 20-hearth house in Church Street in 1664 (**1573**) and died there in May 1665.¹⁶³ The Hearth Tax returns list several occupiers of large premises in Hackney who can be identified as Londoners: Francis Bickley, Robert Dicer or Dycer, and Thomas Blackall, elected and discharged as Aldermen in 1649, 1650, and 1661 (**1578, 1570, 1578**); Henry Chitty, future Alderman of Cheap Ward, and possibly his successor Daniel Forth (**1570, 1571**); Abraham Johnson, Common

¹⁵⁷ Norden, *Speculum Britanniae*, p. 12.

¹⁵⁸ *Survey of London Monograph 13 - Swakeleys, Ickenham* (London, 1933) [online at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=1265>]; *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 4 pp. 102-4; G.E.Aylmer, 'Vyner [Viner], Sir Robert (1631-1688), goldsmith and banker', *ODNB*. 'Swakleys' is marked on Hollar/Blome's map of Middlesex in 1667 [Fig. 5].

¹⁵⁹ D.Marsh, 'Gardens and gardeners in later Stuart London' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 2005), p. 340.

¹⁶⁰ Beaven, *Aldermen of London*; J.R. Woodhead, *The Rulers of London 1660-1689 - A biographical record of the Aldermen and Common Councilmen of the City of London* (London, 1966) [online at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=7>].

¹⁶¹ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 10, pp. 10-14.

¹⁶² *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 10, pp. 75-91.

¹⁶³ G.E.Aylmer, 'Sir Thomas Vyner, first baronet (1588-1665), goldsmith and banker', *ODNB*.

Councilman for Langborne Ward, who held the manor of Wick from 1655 (**1576**); Henry Polstead, Common Councilman for Bishopsgate Ward (**1572**).¹⁶⁴ New sources of wealth were also represented, for example by Henry Drackes or Drax, younger son of Sir James Drax (d. 1663), Barbados sugar-planter, who occupied a house with 20 hearths (**1571**).¹⁶⁵ Other large houses were occupied by men who were to describe themselves in their wills as ‘gentleman’, such as Thomas Salmon (28 hearths: **1576**) and Robert Parwich (36 hearths: **1573**).¹⁶⁶ The wills of thirty gentlemen, five knights or baronets, and two ‘Dames’ from Hackney were proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury between 1640 and 1690.¹⁶⁷ The largest single property in Hackney in 1664 was the later Brooke House, with 37 hearths (**1576**), belonging to the Greville family, and occupied in the 1650s and 1660s by Lady Brooke, widow of the second Lord Brooke.¹⁶⁸

The 1664 and 1666 Hearth Tax assessments for Middlesex list numerous individuals designated as Lord (or Ld, or a specific title), Sir, or Lady in parishes west and north of the metropolis. The ‘Lords’ included some law lords and bishops; the ‘Sirs’ and ‘Ladies’ undoubtedly included city knights and baronets and their widows, as above, but also no doubt traditional gentry.¹⁶⁹ But as some of the preceding examples suggest, city money and genteel status were converging, and city merchants fathered Middlesex gentlemen. The Heralds’ Visitation of Middlesex in 1663 listed 94 families, of which at least thirty derived one or two generations back (often in the female line) from London citizen or merchant families – not counting those sons and daughters not in the direct line who married city spouses.¹⁷⁰ Middlesex’s MPs in the Cavalier Parliament Sir Lancelot Lake and Sir William Allen came from such stock. Lake, of Canons Park, Stanmore (**1296**), was the grandson of the wealthy haberdasher Sir William Ryder, Lord Mayor of London 1600-1; his own daughter married Sir James Drax, the sugar planter.¹⁷¹ Allen was the son and grandson of London fishmongers; his father had bought the manor of Finchley in 1622 and he himself was ‘the first of his family to

¹⁶⁴ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 10, pp. 75-91; Beaven, *Aldermen of London*; Woodhead, *Rulers of London*.

¹⁶⁵ Matthew Parker, *The sugar barons : family, corruption, empire and war* (London, 2011); TNA, PROB 11/307; PROB 11/316.

¹⁶⁶ TNA, PROB 11/340 (Thomas Salmon); PROB 11/351 (Robert Perwich)

¹⁶⁷ TNA, <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/records/wills.htm>

¹⁶⁸ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 10, pp. 75-91; *Survey of London Monograph 5, An account of the manor house of Kingshold, also known as Brooke House, in Hackney* (London, 1904), [online at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/source.aspx?pubid=1052>].

¹⁶⁹ Hearth Tax Returns, *passim*.

¹⁷⁰ *The visitation of Middlesex began [sic] in the year 1663, by William Ryley, Lancaster, and Henry Dethick, Rouge Croix*, ed. J.Foster (London, 1887).

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*; <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1660-1690/member/lake-lancelot-1609-80>; Archer, Ian, ‘Rider [Ryder], Sir William (c.1544–1611), merchant and local politician’, *ODNB*.

give up trade'.¹⁷² The law and government service also played an important part in the accumulation of fortune and the desire for genteel living within reach of the metropolis.

The wide spread of taxpayers with titles or honorifics, and the scatter of substantial properties, even without a titled inhabitant, is thus characteristic of most of central and inner Middlesex, though the Thames-side settlements may have been particularly attractive with their easy access to London. Chelsea was a favoured retreat from the sixteenth century and developing into a 'fashionable suburb' by the seventeenth; its early aristocratic residents were being succeeded by a wider middle class, something that may be true of other settlements too.¹⁷³ In 1636 Chelsea's high tax rating was attributed to the persons of 'honour and quality' who had summer houses there, while owning land and property elsewhere.¹⁷⁴ In the 1690s it was said to be 'graced with good well built Houses, (especially of late Years)'; Fulham and Parsons Green also had good houses for gentry, while the more distant Isleworth and Twickenham, were 'much inhabited' or 'much resorted to' by the gentry.¹⁷⁵ Hampstead was valued for its air, especially for a summer visit; Hackney as already noted, Islington and Stoke Newington had their share of prosperous residents and second-homers.¹⁷⁶ There were some city and gentry residents in Stepney, though the growth of maritime trades towards the river and of manufacturing and victualling trades near the city tended to dominate.¹⁷⁷

If a retreat from the city was clearly desirable to many, descriptions of such properties make it clear that aesthetic pleasure and sociability, rather than seclusion, were prime uses. Norden said that Londoners' 'houses of recreation' were 'cunningly contrived, curiously beautified, with diuers deuises, neatly decked with rare invencions, inuironed with Orchards of sundrie delicate fruite, gardens with delectable walks, arbors, allees, and great varietie of pleasing dainties'.¹⁷⁸ Competitive gardening was evidently in vogue in the later seventeenth century.¹⁷⁹ Evelyn described Lady Brooke's garden at Hackney as 'one of the neatest and most celebrated in England'; Pepys noted that 'Mr Drakes [...] garden is good', but that Lord Brooke's was 'much better', indeed 'excellent', with oranges growing and

¹⁷² <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1660-1690/member/allen-sir-thomas-1603-81>. 'Thomas Allen, knight' (sic) had a house with 19 hearths in Finchley in 1666: **1420**.

¹⁷³ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 12, pp. 14-26.

¹⁷⁴ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 2, pp. 15-60.

¹⁷⁵ Strype, *A survey of the Cities of London and Westminster*, Bk. 1 Ch. 10, p. 43; cf. *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 12.

¹⁷⁶ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 9, pp. 8-15; *ibid.*, vol. 8, pp. 9-19, 143-51; *ibid.*, vol. 10, pp. 10-14.

¹⁷⁷ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 11, pp. 13-19.

¹⁷⁸ Norden, *Speculum Britanniae*, p. 12.

¹⁷⁹ Marsh, 'Gardens and gardeners in later Stuart London', esp. pp. 360-83. Cf. R.G.Lang, 'Social origins and social aspirations of Jacobean London merchants', *Economic History Review* 2nd ser., 27 (1974), pp. 28-47.

‘great variety of other exoticque plants, and several Labarinth, and a pretty Aviary’.¹⁸⁰ Pepys also documents the integration of these country residences into the life of the metropolis, business and pleasure, easily visiting Hackney, Highgate, Frognal, Chelsea and Swakeleys in Ickenham.¹⁸¹

Proximity and accessibility had their price, however, in 1665. Plague spread to the parishes round London, though it was most severe in the inner suburban ring and patchier in the more thinly-settled outer suburbs and rural Middlesex. Shoreditch’s Crisis Mortality Ratio was 7.8, Clerkenwell’s 5.6, Hackney’s 2.8; Stoke Newington’s was probably similar to Hackney’s.¹⁸² Wealthy Londoners were accustomed to leaving London for the summer, and in time of plague, and certainly did so in 1665. But there was also a flood of poorer Londoners without country homes to go to, as described by Defoe and depicted in numerous plague pamphlets. Over 250 died in Hampstead, and the villagers of Finchley apparently threatened to fire on Londoners fleeing the plague.¹⁸³ More distant Middlesex settlements such as New Brentford, Isleworth, and South Mimms were also hard hit, though whether as a result of refugees or of everyday communications is not clear.¹⁸⁴

London, Middlesex and the Restoration

In 1660 Britain was emerging from two decades of war and political revolution. The City had played a key role in the conflict between monarch and parliament in the 1640s and in the struggle for political stability in the 1650s; London men had lobbied Westminster and joined Parliament’s armies, London money had financed the Parliamentary war effort, and control of London was understood to be vital to the security of any regime, republican or monarchical.

London and Middlesex had escaped most of the fighting and devastation of the war years. In November 1642, Prince Rupert took and sacked Brentford, but the road from Brentford to the city was blocked at Turnham Green in Chiswick by a large Parliamentary army and the London trained bands, and the royalist army withdrew to Kingston and then

¹⁸⁰ Pepys, *Diary, 1666*, pp. 181-2. Mr Drake or Drakes is not further identified in the *Diary*, but possibly this is Henry Drax/Drackes (1571).

¹⁸¹ Pepys, *Diary*, passim: see vol. 9, *Index*.

¹⁸² Champion, *London’s dreaded visitation*, Appendix 1, pp. 104-7.

¹⁸³ Defoe, *Journal of the Plague Year*, pp. 100-121; F.P. Wilson, *The Plague in Shakespeare’s London* (Oxford, 1927), pp. 94-5, 102, 157-60; *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 9, pp. 8-15; *ibid.*, vol. 6, pp. 38-55.

¹⁸⁴ *VCH Middlesex*, vol. 3, pp. 114-19; *ibid.*, vol. 7, pp. 113-20; *ibid.*, vol. 5, pp. 271-82.

Oxford. Some effort was expended in 1642-3 in encircling the capital with a system of forts and ramparts, extending from Vauxhall to the present Hyde Park Corner, via St Giles's and Clerkenwell to Shoreditch, and so round to Wapping, and in 1644 troops were mustered in Middlesex against feared attacks from the north-west and west. No royalist army again entered the county or seriously threatened London, though in 1647 the city was peaceably but firmly occupied by the New Model Army, marching from the Colchester.¹⁸⁵

If military conflict remained distant, London nevertheless felt the weight of the war, in the form of disruption to local and distant trade, a greatly increased burden of taxation, and an influx of needy refugees. The flow of goods from the provinces to the capital, especially cloth, London's major overseas export, but also food and for a time coal, was hindered or suspended by hostilities; provincial demand for London's imports was also affected. In the early years of the war London supplied a significant number of troops, while the absence of apprentices and citizens on military service further disrupted normal trading. Later, the city contributed financially to raising the new Parliamentary army, in addition to the existing direct and indirect levies. However, there were benefits: the seat of government remained at Westminster and Parliamentary and other assemblies were in frequent session; the city's support for the regime meant that its economic interests were considered; and continuing military and naval warfare in the 1650s meant continuing demand for military and naval provisioning.¹⁸⁶

The government of the City of London, which had invested heavily in the Parliamentary revolution of the 1640s, was also a major and crucial supporter of the Restoration of monarchy in 1660. In Macaulay's words, 'without the help of the City', Charles II 'could hardly have been restored'.¹⁸⁷ This does not imply a wholesale conversion to royalism on the part of the citizens. It was rather that during the period following Oliver Cromwell's death in 1658, when several conflicting options were mooted, the restoration of the monarchy came to appear as the most likely to guarantee stability. Fears of anarchy and the return of civil war came to dominate the City's outlook, leading eventually to convergence between Anglican loyalists and middle-ground Presbyterians.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁵ *London and the Civil War*, ed. Stephen Porter (Basingstoke, 1996), *passim*.

¹⁸⁶ Stephen Porter, 'The economic and social impact of the Civil War upon London', in *London and the Civil War*, ed. Porter, pp. 175-204; cf. B.Coates, *The impact of the English Civil War on the economy of London, 1642-50* (Aldershot, 2004).

¹⁸⁷ Quoted in G.S.De Krey, *London and the Restoration, 1659-83* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 14.

¹⁸⁸ For this and the following two paragraphs, see De Krey, *London and the Restoration*, chapter 1, pp. 19-66.

In 1659-60, the City government found itself at odds with both the English Army junta and the Rump, the remainder of the Long Parliament, particularly when either threatened to over-ride the municipality's self-government and privileges. Neither had democratic legitimacy in the view of many (two of the City's MPs had been excluded in Pride's Purge of 1648, and were still excluded when the Rump was recalled in 1659). The regime's attempt to prolong the term of the sympathetic Lord Mayor John Ireton in September 1659, in contravention of the City's charter, met with strong and effective resistance. When troops fired on a large crowd of citizens and apprentices that had gathered in support of a petition for a free parliament in December 1659, killing at least two and possibly seven, the City reacted by asserting its autonomy of action, forming its own committee of safety, and electing to Common Council an influx of new names of a broadly Presbyterian rather than Independent colour. The impossibility thereafter of a real rapprochement between the city and either the Rump or the army junta meant that over the next few months attention focused on the call for a new parliament and on the attitude and actions of General Monck, commander of the Scottish army.

Monck's evolution from avowed supporter of the Rump Parliament to committed restorer of the monarchy took place in London, where his initial firm action in defence of the Rump was succeeded by a period of negotiation. Monck was courted by the city and entertained by the livery companies, who spared no expense in wooing him. By now he was seen as the guarantor of the city's rights against the Rump, and the city's security against the army, as well as of the nation's future, which was increasingly seen as monarchist. After a virtual tax strike against the Rump, the city voted money enthusiastically for the restored Long Parliament and its successor, the new Convention Parliament called for April 1660. It was almost universally expected that the new parliament would call for the restoration of the monarchy, and the city's four MPs, Alderman John Robinson, Alderman William Vincent, former Alderman Richard Browne, and Recorder William Wilde, were all strong royalists.

So royalism predominated in the city and Londoners welcomed Charles II when he entered in May 1660. But it was not a universal sentiment, and other views, if currently subdued, remained strong. The honeymoon between city and crown did not last, and religious difference was to be the main cause of disenchantment. Many Presbyterians had supported the restoration of monarchy because they believed it offered the best defence against sectarianism, but they had also envisaged the restoration of a broad and tolerant state church, rather than the narrow high-Anglicanism that was imposed. As the rigid Episcopalianism of the restored church took shape, the alliance between Presbyterians and Anglicans melted. The threat to the inclusive Protestantism that many citizens favoured was apparent enough by

March 1661 for them to insist on the election to Charles's first parliament of three known Presbyterians and an Independent.¹⁸⁹ Middlesex took a rather different view, returning royalists in both 1660 and 1661.¹⁹⁰

However, other benefits accrued to the metropolis as a whole. The restoration of a lively court culture brought 'a mass rush of nobles and squires back from the country to London to welcome Charles II and savor all the pleasures of luxurious urban life'.¹⁹¹ London in 1662-6 was already showing signs of these developments, and the Hearth Tax returns document the presence of noble, gentry and lawyers in the west end.¹⁹² The rapid spread of west end development in the later seventeenth century, including the large town houses in the new squares, is evidence of the demand for aristocratic housing and its satisfaction. Better roads and vehicles, faster postal communications, more newspapers, helped to advertise London's attractions and facilitate access, while improved urban amenities like paving, lighting and drainage made staying in the town more comfortable and pleasant.¹⁹³ So London and Middlesex on the eve of the Great Fire were already beginning to feel some benefits from the Restoration, and having weathered the worst plague in memory, people were perhaps beginning to feel some cautious optimism for the future.

¹⁸⁹ De Krey, *London and the Restoration*, chapter 2, pp. 69-115; cf. <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1660-1690/constituencies/London>.

¹⁹⁰ <http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1660-1690/constituencies/middlesex>.

¹⁹¹ Stone, 'Residential development', esp. p. 176.

¹⁹² See Warren, below, pp. xx..

¹⁹³ Brett-James, *The growth of Stuart London*, pp. xx; Stone, 'Residential development'.