

For *Architecture and the British Atlantic World*, eds Bernard L. Herman and Daniel Maudlin, University of North Carolina Press, forthcoming 2015

English Artisans' Churches and North America: traditions of vernacular classicism in the eighteenth century

by Peter Guillery

The church of St George, Portsea (Fig. 1), was built in 1753–4 by and for shipwrights and other artisans who worked in, and lived just outside, Portsmouth's great naval dockyard, the single most important working hub of British sea-power. Of this church Nikolaus Pevsner, the German architectural historian who founded the *Buildings of England* series, wrote, 'It must strike American visitors as a greeting from New England'.¹ The direction of travel was in fact, if unsurprisingly, the other way round. But if the church has been understood as looking American yet is not, why is that so and what does it mean?²

When Pevsner wrote those words about the church of St George, Portsea, it was a commonplace that the transmission of polite or high-status architectural ideas and styles across the Atlantic in the eighteenth century was a straightforward

flow from east to west. John Summerson summed up that period's perceptions of this relationship, arguing that American architectural standards were 'English standards pure and simple. Up to the revolution of 1775–83 it is not possible to discern any autonomous vitality in American architecture. A remote provincial outcrop of the English school, there was no local leadership of any consequence and a total dependence on contacts with England through the immigration of craftsmen and the circulation of books.'³ That perspective on architectural history was one that was essentially about major buildings, those conceived by and produced for the highest strata of society, such as steepled churches, Christ Church, Boston (1723), or Christ Church, Philadelphia (1727–54), for example, which bear comparison in these terms to London churches like St James, Piccadilly (1676–84), or St Martin in the Fields (1721–6).⁴ But scholarship has for the most part moved on, and much architectural-historical writing of the last few decades has delved deeper. In America, particularly, Henry Glassie, Dell Upton, Bernard Herman, Carl Lounsbury,⁵ and others, have shown that what Summerson asserted cannot be said for vernacular building traditions. There was no comparably inevitable flow of architectural formulae, and relationships with English precedent were much more complex. There are significant aspects of building practice and specific local instances where humbler buildings in North America did follow British precedents, as recent research has explored in novel ways, as by Laurie Smith in the context of geometrical design,⁶ Daniel Maudlin in relation to Nova Scotia,⁷ or Peter Benes on meeting houses.⁸ But a Vernacular Architecture Group conference titled 'Diffusion and Invention: Vernacular Building

in England and the New World' (2005)⁹ produced strong emphases on divergences in building traditions during the seventeenth century, the speed of the separation laying bare the crucial roles of humble agency and local conditions, especially climate and available building materials.

What has perhaps not been sufficiently considered is that polite culture, or, in an architectural context, classicism, was not the only source from which English emigrants to North America who set about building might have drawn. Those emigrants who were inclined to build did not necessarily arrive with architectural sensibilities that were primarily or even significantly derived from polite precedents. The purpose of addressing here a part of the English end of this relationship is not to provide, or even to suggest, precise vernacular prototypes or models. It would, after all, be paradoxical to speak of the spread of any vernacular, if the word is to retain its meaning as an indicator of the local and indigenous. Instead, the intention is to consider and illustrate a certain English cultural environment, based in towns and among artisans who had their own cohesive vernacular building traditions and distinctive outlooks. This part of English society would, through emigration, have contributed substantially to the formation of a sound base for inventive architectural development in America, independent of a top-down model and definitely not mimetic in nature, generating something that was both new and derivative. The result, in a new country, can also, but separately, be termed vernacular or indigenous.

It would be possible to divert at length on the question of definitions of the term artisan, but suffice it to say that for present purposes the word is used here as from the context of urban England in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and that in economic terms it refers to roughly the second quartile of the urban English population in the eighteenth century, the bottom half of the top half, broadly tradespeople – those who were neither poor nor rich. More importantly and specifically, in cultural terms the label artisan refers here to a long urbanized social stratum that defined itself in almost exclusively masculine and retrospective terms (and this exclusivity was deliberate and self protective). For this group respectability and, increasingly, economic survival, derived from what was perceived as ancient or at least long-standing custom or tradition, rooted in trade skills and economic independence. Status was not primarily based in consumption habits or emulative behavior.¹⁰

In the culturally conservative environment inhabited by eighteenth-century English urban artisans there was great continuity of vernacular building practices. This was true in and around London, by far England's biggest concentration of artisans, as well as in other towns with concentrations of skilled workers, among which ports, especially those with naval dockyards, were important. Church building is a field that American scholars, led by some of those already named, have had no difficulty in embracing as vernacular, but one which in England, for ecclesiological and many other reasons, is generally considered only as high-style architecture, and wholly separated from discussions of things vernacular.

There, perhaps, in part, at least, is the rub, as well as something of what lies behind Pevsner's peculiar and seemingly un-historical observation about St George, Portsea.

English emigrants to America, many of whom were artisans or of artisan descent, in the sense adumbrated here, would have taken with them vernacular customs and cultures and a good deal of nostalgia, that is, a yearning for a past perceived as better but lost. This was manifest, not insignificantly, in a search for liberty and simplicity. Emulative politeness may have been in the ascendant in eighteenth-century England, but its roots were in a dominant section of society, the established and prospering members of which would not, as a rule, have been inclined to leave for the hardships of a new country. For many, of course, emigration offered an open road to gentility where other routes were obstructed. The American path to politeness, which Richard Bushman has called the acquisition of vernacular gentility,¹¹ may have been relatively open, but for most it was a long haul from a humble starting point, and many of the travelers on this path will have carried within themselves ambivalence about fashion and emulative behavior in relation to respectability rooted in custom. There were other important differences. Where many English artisans, notably in London and the dockyard towns, might have perceived themselves as a rearguard attached to an old culture, artisans in America were seeking a better life in a new place, with fewer barriers to mobility. The new world lacked the coercive and oppositional social counter-currents of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century

England. The mentalities of emigrants might, therefore, have been more imaginative and opportunistic, as well as nostalgic.

These generalizations need to be tied down to some particulars. England's dockyard and other maritime towns are key places in terms of the subject matter of this volume. There are, no doubt, many ways in which it would be germane to consider aspects of their building culture. In just one of these the focus hereafter is on three naval towns – Deptford, Deal and Portsmouth. These were settlements that mixed determined cultural conservatism with oppositional political radicalism. In the dockyards there was great and cultivated continuity of practice; skilled workers could not be easily replaced. From at least the 1720s onwards difficult labour relations were endemic. Communication between the workforces in the naval dockyards was good enough as to enable effective combined strike action on numerous occasions, perhaps most seriously in 1775 when, it has been argued, a strike may have compromised the effectiveness of the British response to the American rebellion.¹² In the working practices of these dockyard towns there was strong adherence to customary practice, and an outlook that was anything but uncritically emulative in relation to polite culture. Yet, population growth, comparative affluence and the absence of the social hierarchies that were usual elsewhere fostered entrepreneurial endeavor and innovation.

Deptford, now an inner-city suburb, was at this time just outside London, but a

good-sized town in its own right, one that had grown enormously since the 1660s to become a significant maritime-industrial satellite of the metropolis, centered on its naval dockyard.¹³ Artisan identity in Deptford was nicely captured by 1786 when the German tourist Sophie von la Roche visited. She was struck by the sight of the dockyard men, reporting: ‘seeing the carpenters go out through the gate for lunch, each carrying his ration of wood on his shoulder, while a number carried a large net full of shavings. A nice sight indeed, this crowd of family fathers with their domestic provision of tinder going to their midday soup, weary from their labours and honest toil. God! How small a portion of these six million guineas they help to earn, falls to their lot! They were mostly fine-looking fellows; many of them with the eye of a mathematician, still making calculations. In them I saw embodied the fine English schools, where the citizen’s son, like the son of the aristocrat, is taught all kinds of mathematics and really good Latin. I am sure many of them will be reading the papers this evening and talking of the common welfare . . . The respect with which our coachman had to treat these working-people, not being allowed to turn in the narrow street until they had passed, gave me time to consider and contemplate them.’¹⁴

Similar scenes might have been seen on England’s south coast in Portsmouth, on similar streets. Portsmouth was the naval town par excellence, its dockyard the nation’s biggest, with a workforce ranging from 1,500 to 3,000 through the eighteenth century. The ‘suburb’ of Portsea was built alongside the great naval dockyard to house its workers and associated tradespeople, growing from

nothing at the beginning of the eighteenth century to have a population of more than 4,000 in its own right by 1801.¹⁵ In both Deptford and Portsea there was wealth and literacy, and polite commodities like tea and silver were widely available. In both places eighteenth-century housing development was led by speculating dockyard workers, who, with their independent and self-sufficient traditions, also built their own churches. Movement between these and other dockyard towns, especially Woolwich and Chatham, was common. Against any perception that architectural conservatism was a product of isolation, it should be remembered that through the eighteenth century, as has already been mentioned, naval dockyard workers were able effectively to organize strikes on a national basis.

In south-east England, on Kent's east coast, just round the corner from Chatham is Deal, an eighteenth-century maritime town, where virtually all ships travelling between London and points overseas stopped for servicing and to await fair winds. Deal was a chartered port from 1699 with a naval provisioning yard from 1703. It was also a flourishing centre of boatbuilding, less formal marine provisioning, corruption and smuggling – an 'impious and remorseless town' of 'fraud, oppression, theft and rapine'.¹⁶ There was money, wherever it came from. Along and around Middle Street in Deal there is still an astonishingly large and varied group of modest eighteenth-century urban houses, built for habitation by sea pilots, mariners, traders and victuallers.¹⁷

Buildings of a similar nature, if regionally somewhat various, could be shown from many other coastal places, but the purpose here in sticking with London and these few southern dockyard or navy towns is to home in on some churches to look a bit more exactly at a particular building tradition, that, as indicated at the outset, was not directly diffused across the Atlantic, but which illustrates the existence of and scope for independent architectural development among artisans, and demonstrates that, through people of comparable backgrounds, this kind of improvisation occurred in England as well as in America, where it is perhaps more familiar.

To show this it is necessary to track the transmission of a particular type of building from one group of English urban, and largely maritime, artisans to another, from the 1630s through to the 1730s. Deptford's medieval parish church of St Nicholas was rebuilt, all save its tower, in 1696–7. Money for this rebuilding was raised locally through a voluntary subscription and a hefty rate. There was, as has been stressed, wealth in the newly expanded and largely artisan town. The inhabitants of Deptford were, unusually, able to provide themselves with an essentially new church without external involvement or support. Prominent among those behind this project was Isaac Loader, an anchormith. The latterly famous diarist, and high Anglican, John Evelyn, who lived grandly nearby at Sayes Court, described Loader, with distaste, as being of Anabaptist descent.¹⁸ But this was the parish (that is Anglican) church, not a Dissenter's chapel. The rebuilding was carried out to designs by Charley Stanton, a carpenter from

Southwark, on the south side of London Bridge, a place densely populated with artisans and labourers. He provided a centralized auditory interior (for sermons not processions), employing an architectural formula that he had previously tried out in 1675–9 for the church of St Mary Magdalene, Bermondsey, the riverside district that lies between Southwark and Deptford (Fig. 2).¹⁹ The combination in late seventeenth-century London of such purely classical interiors with plain brick exteriors is usually associated with Christopher Wren's post-Fire churches in the City. But none of Wren's comparable buildings antedate the Bermondsey church. Every part of Stanton's buildings, from the chaste almost Palladian Tuscan interiors, to the scrolled gables over the transeptal bays on plain brick exteriors, to the overall dimensions, and, most significantly, the plan form, in fact derives from even earlier churches that had been built by and for largely artisan populations in other working suburbs of seventeenth-century London, at Westminster Broadway in 1635–42, and at Poplar in 1642–54 (Figs 3 and 4). This last chapel also served the adjoining east London hamlet of Blackwall, where the East India Company built its ships, and from where, most pertinently in the context of this volume, the Virginia settlers' embarked in December 1606. The prime mover in the completion of the Poplar Chapel in the 1650s was Maurice Thompson, an eminent Puritan merchant who had made his fortune in Virginia and become a close associate of Oliver Cromwell's.²⁰

In all these eastern suburbs of London there was strong commitment to Cromwell's side of England's great seventeenth-century political and liturgical

divides. These places were characterized by a Calvinist consensus at the beginning of the seventeenth century, which led on to the rejection of Arminian or Laudian religious reforms in the 1630s, and thence to widespread Dissent or Nonconformity after the Restoration. These are not Puritan churches, but they are demonstrably anti-Laudian in their chancel-less centralization and simple and undecorated Protestant functionality. The perpetuation of this originally moderate Calvinist church type in places like Bermondsey and Deptford in the late seventeenth century is a rejection of the more ceremonial or re-Laudianizing alternatives that Wren and others introduced into the City. The tacking on of small chancels may simply be a concession to the post-Restoration settlement. That some of Wren's City churches are similar needs to be understood as the result of inventive compromises with an existing vernacular approach on Wren's part. In the past this aspect of Wren's architecture has been ascribed to the influence of Dutch architecture, something in which he is not known to have shown any interest. The Dutch influence is there, but at a remove, mediated by earlier seventeenth-century Londoners who were more broadly sympathetic to the Dutch approach to religion and religious architecture in the first place.

This strongly centralized auditory church type found further echoes in other places with maritime links and artisan populations. There was a working and mercantile Danish population in London's eastern maritime suburbs, in Wapping, principally because of the Scandinavian timber trade. The Danish or so-called mariners' church in Wellclose Square of 1694–6, designed by Caius Gabriel

Cibber, himself a Danish immigrant, had a strongly centralized cross-axial interior. In the same decade, it might be noted, Scandinavian, Dutch and English people combined to build the differently centralized church of Holy Trinity in Wilmington, Delaware.

The cross-axial kind of interior was even adopted and scaled up by Nicholas Hawksmoor in some of the great east London churches that were initiated by the high Anglican Tory Government following the Fifty New Churches Act of 1711 which showered munificence, and awe-inspiring buildings, on what were thought to be dangerously godless suburbs, as at St George in the East of 1714–29, also in Wapping (Fig. 5). Despite, or maybe even because of, this high-level appropriation this sort of centralized church interior fell outside the mainstream of church building in later eighteenth-century England.

But it can be picked up in Deal and Portsea. The church of St George-the-Martyr in Deal was built in 1706–16. It is a rectangular brick box with slight cross-axial transeptal projections, its overall plan proportions are close to those of St Nicholas Deptford and its predecessors. It was intended principally for use by those engaged with the sea for what was in effect then a new town, and was probably designed by a local builder, Samuel Simmons, following a fund-raising campaign chiefly promoted by the mayor, Thomas Powell, a ships' victualler. Outside help had to be garnered to complete the building, but this would not significantly have influenced its form. Inside, much has been altered, but early

plans show that the seating and fittings were originally oriented north-south, the pews facing a three-decker pulpit on the south side, the altar off to the east side in a mere gesture of a chancel that is, unexpectedly perhaps, under a cupola at the front. This layout is a departure from that of the forerunners that have been described, but the functionality of the auditory intent is perhaps even more explicit.²¹

And so, finally, attention must return to St George Portsea (Fig. 1). The leaflet historical guide to this church produced by the local parish tells us, echoing Pevsner in being illuminatingly misleading, that 'Its style is known as American Colonial'. It was built in 1753–4 by dockyard artisans to serve their own community and to assert Portsea's independence of Portsmouth. Its designer was probably Nicholas Vass, a house carpenter who had worked in the dockyard since 1734.²² The builders working under him were fifteen shipwrights, three gentlemen, a carpenter, a tallow chandler and a grocer. There is no known evidence that any of them had crossed the Atlantic. Here, it is the exterior that departs from the London forerunners. There are no obvious models for this strangely blockish assemblage. It is a pragmatically devised and simple functional shell for another auditory interior (Fig. 6). This does very much hark back to the seventeenth-century London type. There is a cross-in-square plan and Tuscan columns. Originally a centralized triple-decker pulpit was located in front of the altar (Fig. 7), an arrangement that seems to follow on from the seventeenth-century forerunners, but which was unusual in the mid eighteenth

century. It did become more common in late-Georgian urban churches, and was, in fact, adopted in a reseating of St George's, Deal, in 1822.²³

It is well documented that the artisans of Deptford, Deal and Portsea had extensive contacts with each other through the eighteenth century. So it is hardly surprising that their churches should have certain common qualities. The crucial point is not just that there were these links, but that architectural initiatives were taken and seen through without significant high-style influence or interference. There is a kind of cultural cocoon around these buildings. The metaphor of a cocoon has protective and closed connotations, but it also speaks of inner transformation. The organism within has existed without the protection, and will so exist again, in a new form, but in the meantime interaction with an external environment has shut down. In all these places and times there was receptivity to new forms, that is to the polite, but there is also an evident unwillingness to be overwhelmed or determined by it.

These English artisans' churches, it must be acknowledged, have little in common with eighteenth-century American churches. The argument here is not that in narrow formal terms there are transatlantic analogues. These English churches were apparently not closely imitated across the Atlantic. Transatlantic differences of landscape and climate did mean that vernacular building practices quickly diverged. Yet there is a kind of kinship. The architectural vocabulary, in both its material and spatial aspects, is broadly similar to that of many early

American churches, suggesting something in the way of common cultural frameworks and experiences. Virginia's chancel-less room churches,²⁴ even those larger examples of cruciform plan, developed differently and separately, and, if formal similarities are sought in England, perhaps they are more to be found in early Nonconformist chapels.²⁵ But, to return to the opening quotation, Pevsner's perception of American-ness in St George, Portsea, was a recognition, if unwitting, that the inventive vernacular approaches to building on which English emigrants to America and their descendants drew, continued to find expression in eighteenth-century England as well.

ENDNOTES

1 – Nikolaus Pevsner and David Lloyd, *The Buildings of England: Hampshire and the Isle of Wight* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967), 439.

2 – This essay presents material published elsewhere, reworked to arrive at new conclusions. See Peter Guillery, *The Small House in Eighteenth-Century London* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2004); Peter Guillery, “Suburban Models, or Calvinism and Continuity in London’s Seventeenth-Century Church Architecture”, *Architectural History* 48 (2005), 69–106.

3 – John Summerson, *Architecture in Britain: 1530 to 1830* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 5th edn 1970), 539.

4 – Stephen P. Dorsey, *Early English Churches in America 1607–1807* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952). This perspective has been perpetuated in Terry Friedman, *The Eighteenth-Century Church in Britain* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011), 608–14.

5 – Henry Glassie, *Folk Housing in Middle Virginia* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1975); Henry Glassie, *Vernacular Architecture* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000); Dell Upton, *Holy Things and Profane: Anglican Parish Churches in Colonial Virginia* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1997); Gabrielle M. Lanier and Bernard L. Herman, *Everyday Architecture of the Mid-Atlantic: Looking at Buildings and Landscapes* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997); Bernard L. Herman, *Town House: Architecture and Material Life in the Early American City, 1780–1830* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005); Carl Lounsbury, “Anglican Church Design in the

Chesapeake: English Inheritances and Regional Interpretations”, in *Constructing Image, Identity, and Place: Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture IX*, eds Alison K. Hoagland and Kenneth A. Breisch (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2003), 22–38.

6 – Laurie Smith, “Following the Geometrical Design Path: From Ely to Jamestown, Virginia”, in *Built from Below: British Architecture and the Vernacular*, ed. Peter Guillery (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011), 11–32.

7 – Daniel Maudlin, “Architecture and Identity on the Edge of Empire: The Early Domestic Architecture of Scottish Settlers in Nova Scotia, Canada, 1800–1850”, *Architectural History* 50 (2007): 95–123.

8 – Peter Benes, ‘Meeting houses of Puritan New England: The Transatlantic Passage, 1630–1800’, in *The Archaeology of Post-Medieval Religion*, eds Chris King and Duncan Sayer (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2011), 179–95.

9 – A first version of the present essay was presented at this conference.

10 – See, among much else on this subject, Edward P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968); ed. Geoffrey Crossick, *The Artisan and the European Town, 1500–1900* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997); David R. Green, *From Artisans to Paupers: Economic change and poverty in London, 1790–1870* (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1995); Guillery (2004), *op. cit.*

11 – Richard L. Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, houses, cities* (New York: Vintage, 1992).

12 – Roger Knight, “From Impressments to Task Work: Strikes and disruption in

the Royal Dockyards, 1688–1788”, and Roger Morriss, “Government and Community: The changing context of labour relations, 1770–1830”, both in *History of Work and Labour Relations in the Royal Dockyards*, eds Kenneth Lunn and Ann Day, (London: Routledge, 1999), 1–20 and 21–40.

13 – Bernard L. Herman and Peter Guillery, “Negotiating Classicism in Eighteenth-century Deptford and Philadelphia”, in, *Articulating Classicism: New Approaches to Eighteenth-Century Architecture*, eds Barbara Arciszewska and Elizabeth McKellar (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 187–225.

14 – Sophie von la Roche, *Sophie in London, 1786: Being the Diary of Sophie von la Roche*, trans. Clare Williams (London: Jonathan Cape, 1933), 253.

15 – For links to North America, see Roger Leech, “Portsmouth – A Window on the World?”, in *Cities in the World, 1500–2000*, eds Adrian Green and Roger Leech (Leeds: Maney, 2006), 299–306. For Portsea more generally, see, Christopher William Chalklin, *The Provincial Towns of Georgian England: A study of the building process, 1740–1820* (London: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1974), 122–9; Ann Veronica Coats, “The œconomy of the navy and Portsmouth: A discourse between the civilian naval administration of Portsmouth dockyard and the surrounding communities, 1650–1800” (PhD diss., University of Sussex, 2000).

16 – Anonymous, *Deal in an Uproar*, 1709, as quoted in Friedman, *op. cit.*, 77, 131.

17 – John Newman, *The Buildings of England: North East and East Kent* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 3rd edn 1983), 281; Gregory Holyoake, *Deal and*

Walmer: A Celebration (Wimborne Minster: Dovecote Press, 2009).

18 – British Library, Add. MS 78629A, Evelyn Papers, map of Deptford in 1623, copied and annotated by John Evelyn, c.1703; B. R. Leftwich, “The Parish of St Nicholas, Deptford”, *Ecclesiological Society Transactions*, 1/4 (1941), 41.

19 – Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England), *London, v: East London* (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1930), 1–3, 15–16, with supporting inventory cards in the National Monuments Record, of 1919 for St Nicholas and c.1927 for St Mary Magdalene, both by A. W. Clapham; Bridget Cherry and Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Buildings of England; London 2: South* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1983), 402, 599; Howard Colvin, *A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects 1600–1840* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 3rd edn 1995), 917.

20 – Guillery (2005), *loc. cit.*

21 – Newman, *op. cit.*, 282; Barbara Collins, *A Short History of the Civic Church of St George-the-Martyr, Deal, Kent* (Deal: Mercury Printing Service, 1966); “St George’s Church, Deal 1716–1799: a commemorative booklet”, 1999. The architectural design has recently been attributed to John James, see Friedman, *op. cit.*, 474–5. In 1712 James was brought in to oversee completion of the church, but it is not evident that he had any earlier involvement and the building, its cupola apart, does not look like something James would have designed.

22 – Coats, *loc. cit.*; “A Brief History of St George’s Portsea, by the congregation and others”, n.d.

23 – Nigel Yates, *Buildings, Faith and Worship: The Liturgical Arrangement of*

Anglican Churches 1600–1900 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, revised 2000),
87, 89.

24 – Upton, *op. cit.*; Lounsbury, *loc. cit.*

25 – Benes, *op. cit.*

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS AS CAPTIONS

1 – The church of St George, Portsea, Hampshire, England, built in 1753–4 by and for artisans of Portsmouth Naval Dockyard (English Heritage Archives, © Colin Cromwell; courtesy Images of England).

2 – The church of St Mary Magdalene, Bermondsey, Surrey (now London), England, built in 1675–9, showing the interior from the east (photographed for the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England in 1929, English Heritage Archives).

3 – The Poplar Chapel (latterly the church of St Matthias, Poplar), Middlesex (now London), England, built in 1642–54, showing the interior from the west (photographed by Derek Kendall in 2004, English Heritage Archives).

4 – Reconstructed plans of seventeenth-century suburban London churches (drawing by Andrew Donald, English Heritage).

5 – The church of St George in the East, Wapping, Middlesex (now London), England, built in 1714–29, Nicholas Hawksmoor, architect, showing the interior from the west (photographed by Bedford Lemere for the National Buildings Record in April 1941, a few months before the church was gutted by incendiary bombs, English Heritage Archives).

6 – The church of St George, Portsea, showing the interior (English Heritage Archives).

7 – The church of St George, Portsea, plan and section drawn in 1753 (Portsmouth Museums and Records Service).