

## VII

# Introduction to the Maps

*Henry Johns*

WHEN the first of our volumes was published in 1969 its combination of good scholarship and scientifically based mapping was universally recognized as establishing a new world standard in historical cartography. In order to provide a framework for continuity in the publication of the series, and more generally encourage the study of urban topography, the Historic Towns Trust was established.

Before the publication of the present volume no medieval mapping record of London existed. Our task was to provide the missing dimensions of the periods of *c.*1270 and *c.*1520 using scientific methods of topographical survey and cartography in the reconstruction of ground features in their proper historical setting. The topography of London has fascinated generations of scholars but the methods had eluded them whereby the mass of medieval records, mainly in the form of the written word, could be used to reconstruct the topography of London as a related whole for any selected period of its history.

The earliest surviving mapping records date no earlier than the late sixteenth century: Agas, engraved after 1561 and before 1566–70; Braun and Hogenberg, 1st edition 1572; Norden, 1st edition 1593. These maps are of interest on account of their date but the depiction of ground features in these pictorial representations is far too generalized for reliable cartographic use. The best maps of the seventeenth century are Leake 1666, and Ogilby and Morgan 1677. These maps show the progressive rebuilding of the city after the Great Fire of 1666, which changed most of the old urban landscape. Streets and lanes were widened, others destroyed, and new thoroughfares made. Much of the magnificent medieval architecture and other old landmarks was irretrievably lost, including churches, many of which were not rebuilt. An appreciation of these maps is given below.

Leake's large-scale map (34 inches to 1 mile approx.) was surveyed and published shortly before the Great Fire. It was on this map that Leake himself was charged by the Fire Commissioners to record the area of devastation wrought by the fire as well as indicating the sides of streets and lanes in the course of widening, including the direction of new streets, before rebuilding started. As we discovered after a detailed examination of Leake's map, the accuracy of his original survey would not stand up to critical ground inspection, especially the width of streets and lanes. This must have become known to Leake when he was undertaking the work for the Fire Commissioners and would account for the additional annotations in figures (which we now know to

have been feet) recording pre-fire widths of streets and lanes at selected intervals, still discernible on the ground after the Great Fire. This positive evidence of the sides of streets and lanes at selected intervals provides unique information on which to base the position and alignment of the medieval street pattern. The interpretation and application of Leake's annotated information had escaped the notice of many generations of scholars concerned with the medieval topography of London.

It is important to mention that Leake's map shows the ground plans of pre-fire churches, which are no better than indicative of their shape and size before destruction in the Great Fire; yet, with careful application of this information together with archaeological and other records, the ground plans of medieval churches can be reliably reconstructed in most cases.

The Ogilby and Morgan large-scale survey (50 inches to 1 mile approx.), published in 1677, was a remarkable and ambitious undertaking for its time. The survey shows in great detail the streets, lanes, alleys, and buildings of the new urban landscape existing eleven years after the Great Fire before rebuilding was entirely completed. It also delineates the City, Ward, and Parish boundaries.

However, an evaluation of this survey reveals that the methods used produced significant errors in the position of many ground features. The types of error are wide and varied, but most stem from the cause that the survey was based on an uncontrolled framework from which it was impossible to obtain accurate relative relationship between ground features shown on the map. There are errors in linear measurements—in one instance a chain error (66 ft.) exists between two streets, which results in considerable distortion of the map features in that locality. The surveyors appear to have made no attempt to ascertain the direction of lanes and alleys leading off streets and in one case, for example, a building only 150 ft. along an alley from the street is 50 ft. in error from its true ground position due to the angle of the alley from the street being incorrectly depicted on the map: this type of error is frequent throughout the survey and produces serious distortions in the position, shape, size, and alignment of many buildings and other ground features. This characteristic is common to all maps until the advent of the scientifically controlled Ordnance Survey maps of the nineteenth century. The Ogilby and Morgan survey is, nevertheless, a remarkable administrative and consultative document and, although the surveyors never mastered the principles of large-scale topographical mapping, it was the best that could

be achieved at this period with the knowledge available and in the absence of scientific instruments.

The main use of this map for medieval research was in the area of the city which escaped the Great Fire. It was in this area that we were able to identify old landmarks and other features of medieval origin including the remains of monastic establishments which had suffered partial destruction at the dissolution of the monasteries in c.1540. With the application of archaeological information and the interpretation of medieval records, assisted by the work of scholars over many generations, we were able to reconstruct these medieval features in their original form to a sensible degree of accuracy and in their proper historical setting.

When this work in mapping the topography of medieval London was planned, it was not envisaged that it could prove so complex or take fifteen years to complete, even with the great catalogue of information extending over many centuries. In the following subsections of this chapter are given the methods used in reconstructing the topography in mapping form, together with examples of delineating ground features from the written word alone.

To enable a comparative study to be made of the changing urban landscape of London we have used the map of c.1520 on which to show the principal ground features of the Roman and late thirteenth-century periods.

### A. The Reconstruction of Medieval London in Mapping Form

Throughout the progressive construction of the large-scale plans it became increasingly clear that the medieval information emerging would require a fresh, overall, historical interpretation and reassessment. For the first time medieval London could be seen and studied as a related whole, rather than in unrelated parts.

#### *Construction of the medieval mapping framework*

The construction of these unique maps of the medieval period was based on the sound surveying principle of working from the whole to the part—that is, by establishing on the first scientifically surveyed plans of the mid-nineteenth century a reliable framework of the known positions of existing medieval ground features to form accurate graphical control points. These control points were, in general, the isolated remains of known medieval features such as parts of walls, churches, monastic establishments, city wall, principal buildings, and other topographical features. The sources for these isolated remains were culled from research into the classification and dating from archaeological records. No attempt at this stage was made to complete the medieval features from these isolated remains: to have done so would have produced unacceptable errors of relationship or orientation between other ground features not yet established.

The next stage was to produce the main street and lane patterns of the medieval period, for until these were established in some detail the buildings and other topographical features could not be reliably located for position and orientation.

Following the Great Fire of 1666 much of the medieval street pattern changed—streets and lanes were widened, others built over, and new streets constructed. Although there was written documentary evidence of the width of

many medieval streets and lanes it could not be sensibly used until the ground relationship was known between the medieval streets and the post-fire changes. The first clue to this solution was found on Leake's map of 1666, resurveyed immediately after the Great Fire, on which are indicated the sides of the streets widened, or being widened, with their pre-fire widths annotated in feet, at selected intervals. This vital information could not be transferred directly to the scientific map framework under construction as it was essential that the relevant post-fire street pattern had first to be accurately established before applying Leake's annotated information. By a careful inspection of the post-fire large-scale survey of c.1677 by Ogilby and Morgan, it was possible to identify many of these streets and lanes, in whole or part, on the first scientific survey of the mid-nineteenth century by the Ordnance Survey.

It was now possible, from this additional control framework of the relevant street patterns, to 'survey-in' the streets and lanes to a fuller extent, and to adjust their widths and alignments using Leake's vital information and other source material supplied by the historians. Most of Leake's annotated information proved to be identical with the street widths of the medieval period. The phrase 'survey-in' used above means to complete a feature by cartographic and survey revision methods using the rigid control points previously established. By this means information to be added is contained within a dense graphical control network of fixed ground points which reduces the possibility of error.

At this stage a skeletal medieval map framework had been constructed, which consisted of isolated medieval remains still existing in the mid-nineteenth century, and a detailed mapping record of many of the medieval street and lane patterns on which most of the remaining ancient features could be reliably located and delineated.

#### *Detailed compilation and delineation of medieval map features*

This stage was concerned with the addition of all the known principal ground features—castles, churches, monastic establishments, public and private buildings, defence systems, ditches and streams, and other water features including wharfs of the river front. The sources for these were wide and varied. They were mainly cartographical, archaeological, architectural, along with the written word, although the latter assumed greater importance during the final stage of mapping.

The same compilation procedure was used as hitherto, but with an increased emphasis on delineating, where possible, the extent, shape, and size of the medieval ground features in their proper orientated positions. Great care was necessary in the use of architectural plans for they are not in the strict sense topographical: these had to be 'surveyed-in' relative to other ground features to obtain the correct orientation.

An example of this, and there were others, was Wren's plan showing the relationship of the medieval St Paul's Cathedral with his rebuilding of it after the Great Fire: it proved incorrect for comparative relationship of one to the other. Orientation is a fundamental principle of topographical survey and unless applied no reliable reconstruction of ground features is possible.

The map was now at an advanced stage of development and the medieval ground features were appearing, for the first time, as a related whole rather than in unrelated parts. There was now sufficient visual topographical information of the

medieval period to start the final phase of mapping where the only evidence was limited to the written word, mainly of medieval origin.

#### *Final stage of map compilation*

The medieval descriptions of ground features were never written for the purpose of precise topographical delineation because, at the time they were written, such features were easily recognized on the ground without elaboration. But with an elapsed period of between 400 and 700 years most of these ancient features had long since disappeared.

The use of the written word for the siting and delineation of ground features was a lengthy and exacting task. It was essential that all evidences relating to a particular feature had first to be evaluated in order to reconcile conflicting information. There was then the problem of the interpretation of the written word, for unless there is material vision to aid the eye of the mind the interpretation is all too often valueless. With the mapping record of the medieval period now available at an advanced stage, the understanding of the written word became clearer and it was possible to complete the ground extent of many features, to confirm others, and to locate others to a reasonable degree of certainty. This was a challenging and rewarding stage as many new and important ground features of historical significance emerged for the first time in their proper topographical and historical setting.

This unique topographical mapping record provides the missing visual dimension of the ancient city from which a fuller and more reliable study can be made than hitherto of London life, its history and topography.

### **B. How the Destroyed Features of Baynard's castle and Montfichet castle Were Delineated from the Written Word Alone**

#### *Montfichet castle c.1080 to 1275*

1. The ground position of this castle was established from a careful study of three deeds relating to the sale of land and buildings for the period c.1228 to c.1247. These were:

- (a) 'all land and buildings which lie against the land which was of Master Hugh of London outside the Atrium of St Paul's against Castle Montfichet' (St Paul's Deed, Box 15, No. 1359, c.1228-1240);
- (b) 'land and buildings in the corner opposite the land of the Dean of St Paul's [i.e. the deanery] between the land of David Long, chaplain, to the north and the road south which leads towards the city wall following against the ditch of Castle Montfichet' (St Paul's Deed, Box 15, No. 402, c.1228-1240);
- (c) Grant by abbess of Caen to Henry, the dean and chapter of St Paul's—'all land and buildings in the city near Castle Montfichet from the west side of the house of the said Henry...' (St Paul's Deed, Box 24, No. 1746, c.1246-7).

2. To determine the ground position of this castle it was first necessary to know the relative ground positions of specific topographical features mentioned in the deeds. These were: the atrium of St Paul's; the road to the south which led towards the city wall following against the ditch of Castle

Montfichet; the deanery of St Paul's; and the city wall. (These features had already been established on our working map compilation of London for c.1270.)

The Atrium was the court at the west end of the medieval St Paul's Cathedral. The deanery was 250 feet south-west from the west end of the cathedral on the north side of the road which led towards the city wall following against the ditch of Montfichet castle: this road was Carter Lane, not referred to by name until c.1286. The city wall, at the period the deeds were written, extended from Ludgate direct to the River Thames, diverging eastwards at a small angle from the line of the city wall north of Ludgate. With the above named features already depicted on the map compilation, the eye of the mind had sufficient visual topographical and cartographical assistance to interpret, more reliably, the written word of the deeds, which enabled the position of Montfichet castle to be sited and delineated to within a sensible degree of accuracy for the first time.

Thus: the southern boundary of the castle extended west from a point very close to the first property west of the deanery, the property and the deanery being on the north side of the unnamed road (later Carter Lane), which led towards the city wall following against the ditch of the castle. The eastern boundary ran north from the same point, very close to the first property west of the deanery to an approximate position about 130 ft. west of the atrium of St Paul's or 260 ft. west from the south-west end of the cathedral. The northern boundary extended west from this close approximation of the north-east corner, at some short distance south of the road (later Bowyer Row), leading to Ludgate. The western boundary was, with reasonable certainty, the city wall.

This establishes, beyond doubt, that Montfichet castle was a separate fortification from that of Baynard's castle, which supports William FitzStephen's mention of two very strong castles in the west, recorded in his 'Description of London', c.1174.

3. There is no written record to indicate the position of the tower known to have existed within the enclosure of the castle, but it may be assumed that it was roughly central, sited on a mound: it has been depicted as such on the map. This assumption may have some merit and the following reason for it is worth attention.

It was noticed in a London mapping record of archaeological finds of the Roman period that a quantity of stones were found west of Sporyer Rowe, now Creed Lane, which, interestingly, was within the boundary enclosure of Montfichet castle, as defined above. When the tower of the castle was pulled down in c.1275, the stones would have been used for other building purposes and those not required would have been left scattered upon the ground at the base of the mound. Subsequently, when the mound of the tower was levelled, earth would have been deposited over the unwanted stones giving a false surface depth of the period relating to the archaeological find, alleged to be Roman. Moreover, there is more than a distinct possibility that the archaeologists who carried out the excavations were not aware that the site in which they were digging was that of Montfichet castle, for we can find no record that the boundaries of this castle were known, until sited and delineated from the results of our research. It could well be that the scattered stones could be of the tower of Montfichet.

*Baynard's castle c.1080 to 1275*

4. In 1275 Robert Fitzwalter obtained licence from the Crown to convey Baynard's castle and Montfichet castle to the archbishop of Canterbury for the foundation of a new house and church of the Blackfriars which was, at this time, in Holborn towards the north end of Shoe Lane on the east side (*LBC*, 71 n).

5. On 10 June 1276 (*LBC*, 71) is recorded a confirmation by King Edward of a grant, formerly made to the archbishop, of two lanes adjacent to his place of Baynard's castle and Montfichet castle, for the purpose of enlarging the place of the Blackfriars on condition that the archbishop should provide the citizens with a more convenient way. Neither of these two lanes could have been the later named 'St Andrew's Hill' running south from Carter Lane to the River Thames, as this lane or highway is mentioned as early as 1264 (*HR* 3/6, 1264).

Of particular interest is the fact that no thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century references have been found relating to lanes and properties on the west side of this highway, unlike the east side where many properties, including lanes, are recorded, together with St Andrew's church, bearing the appellation of 'de Castello' in c.1244. This suggests that the west side of the highway (St Andrew's Hill) formed the east boundary of Baynard's castle. From our working map compilation of London at c.1270 the distance from the west side of this highway to the city wall was 180 ft. at the south end near the River Thames, increasing to 280 ft. where it joined Carter Lane to the north, directly opposite the east boundary of Montfichet castle (see (2) above). From these evidences the inference is that the city wall (and ditch) formed the west boundary of Baynard's castle, an identical procedure adopted in the usage of the city wall as the east boundary of the Tower of London at the south-east angle of the walled city. That the beginnings of the Tower in the east and of Baynard's castle (and perhaps of Montfichet castle) in the west were contemporaneous is hinted at by William of Poitiers (ed. R. Foreville (Paris, 1952), p. 236).

6. Very little emphasis has been placed by historians on the importance of the castles built in the west of the city during the Conqueror's time. The principal role of Baynard's castle, as a study of the topography clearly supports, was to control the River Thames at the west end of the walled city, and, in addition and too often overlooked, the wide tidal estuary of the River Fleet barely 120 yards west of the city wall. Without control of this important tidal estuary and the River Thames at the west end of the city, it would have been increasingly difficult to keep in obedience the populace of the city which had submitted unwillingly to the Conqueror. Interestingly, the barbican of the castle is now known to have been on the west side of the castle's defences: this has been established from references to sale of land and properties outside the city wall, which are as follows.

From the Hundred Roll for the city of 1279, unpublished because damaged: 'Also they say [the jurors] that Adam Bruning, while he was Alderman of Castle Ward, obstructed a certain lane of a width of 4 ft. between the house of the Prior of Ogbourne and the house which was of Hillary le Porter towards the Thames . . .'. The same Hillary appropriated to himself the ditch of the castle, near the barbican of the castle, on which he raised a certain earth wall. (*PROSC*5/London Tower Series/1m.19.) In 1304 (*HR* 32/87), 'Silvester

de Burstalle and Katherine his wife quitclaimed their right in tenements . . . in the parish of St Andrew Baynard castle . . . between the tenement of the Prior of Ogbourne on the west and the tenement of the late Hillary the draper on the east'. (Silvester de Burstalle and his wife were related to Adam Bruning mentioned above.)

7. On 8 January 1278 (*LBA*, 222) there is a reference to 'an inquisition by the Mayor and Sheriffs as to whether any, and if so, what damage would arise if the King were to allow a certain ditch dividing land in Baynard's castle, the property of the archbishop of Canterbury, to be filled up in order that the two parcels of land might adjoin . . .'.

These two parcels of land were, with reasonable certainty, the separate castles of Baynard and Montfichet granted to the archbishop in 1275. We know from the delineation of Montfichet castle (given in (2) above) that the south boundary of this castle was a ditch with a road following towards the city wall. This ditch was, most probably, the one in question, and the road following it one of the two lanes granted by the king to the archbishop over a year earlier for the enlargement of his place—the Blackfriars (see (5) above). These two parcels would then have adjoined. Also mentioned at the same inquisition of 1278 was the subject of 'pulling down part of the city wall near Ludgate, and to build a new strong wall from the turret of the said gate, between the inhabitants of Fleet Street and the archbishop's place, as far as the Fleet River for the city's protection'.

The old city wall (forming the west boundaries of the castles) was pulled down and rebuilt, extending west to the River Fleet from just south of Ludgate, then due south on the east bank of the River Fleet to the River Thames: the additional extension south to the Thames not being completed until some time after 1315.

The destruction of the old city wall was to allow the archbishop to enlarge his place (the castles of Baynard and Montfichet) to conform with his building plans for the large house and church of the Blackfriars: the confines of the castles being too small to accommodate his plans. The possibility should also be mentioned here that the other of the two lanes granted to the archbishop for enlarging the Blackfriars in June 1276 was outside the city wall (see (5) above).

8. The interpretation of the evidence, so far, indicates that the east boundary of the castle was on the west side of 'St Andrew's Hill'; the west boundary of the castle was the old city wall and ditch; the barbican was on the west side of the castle; the prior of Ogbourne's Inn and Hillary's house were west of the old city wall; one of the two lanes given to the archbishop to enlarge his place was the road or lane following the ditch of the south boundary of Montfichet castle; and the other lane was possibly outside the city wall.

9. It was now necessary to relate the interpretation of the early evidence of Baynard's castle to the later developed layout of the Blackfriars, which had been established previously on our working map compilation of London at the later medieval period of c.1520. Of particular interest was a lane extending from the west side of St Andrew's Hill in a north-west direction 50 ft. north of its junction with Thames Street. In this lane, on the south side, was the Duke's Wardrobe adjacent to St Andrew's Hill. This lane, at a point where it joined the site of the line of the old city wall, turned west almost at right angles to the wall for a distance of 210 ft. where it joined a north-south lane. This north-south lane had a peculiar topographical characteristic as it ran straight

from the River Thames north for 600 ft. to just above the gate by the porter's lodge where, by a series of 'dog-legs', it went north and east emerging about 50 ft. inside Ludgate at Bowyer Row. It was observed that no buildings of the Blackfriars extended west of this lane, and none extended to or beyond the east-west lane to the south in which the fifteenth-century Duke's Wardrobe was situated. This posed the problem: were these lanes or any part of them existing in c.1275 at the time the archbishop was granted the castles?

10. An examination of the lane in which the fifteenth-century's Duke's Wardrobe was situated, north-west from near the south end of St Andrew's Hill to the point where it joined the site of the line of the old city wall (the west boundary of the castle) showed that this part of the lane fell within the site of the castle precincts.

As no thirteenth- or early fourteenth-century records can be found of lanes or properties on the west side of St Andrew's Hill (the east boundary of the castle), the indication is that this part of the east-west lane was of later origin, after the castle was destroyed, and was made by the archbishop to provide the citizens with a more convenient way (see (5) above). The remainder of the east-west lane extending west from the old city wall to join the north-south lane appeared interesting as the prior of Ogbourne's Inn (later King's College Mansion) must have been somewhere in this area west of the city wall.

A lane is mentioned, unnamed, in the contemporary husting rolls, in which the thirteenth-century tenement of the prior of Ogbourne was situated on the south side of the lane, which must have run east-west. Stow also records a lane between the Blackfriars and the River Thames called, in 1352, Castle Lane, in which there was one great messuage of old time belonging to the priory of Ogbourne now called King's College Mansion. As this lane was the only east-west lane outside the Blackfriars' precinct it is reasonably certain that the prior's Inn was in this part of the lane with two other properties, including Hillary's by the castle ditch and near the barbican of the castle. Therefore this part of the lane appears to have existed at the time the archbishop was granted the castles in c.1275 (see (7) above). It is of interest to mention that this part of the lane from the west boundary of Baynards Castle (old city wall) to where it joined a north-south lane was 210 ft. as measured from the working map compilation of c.1270. This seems a reasonable distance for the three properties to have been accommodated and may have some significance relating to the siting of the barbican of the castle.

11. Although the north-south lane with a series of 'dog-leg' characteristics at its north end, which enclosed the west limits of the later Blackfriars' precincts (see (9) above) was for almost its entire length outside the old city wall, the northernmost 'dog-leg' crossed the line of the demolished old city wall 50 ft. south of Ludgate at the very point where the new replacement city wall ran west to the River Fleet (see (7) above). It is important to note that this replacement city wall truncated the lane at its north end, hence its divergence east and north to its emergence inside the line of the demolished old city wall, 50 ft. east of Ludgate.

Thus it is reasonable to suppose that the north-south lane could have originally extended (before it was truncated by the new city wall) from Fleet Street, west of Ludgate opposite the Old Bailey, directly south to give direct and easy access from outside the old city wall to the River Thames, the prior of Ogbourne's Inn, and the mill of the Templars on the River

Fleet (c.1162 to c.1307 when it was demolished). We know that when the building of the Blackfriars was completed its west precincts did not extend beyond this lane (see (9) above). Thus it is reasonable to conclude that this was the other lane given to the archbishop to enlarge his place of the Blackfriars.

12. Consequent upon the foregoing study of buildings and lanes existing before the destruction of Baynard's castle and Montfichet castle in c.1275, our working-map compilation for c.1270 now reflected a fairly comprehensive visual layout of the topography of the area before the building of the Blackfriars and the new city wall completely altered the landscape.

13. We know from (6) above that the barbican of Baynard's castle was on the west side and must have been close to Hillary's house for 'the same Hillary appropriated to himself the ditch of the Castle near the Barbican of the Castle' as the early reference mentions.

A barbican was an outer defence to a city or castle, as distinct from a turret which was a subordinate tower of a castle. The barbican would have protected the principal or most vulnerable entrance gate to the castle and it was the large estuary of the River Fleet, only 120 yds. west of the castle, which posed the greatest threat of attack. This means that the way from the gate of the castle and the barbican was east-west to the Fleet River, and only one lane has this characteristic, which is the lane where Hillary's house and the prior of Ogbourne's Inn were situated. As Hillary's house was known to be near the barbican it is a distinct possibility that where this lane joined the old city wall (the west boundary of the castle) was the entrance gate to the castle. If so, the barbican could have been built at this point attached to the city wall or on the west bank of the ditch, although the latter seems more likely. It is interesting to record that from the castle gate and barbican (as defined) the lane ran west to the mill of the Templars near to the estuary of the River Fleet. This lane could have served two purposes: (a) it gave quick, direct, and easy access to the Fleet estuary and the River Thames; and (b) it served in times of peace and rebellion as a secure provisioning convenience for supplies from the Templars' mill.

14. As previously established, the east boundary of Baynard's castle was on the west side of the highway (later St Andrew's Hill) (see (5) above). This part of the fortress must have had an entrance gate, but no record of such can be found. But it is of interest to establish its probable position, which arises from two references to a highway (long since gone) through the middle of the cemetery of St Andrew. These are: (a) 3s. rent from the house of Walter de Chabenhams between the tenement of Alan de Castello in the south and the highway through the middle of the cemetery in the north (*Cart. SBH* 564-1292-3); (b) 6d. from a messuage of Geoff. de Hales between the cemetery in the east and the road to the west, extending from the tenement of Jn. Fayrhod in the north to the road through the cemetery in the south (*Cart. SBH* 564-1292-3).

It was assumed that the tower of Baynard's castle had characteristics similar to those of the Tower of London as their beginnings were contemporary. The tower was sited where the higher ground started: from the River Thames the incline was exceptionally steep to the assumed position of the tower. By coincidence the highway through the cemetery joined the highway going north (St Andrew's Hill) at a point directly opposite, and central to, the east side of the tower. It

is at the point where the direction of the highway through the cemetery meets the curtain wall of the castle that the east gate has been sited.

15. It was now possible to study in more detail the road or lane that followed the south boundary ditch of Montfichet castle towards the old city wall (see (1) above).

When the building layout of the Blackfriars had been completed, a lane (later named Shoemaker Row or Lane) diverged from the deanery of St Paul's on the north side of Carter Lane in a north-west direction for 180 ft. from which point it went due west parallel with and about 15 ft. north of the Blackfriars church, through the site of the old city wall, to a north-south lane opposite the west end of the nave of the church. The south side of this lane completely encompassed the house and church of the Blackfriars except for the friars' cemetery and the lay persons' houses on the north side of the lane. In this lane was an entrance gate 170 ft. east of the nave of the church. It is most unlikely that this lane or any part of it was the site of the original lane or road following the south boundary ditch of Montfichet castle as it too neatly coincided with the developed layout of the Blackfriars; moreover, the lane acquired by the archbishop from the king in 1276 was for the purpose of enlarging his place. In January 1278 the archbishop was further granted permission to fill in 'a certain ditch' so that two parcels of land might adjoin. It is with reasonable certainty that the ditch was the south boundary of Montfichet castle and the lane following it to the old city wall was the division between the two separate castles—Montfichet to the north and Baynard's on the south.

We know from (1) above that the south-east corner of the ditch of Montfichet castle was very close to the first property west of the Deanery on the north side of Carter Lane, extended eastwards along the south side of the precinct of St Paul's Cathedral. If the north side of this lane is prolonged to the old city wall the site of both the lane and ditch of Montfichet castle falls under the chancel of the Blackfriars church. This siting of the lane dividing the two castles accords with the conditions of the grant by the king in 1276 for enlarging the site, without which the archbishop would have had this portion of the king's highway seriously restricting his plans for the building layout of the Blackfriars (see (5) and (7) above).

The other lane given by the king for enlarging the site was outside the old city wall and ditch. This area west of the old city wall (the boundary of both castles) extended to a north-south lane beyond which the precincts of the Blackfriars did not encroach. It was within this area that the greater portion of the conventual buildings were eventually sited, including the nave of the church but excluding the chancel—the Blackfriars church being built astride the site of the old city wall. The building of the church started in 1279 with, most probably, the chancel, followed by the nave after the old city wall had been demolished, the cloister being in course of construction in 1292 (see (5), (9), (10), (11) above).

16. The grant of the two lanes by the king imposed the condition that the archbishop had to provide the citizens with a more convenient way. One of the two lanes made by the archbishop must have been that part of the lane in which the fifteenth-century Duke's Wardrobe was situated (see (10) above).

From our map compilation of c. 1270, now nearing comple-

tion for this locality, the other lane constructed to provide the citizens with a more convenient way was, most likely, Sporenereslane (later Creed Lane) first mentioned by name in 1386, although its origin must have been earlier as its position falls within the east boundary ditch of Montfichet castle.

17. The c. 1114 Charter of Henry I granted to Richard de Belmeis, bishop of London, relates to the boundaries of the 'castle complex' in the west of the city, and to the supply of stones from the wall of the moat of the 'complex' for the rebuilding of St Paul's Cathedral, its new foundation having been started twenty-seven years earlier following the fire of 1087.

The northern boundaries of the 'castle complex' mentioned in the charter have caused some confusion to historians as they believed that the northern boundaries referred either to Baynard's castle or even the walled enclosure of London itself. This confusion arose because historians had no material aid to assist the eye of the mind in interpreting the meaning of the written word; without this aid the interpretation is all too often valueless or misleading. Moreover, charters were not written for the purposes of precise topographical delineation because at the time they were written the features were easily recognized on the ground without further elaboration.

To understand the meaning it was essential to delineate, in mapping form, the boundaries of this 'castle complex' in the west of the city. If this could be done from more precise evidence then the fog of conjectural theories would be dispersed and a solution nearer the truth would result. The more reliable evidence was found concerning the 'castle complex', which is given above under 'Montfichet castle' and 'Baynard's castle'. When this evidence was defined in topographical and cartographical terms the material aid, in the form of mapping, became available for the first time, and more reliable conclusions could be drawn than hitherto. These conclusions showed that the northern boundaries mentioned in the charter, which extended near to the line of the north side of St Paul's, were those of Montfichet castle; the larger and more important of the two castles being Baynard's, which lay on the south side of Montfichet, extending to the River Thames.

Although there is no specific evidence for the foundation date of Montfichet castle there is indirect evidence to support the view that it formed part of the 'castle complex' at the time of the charter. This castle was known to exist before 1136 for its lord was concerned in the plea about the lordship over the water of the River Thames at this time. The charter itself was drawn up for one purpose only, which was for the supply of building materials to the bishop by destroying part of the walled moat of the 'castle complex'. It is of significance that both William de Montfichet and Robert FitzRichard (of Baynard's castle) attest this charter, for it was their fortresses that had to be weakened to provide part of the material for the rebuilding of St Paul's. Thus it can be concluded with reasonable certainty that Montfichet castle was, with Baynard's Castle, part of the 'castle complex' at the time of the charter of c. 1114.

The above indicates how dangerous it may be to ignore the main purpose of a charter, thereby elevating subordinate elements to determine the historical facts. Hence the previous complications and confusion on this subject.