OPENING ADDRESS OF THE ARCHITECTURAL SECTION AT THE LONDON MEETING.[1]

By EDWIN FRESHFIELD, LL.D., F.S.A.

I believe it is one of the unwritten rules, or at all events traditions, of the Royal Archæological Institute, to ask some gentleman of antiquarian predilictions to occupy the presidential chair of one or other sections of these Meetings upon the same principle as the Hero in the "Grand Duchess of Gerolstein" asked to be appointed a schoolmaster in order that he might learn the first duties of his position, viz.: to read and write. It must be, I think, upon this principle that, some few years ago, the Council asked me to preside over the Antiquarian Section, antiquities being a subject with which I am unacquainted. The Council have now been good enough to ask me, who am equally unacquainted with Architecture, to preside over the Architectural Section, while my friend Mr. Micklethwaite, who is pre-eminent as an architect, has been asked to preside over the Antiquarian. I am sure the gentleman will forgive me for commencing with this, because upon the principle of Mr. Richard Moniplies, in Sir Walter Scott's novel of the "Fortunes of Nigel," I find it better, if anybody is likely to have anything to say against me, to say it myself.

In the address that I propose to give you to-day, I have thought it well to put myself in the position of one of us cockneys wishing to point out to a visitor to London, as all of you, gentlemen, are here, the manner in which I think he could, without going outside of a 1s. 6d. fare in a Hansom cab, if he was so minded, study the Architecture of the different periods of English History. I should like, however, to premise that a city is, for many reasons, a bad

[1] Read at Burlington House, July 14th, 1893.

place in which to study architecture. I remember Sir Charles Newton, upon whom I urged, now many years ago, the advisability of continuing excavations in Ephesus after the discovery of the Temple, telling me how hopeless it was to attempt to excavate in a city that had been continuously inhabited for a long period. From the nature and necessity of things, successive generations would have destroyed, by repairs, alterations and otherwise, the distinctive features that a person by excavation would wish to find. I know well by experience that so it is in London with architecture. Not only have the buildings been from time to time repaired and altered as occasion required, but they have been altered according to the different uses to which they have been put, and the different tastes of different ages, and also within a comparatively recent period almost all of them have more or less been subjected to the severe process that is called restoration, *i.e.*, restoration to their supposed original condition, by persons unacquainted with it, and out of joint with the circumstances which produced those conditions. Nevertheless, making allowance for all this, there are still some notable examples left, and of these I shall give a short list. It must not be taken that I pledge myself in a general address like this to a particular year when I give a date. I believe all the dates I give are approximately accurate. I have verified them as far as I can.

Probably the first occupation of London of which the enquiring antiquary would wish to find some architectural remains is the Roman. The only remaining Roman architectural feature of London is the wall. The course of the Roman wall of London is pretty well known, and from time to time by excavation at various points of it a good deal of information has been gathered about it. In the 52nd Volume of *Archæologia*, p. 690, there is an exhaustive description of a portion of it discovered near the new buildings of the post office at Aldersgate—the fact that the description was made by Mr. Fox ensures that it was both careful and complete. The wall is built in courses with stone and Roman brick, underpinned and preserved, and can be seen from the buildings of the New Post Office. It gives a very fair idea of the general construction. I think it would not be impossible for this

Society either in the neighbourhood of All Hallows on the Wall or of the Churchyard of St. Alphege, possibly also of St. Giles, Cripplegate, to uncover a portion of the Roman Wall which might be permanently exposed for examination and study. The suggestion that St. Peter's-upon-Cornhill was built by Lucius, King of Briton, in the 2nd century is very interesting, but no part of the present church was built at that time, and we have nothing in London of an earlier date than very late Saxon.

Of the pure Saxon period there is no example remaining. Edward the Confessor rebuilt in part Westminster Abbey during the last few years of his life, commencing with the year 1060, but I think it may be assumed that, however many Saxon workmen may have been employed in the building, the church itself was a pure Norman building. You have visited Westminster Abbey under the auspices of our mutual friend, Mr. Micklethwaite. You could not have a better or more appreciative guide. He has no doubt pointed out to you the base of the pier near the Reredos, which I believe is undoubtedly Saxon. There are other portions of the buildings which when I was young I was taught also to consider Saxon, but I believe doubt has been thrown upon these. But this doubt is of no great importance if the buildings were not built by Edward the Confessor they were the continuation of his work. For the indigenous Norman examples of this date we must look to the ruined Abbey of Jumièges, or the Church of St. George at Boscherville, near Rouen. Among the Westminster Buildings to which your attention has no doubt been directed is the building called the Chapel of the Pyx, which Sir George Gilbert Scott has described in his *Gleanings of Westminster Abbey.*

Another specimen in the City of very early Norman work is the crypt of Bow Church. This crypt, which is sadly kept, is very interesting. There are several pure early Norman cushion capitals, and one with a sort of leaf ornament on the edge, which I do not remember to have seen elsewhere. The capital upon which this ornament is seen is that of a pillar partly built up. There is one part of the north side of the crypt which may be late Saxon. This crypt and the Norman work at Westminster Abbey

may not inappropriately be compared with the Chapel in the White Tower. This Chapel was built in the year 1078, and is consequently one of the earliest specimens of Norman architecture in England. The Chapel terminates in an apse. I cannot tell if the crypt of Bow Church did the same—if it did the apse must have been destroyed at a very early period, as the building is bounded at the east end by a street.

I do not know how far Mr. Pearson kept the promise, which was made to us by the Chief Commissioner of Works at the time, to preserve in the altered building the exterior wall of Westminster Hall. I hope he did. Westminster Hall must have been commenced within a very few years of the building of the Chapel of the White Tower. When the Law Courts were removed some 10 or 12 years ago the whole of the west wall of Westminster Hall was uncovered, and was shown to be of early Norman work, altered in the reign of King Richard the Second. The early Norman work was of Caen stone—the later work of Richard the Second of Reigate fire stone. The Norman work was supported by flat Norman buttresses, and the wall was covered with Norman masons' marks, whilst the building itself was not unlike, but on a very much larger scale, the hall of the Exchequer of Normandy, at Caen. The later work of Richard the Second was supported by heavy flying buttresses and of a different construction. Of the same date as Westminster Hall is the western part of the well-preserved crypt of the Church of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, at Clerkenwell—this crypt was no doubt built in the reign of King William Rufus.

The next building to be noticed is the Church of St. Bartholomew the Great. This is a beautiful specimen of the more advanced period of the Norman architecture before the transition had begun. This building may be fixed as between the years 1123 and 1133—it is very well known, and although it has suffered from restoration the suffering has not been very severe. Of the date of King Henry the Second's reign we have several buildings, and first the round part of the second Temple Church, built in the year 1185. In the same year, and at the same time, was built the second Church of the Knights of St.

John of Jerusalem at Clerkenwell—the Churches of the Hospital and of the Temple were consecrated at the same time by the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Heraclius, just before the extinction of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. The Hospitallers' Church has, in one sense, met with more severe treatment than the Temple Church. There is little left of this Church except the crypt and a few bases of Purbeck marble of one or two pillars in the nave. The round part of the Temple Church is standing, but it has been restored. The eastern part of the crypt of St. John's Church is that built in 1185, and the junction between the two styles, the early Norman of the first Church and the transition of the second Church, is very well marked.

Of about the same period is the Bell Tower of the Tower of London. This tower now forms part of the house of the Lieutenant of the Tower, General Milman, who, I make no doubt, with his usual courtesy, will permit you to see the construction of it. The date is, I believe, 1190. These buildings mark the distinctly transition period—so that we have a fair representation of the architecture of the Norman and transition period.

Within the next few years the Church of St. Mary Overey, the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, and the Chancel of the Temple Church were built, and here, if I may be permitted to do so, I should like to indulge in a digression. In many respects the most interesting of these churches is the Church of St. Mary Overey. If you will take a map, and draw a straight line from Southwark to Shoreham, you will find that it will pass through the parishes of Carshalton and Reigate. Any person who casually visits these four churches, viz., St. Mary Overey, Carshalton, Reigate and Shoreham, will come to the conclusion that they were built at the same time by the same architect, or at all events, by the same gang of workmen. Why there should be a connection between Shoreham and the other three churches, unless the workmen were following the main road up to London, it is not quite so easy to tell. But as between St. Mary Overey, Carshalton and Reigate there is a very interesting and easy connection, I do not know at what time the architects began to use Reigate stone, but they did so in the thirteenth century. In the

early accounts of the building of Westminster Abbey, it seems that the chalk with which the roof was made was bought from Henry de Carshalton, who no doubt lived at Carshalton and owned the extensive chalk pits which existed between Carshalton and the well-known house, The Oaks. These chalk pits are now overgrown with yews and other trees, and form a very picturesque object in the ride from Carshalton to Woodmanstern. This I believe is the nearest point to London from which chalk could be got. At the same time the stone for the building was being brought from the neighbourhood of Reigate. This I think affords a sufficient connection between Reigate and Carshalton, and the buildings then erected in London, and makes it clear why the churches of St. Mary Overey, Carshalton and Reigate, which were all built at the same time, should have been built under the same influence. A very short time afterwards the architects found that chalk could be got as conveniently from the neighbourhood of Reigate as it could from Carshalton. The Reigate stone, as it is probably well-known to most of you, did not come from Reigate, but from the hills lying between Merstham Station and Godstone, where extensive old quarries still exist The Reigate stone, as it is called, crops out just below the chalk, which forms the range of hills called the North Downs. The part of the range of hills from which the stone came lies in the parish of Chaldon, and it is interesting to see that, in the accounts for building Westminster Abbey, the stone is bought from Roger de Reigate, and the chalk from Richard (and afterwards from Agnes) de Chaldon, and Carshalton was deserted. I should think it is probable that it was from this connection that Chaldon Church came to be ornamented with the curious wall-painted picture of the Last Judgment, which is known to many of you, and that to it Chipstead Church, which is the Church of the adjoining parish, is indebted for the beautiful central crossing and the groined roof with which it is ornamented.

If you have not already done so you will probably visit the Chapel at Lambeth Palace. This Chapel has, I believe, been attributed among other builders to a person we know very well—Archbishop Hubert Walter, a distinguished Archbishop in the reigns of King Richard and King John.

To the same date may be attributed the chancel of the Temple Church. This was a period during which the greatest proportion of the Temple Buildings in England were either built or repaired.

A very few years later, namely, in 1242, in the reign of King Henry the Third, began the reconstruction of Westminster Abbey. If we had no building in London except Westminster Abbey this alone would furnish us with a complete history of Gothic architecture. If I do not refer to it at length again in this short address it is only because you have already seen it, and had explained to you the manner in which the building of the Abbey proceeded continuously from the reign of King Henry the Third until just before the suppression of the Abbey, and that the buildings were erected in one harmonious design, so that while it is possible by examination of the details to trace which part of the Church was building at a particular period, the building itself produces in the main the impression of having all been built at the same time. King Henry the Third also greatly enlarged the fortifications of the Tower of London—it is said that he built the Traitors' Gate and St. Thomas' Tower. You will see the Tower yourselves. I particularly notice the Traitors' Gate because of its peculiar construction—the arch has no key-stone, and the stones are held together by notches—a not uncommon practice in the East, where it is a preservation in case of earthquake, but I do not know any other in England. I should have thought it was later. Towards the latter end of the thirteenth century Bishop de Luda built the Chapel in Ely Place. It is a beautiful specimen of the Geometric style of architecture, the most beautiful in London. During this period the work in Westminster Abbey was in progress. In the year 1347, St. Stephen's Chapel at Westminster was built. Of this the crypt alone remains. During the next 50 years Westminster Hall was rebuilt, and the Church of the Augustinian Friars in the City, but it was in the commencement of the fifteenth century that rebuilding in London had its greatest impetus. The century opens with the rebuilding of the Guildhall, in the year 1411. The Guildhall is a building of great interest, and it has a very perfect crypt, which you will study with interest.

The mention of crypts brings me to mention another matter. It is astonishing the number of crypts, or so-called crypts, which must have existed in London. These are continually being discovered and destroyed. The real question is what they were. In the first place, with regard to some of them, I doubt if they were crypts at all. The level of London has been raised so unevenly, that in some instances I think they must be the ground floor of some building destroyed at the Fire. The word crypt carries with it a sort of mysterious feeling; but, after all, a crypt was merely a cellar in many cases. In proof of this I would appeal to any gentlemen here who know the ancient and loyal City of Winchelsea, of which I am an honorary freeman. The crypts or cellars of the old town extend far into the neighbouring fields, and my grandfather's sheep in the hot weather used to shade themselves in one of the many rows of cellars with which the fields are honeycombed. I do not believe Winchelsea was ever completed. The architect laid out his streets at right angles, and along the line of the streets made cellars with beautiful early Fourteenth century groining, upon which the houses, which were never built, were to be built. In London they were built. A photograph which I exhibit of a crypt lately discovered, and destroyed, in Ironmonger Lane will illustrate what I mean. You, gentlemen, can see one in full use in Laurence Pountney Lane, and there must still be plenty more. With respect to this I urge the gentlemen to go and see that at Laurence Pountney Lane at once. It is private property—it is threatened with destruction—and, good and perfect as it is, no power except that of money can preserve it. In that respect I fear antiquaries are like conies—a feeble folk.

The Churches of St. Ethelburga, St. Helen's, and the beautiful south-west porch of St. Sepulchre's were all built at this period. In the year 1465 Crosby Hall was built, and although an eating-house is not a convenient place in which to study antiquities, it is well worth a visit. The Hall of Lincoln's Inn was built about the same time. This hall is interesting, and although repeated alterations to suit the requirements of a law court, for which it was never intended, have, to some extent, spoilt it, still it is interesting. Merchant Taylor's Hall is of about the same

date, and there is attached to this Hall a very interesting series of buildings, part of which (including a crypt) is at least as old as the Hall. The Gate of Lincoln's Inn was built in 1481—this is now a very poor affair—the groining is gone, and the gate itself overtopped by new chambers. The Gate of Lambeth Palace was built in 1490—this is a much more satisfactory piece of building and better preserved.

In the year 1502 King Henry the Seventh's Chapel was added on to Westminster Abbey, and two years later (1504) St. John's Gate, Clerkenwell, was built. This latter is a very perfect specimen of Domestic architecture of this date, and although it has been repaired, it still retains its principal features. Another specimen of domestic architecture is a part of the Charterhouse. In 1526 the small cloisters, now enclosed in the Houses of Parliament, were added to the Chapel of St. Stephen's, and about ten years later the Gateway of St. James' Palace. This is the latest specimen of Pre-Reformation work that I know of in London. The rest of King Henry the Eight's reign, and the reign of that brilliant young prig, his son, were mainly occupied by pulling down. There was very little building done then. It is very curious, but of the style which is called Elizabethan I do not find satisfactory examples. Some of the city halls must have been built or adapted then, but they were mostly burned at the Fire. The only buildings of importance that I can mention are the Hall of the Temple, built in 1570, and a part of the Charterhouse, which is of about the same date. In the year 1623 the Chapel at Lincoln's Inn was built, and I would commend it to your notice as an extraordinary good specimen, as far as the outside of the building and the undercroft upon which it stands is concerned, of Gothic Architecture at this time. It is so good, that I believe some doubt existed as to whether it was not of an earlier date ; but the account of the building was found, leaving no doubt that it was built at that time.

There were two churches in the city built about the same time, the Church of St. Alban, Wood Street, and St. Katharine Cree Church. St. Alban, Wood Street, was burnt at the Fire of London, and rebuilt in the same

style after it by Sir Christopher Wren; the apse at the east end was an addition of Sir George Gilbert Scott, and a happy one, as at the time it was the means of preserving the church, but it is not part of the original structure. The Church of St. Katharine Cree Church was consecrated in the year 1630, and quite independently of its architectural merits as a church it is of great historical interest. The service used by Archbishop Laud at the consecration of it, in 1630, was one of the subjects of the indictment preferred against him by the Puritans. But there is another interesting feature in St. Katharine Cree Church. The tower is part of the original building; against the east wall of the north side of the tower is preserved the westernmost pillar of the old arcade, dividing the nave from the south aisle. The condition of the tower piers, and particularly of this pillar, shows the extent to which the original church was below the surface of the church of 1630 and of the present pavement. The contemporary accounts show that the pavement of London had risen round the church, and that the inside of the church was partly filled up when the new church was rebuilt. This part of London was not burnt at the Fire. I consider St. Katharine Cree Church a very satisfactory specimen of church architecture, and it looks to me as if, but for the Fire of London, we should have at this time probably developed in London a new style of architecture of modified Gothic. But the Fire of London came immediately afterwards, and the whole re-building of the city falling into the hands of Sir Christopher Wren, except in the instances I shall presently mention, stopped this at once and for ever. In the reign of King Charles the First, and not long before the great Rebellion, another important building was built at Westminster, the Banqueting House at Whitehall.

The Fire in 1666 swept away, together with St. Paul's Cathedral, which must have been at least as interesting a study of architecture as Westminster Abbey, by far the greater part of the churches within the walls and some within the liberties also, together with Castle Baynard, the old buildings of the Steelyard and the Merchants' Houses and Palaces. When Sir Christopher Wren commenced to rebuild he was within certain fixed lines practically left a free hand. There are, however, the following churches

which from a variety of circumstances he was compelled to rebuild in the Gothic style. First, St. Mary Aldermary. Some portion of the original tower had remained, and upon a careful examination of the church you will find in the church itself some other remains of the old perpendicular work which Sir Christopher Wren used in his building. Secondly, St. Alban's, Wood Street. This church had just been built by Inigo Jones, and was also rebuilt by Sir Christopher Wren in the Gothic style. Thirdly, the tower and spire of St. Dunstan's in the East. Fourthly, the tower of St. Michael's, Cornhill. In repairing the Church of St. Sepulchre's a great deal of the old work was preserved. St. Sepulchre's has undergone several restorations, but the tower is an extremely beautiful one. The tower of St. Michael's, Cornhill, is entirely Wren's, and is a very fine piece of work, with very bold and effective proportions, but poor detail. The tower and spire of St. Dunstan's in the East are as good as St. Michael's and very delicate. St. Mary Aldermary I think retains more of the old tower built before the fire than either of the two others, and is almost a restoration rather than a rebuilding. When Sir Christopher Wren was allowed a free hand as to his style he abandoned all attempts to imitate Gothic architecture. The parochial feeling in the City was at that time very strong. If Sir Christopher Wren had had his own way he would have united many of the small parishes and built a few large churches, but the strong parochial feeling prevented this, and the value of the land generally limited him to building upon the space upon which the old churches had stood, and as a general rule he built upon the old foundations. The extent to which he was allowed to encroach upon the churchyards was very slight indeed, but the manner in which he treated the buildings was very remarkable Probably the best instance is St. Stephen's, Walbrook, but with St. Stephen's, Walbrook, may be compared St. Mary Abchurch, St. Swithin, London Stone, St. Mary-at-Hill, St. Mildred, Bread Street, and All Hallows, Lombard Street. It is always said that in building St. Paul's Cathedral Sir Christopher Wren wished to have taken as his model the church of St. Stephen, Walbrook. St. Stephen's, Walbrook, is said, itself to be a

copy of a church in Rome, but I have never found the particular building. Although in St. Paul's Cathedral there are many features which may be considered unsatisfactory, still I think it is a matter not to be regretted that Sir Christopher Wren's original intention was controlled. I cannot imagine anything more satisfactory than the central dome; this was no doubt copied from Ely Cathedral, of which his uncle, Matthew Wren, was Bishop, and in which Cathedral there is, or was at all events when I was a boy, some of Sir Christopher's handiwork, but it would be curious to know whether Sir Christopher or Alan de Walsingham, the builder of the octagon at Ely, were indebted to the Byzantine architects for the arrangement by which the dome is supported upon eight arches instead of four. This arrangement was well known in the tenth and eleventh centuries in Greece. I do not know any instances of it in any other part of the Levant except, perhaps, in the Patriarchal Church at Alexandria, which building has been very much injured. However, the plan of supporting the dome upon eight arches is well shown in the Church of St. Nicodemus at Athens, in the Church of the Monastery at Daphne on the road from Athens to Eleusis, and in the large monastic Church of St. Luke at Stiri. The church at Daphne was the burying-place of one or more of the Angivine Dukes of Athens. The particular form of building must have been well known to the western monks, some of whom indeed tried their hands on the building at Daphne, so that it is most probable that Alan de Walsingham got his idea from them, and Sir Christopher Wren took his design from Ely Cathedral.

There are several other interesting churches by Sir Christopher Wren that should be seen—St. Peter-upon-Cornhill, St. Magnus, Bow Church, and St. Bride, these are all good specimens of his large churches; St. Lawrence, Jewry, St. Edmund the King and Martyr, St. Andrew by the Wardrobe, are specimens of his smaller churches. St. James', Garlick Hythe, is the only church in the City built by Sir Christopher Wren, except St. Paul's, which has an apse.

I have said that Sir Christopher Wren built of necessity upon the old foundations, even to the extent of being

obliged to follow the irregularities in the shapes of the older churches; this may be seen by any person who chooses to visit St. Margaret's, Lothbury. The church here is shorter at the north than at the south side, and the east wall runs at an angle to the north and south walls, the altar, which was part of Sir Christopher's design, has been made to fit the angle of the east wall so as to present a straight line to the body of the church. Accidently I discovered an old ground plan of the church before the Fire, showing that Sir Christopher Wren had followed exactly the foundations of the older church, which was similarly irregular. But I should like to say one other word about Sir Christopher Wren. Sir Christopher did the best he could. To each of the parishes a certain sum was allotted, and he gave them the best he could for the money, but that the best was not always satisfactory it is useless to deny. Sir Christopher seldom troubled himself to do more than build upon the existing foundations; the churches he built were built upon different principles to those which they replaced, and in many instances the foundations were not strong enough to carry the substituted building. If any of the gentlemen present care to spend half-an-hour in visiting the Church of St. Michael Bassishaw, he will see exactly what I mean. The Church of St. Michael Bassishaw is one of those in which I think, though I am not sure, Sir Christopher Wren exceeded the limits of the old church. The northern wall is built upon the wall of the old church and has bulged, the south wall seems to me to stand beyond the limits of the old church. The church is divided into a nave and two aisles, with a row of what appear to be rather handsome pillars. In the course of a recent reparation it was discovered, in the first place, that these pillars were wood covered with plaster, and, in the next place, that they were built upon such insecure foundations that they all required under-pinning. This church, however, illustrates another danger, which Sir Christopher Wren's churches are going to be subjected to, and which, unless I am very much mistaken, is likely to be more formidable than the successive attempts of the Bishops of London to destroy them under the Union of Benefices Act. The gentlemen present, if they do not know it, must learn that up to the year 1845, or thereabouts

it was the universal practice to bury in these churches and to bury over and over again. For nearly the last fifty years the churches have been closed for burials, and no interments have taken place; but the favourite plan now is for the officer of health, if he sees a church under repair, to come in and to suggest that he smells an unwholesome smell, and to request the removal of a piece of the pavement. Then follows an immediate request that the church should be emptied of all the bodies. There are no funds out of which this can be done except a rate upon the parishioners, and if, as is almost sure to happen, something further is necessary to be done, the ratepayers, consisting principally of persons non-resident in the parish, vote and will vote for the union of the parish to some adjoining parish, where the same history in all probability, will be repeated. This danger to Sir Christopher Wren's churches is a much more subtle one than the direct attack by successive Bishops; I could combat the one, I do not think I can the other. It may be a subject of consideration how this new danger is to be met, but my address is not, I think, the proper time to discuss this.

Of the City Halls built at this period, the most characteristic seems to me to be Vintners' Hall, in Thames Street. It is a very interesting specimen of Domestic architecture of this date, and is practically unchanged.

The successors of Sir Christopher Wren built many buildings and churches in London. One of the most notable is St. Mary Woolnoth, built by Hawksmoor in the very first days of the eighteenth century. In the same way as in the case of the Church of St. Katharine Cree Church, it seems to me we were at this time on the verge of developing a style of architecture. It seems to me likely that, if the architect of St. George's, Bloomsbury, and St. George's-in-the-East had had a following, his school might have developed a style not unlike that of the churches in Central Syria and produced buildings convenient for service and of great constructive merit. I commend to your notice not the classical façade and tower of St. George's, Bloomsbury, but the body of the church as a study of this style, and particularly the outside of it.

The next epoch is marked by the style of which the Bank of England is the best example, and this was

succeeded by the classical style represented by St. Philip's, Regent Street, and St. Pancras. This style was succeeded by what the Bishop of Oxford calls the Gothic revival which commenced with Sir Walter and culminated with Sir Gilbert Scott. Of this revival the gentlemen may find many examples in London, including among them Mr. Brandon's beautiful building for the Irvingite community in Gordon Square, and Mr. Pearson's Church of St. John, Red Lion Square. If I do not mention others it is from no desire to disparage them, but the most hopeful thing I can say about them is that my friend Mr. Micklethwaite tells me that we are gradually working out in a practical way a method of church building suited to our present requirements.

I believe Lord Chief Baron Pollock used to receive the successive Lord Mayors with the remark that the City of London was in ruins. He meant, I suppose, in course of rebuilding. The London which I remember as a boy is passing away; old churches, halls, houses, and streets have gone, and have been replaced by buildings in which every style of architecture has been introduced. You will see these as you walk along, I need not tell you of them. This then is the end of my address. We are archæologists here, we are not architects. I do not pretend to have exhausted the subject, a cockney like myself could find many charming little bits to show you in an afternoon walk—the cloisters of the Bluecoat School and the south front of that building, the Court of Barnard's Inn and some of the adjoining houses, or the row of houses at Holborn Bars, called Staple Inn. In the east end of the City there are all sorts of interesting peeps. You might do worse than spend your Sunday afternoon in prowling about the City. But I have said enough; I am not an architect; but I have, I think, shown you where you may study architecture while you are here, and that without, as I said, incurring a heavy bill for cab hire.