



**Hill, T. (2017) '“In fiction as in fact”: 40 years of literary studies in The London Journal.' *The London Journal*, 42 (1), pp. 1-12.**

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis Group in *The London Journal* on 01/02/2017 available online: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03058034.2017.1279855>

## ResearchSPAce

<http://researchspace.bathspa.ac.uk/>

This pre-published version is made available in accordance with publisher policies.

Please cite only the published version using the reference above.

Your access and use of this document is based on your acceptance of the ResearchSPAce Metadata and Data Policies, as well as applicable law:-

<https://researchspace.bathspa.ac.uk/policies.html>

Unless you accept the terms of these Policies in full, you do not have permission to download this document.

This cover sheet may not be removed from the document.

Please scroll down to view the document.

**'In fiction as in fact':**  
**40 years of literary studies in *The London Journal***

When I mentioned to a couple of fellow early modern literary scholars that I had been asked to write a survey of those literary topics published over the forty-year history of *The London Journal* there were raised eyebrows. The consensus seemed to be that the journal was primarily, if not exclusively, an historical one, and that there surely wouldn't be much to say. This is an interesting and perhaps widespread perception of the journal's remit. Perceptions can stand in one's way as much as they can invite participation, and it might well be that *The London Journal's* reputation as being concerned in the main with *historical* articles about London has encouraged one camp whilst at the same time restricting its apparent relevance to another.

Nevertheless, the journal's founding principle was that it should be 'multi-disciplinary', and so it is only right that no one discipline should predominate. *The London Journal* is also based on the aspiration that its scope would appeal to all those 'taking an interest in the fine and performing arts, the natural environment and in commentaries on metropolitan life in fiction as in fact'. I want to tease out some of the implications of this latter statement later in this article as I think they—inadvertently, perhaps—have led to a characteristic 'take' on those literary treatments of London the journal has published over the last four decades. The phrase '*commentaries on metropolitan life in fiction as in fact*', rather than 'representations of metropolitan life, implies two related assumptions: on the one hand, that (real) 'life' would be the underlying subject matter of these articles, and on the other—crucially—that both 'fact' and 'fiction' would treat this in much the same manner, i.e. that literary works operate as a form of 'commentary' on society in a quasi-documentary way. It is perhaps to be expected, then, that when one looks at the precedent for the current exercise, a special 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary issue in 1995 (issue 20:2), one sees a series of of chronological survey pieces which are all broadly historical in remit written by eminent contributors (Derek Keene, Caroline Barron, Vanessa Harding, and so on) who are all historians. On the basis of the 1995 'stocktake' one would indeed have concluded that the main business of *The London Journal* is urban history.

Such a view would be a misapprehension, though, for it is not the case that the journal has featured no literary articles at all over its forty year history. It has actually published quite a few, some path-breaking. As one might expect from such a generalist publication, an overview of *London Journal* articles on literary topics reveals an uneven breakdown of periods covered. What could be described as the 'long' early modern period, stretching from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries dominates coverage, with some sixteen pieces. The nineteenth century is the next most popular, with eight; the twentieth century appears to be of less interest to writers for the journal, with only two articles in this area; finally, the journal, surprisingly, has yet to publish a research article on medieval (i.e. pre-sixteenth century) literature and culture although it has certainly featured many significant historical works in this period. I would surmise that the journal has tended to prioritise the 'long' early modern period, and to a lesser extent the Victorian period, because these lend themselves to historicist approaches in a way that contemporary literature—

which is in addition, arguably, the most ‘theorised’ area of literary study—does not. I return to the import of this chronological spread below. What is certainly the case is that those articles published in *The London Journal*, as I have just implied, have tended to inhabit an historicist perspective, broadly defined. In this respect it is instructive to return to the journal’s original 1970s aim to explore ‘commentaries on metropolitan life in fiction as in fact’, for this seems to encapsulate a characteristic social history-style approach from that moment. For literary scholars, this translates to a time before the new historicist boom in early modern literary studies of the mid-late 1980s, and also a time before the ‘theory wars’ of around the same period, of which more below.

One can begin, therefore, to trace ways in which the journal’s articles reflect dominant scholarly trends. For the remainder of the 1970s, the journal published just four pieces of a broadly literary nature: an account of an 1872 book of engravings by Gustave Doré accompanied by text by the journalist and biographer Blanchard Jerrold (issue 2:1, 1976); an article on Strype’s 1720 edition of the *Survey of London* (issue 3:1, 1977); and two more early modern pieces: the important historian Peter Burke on popular culture in seventeenth-century London (issue 3:2, 1977) and Anne Barton on city comedy (issue 4:2, 1978). They may be few in number, but all are in differing ways noteworthy contributions, not only to the output of *The London Journal* but also to the state of literary and associated fields at that moment in time. Burke’s article appeared in the journal the year before his seminal *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* was published, and Barton’s discussion of early modern comedy and the ‘ethos of the city’ (she does not use the term ‘city comedy’, as such, preferring ‘London comedy’) also made its mark in advance of the re-publication in 1980 of the book that did much to create interest in this sub-genre, Brian Gibbons’ *Jacobean City Comedy*. Despite what now looks like a simplistic take on the relationship between theatre and the City authorities, Barton’s is a foundational study that is still cited today, although one cannot help but think that if either or indeed both of these pieces had featured in journals more central to literary studies their impact may have been all the greater.<sup>1</sup>

The abstract of Nadel’s piece on Doré and Jerrold strikes a note that was to become more or less ubiquitous in *The London Journal*’s literary articles: ‘[b]etter known as the source of Doré’s response to London, the volume is also a revealing *literary portrait* of the capital of Victorian England at the height of its influence, population, and power’ (emphasis mine); the article itself begins by emphasising the factual nature of Jerrold’s account of London.<sup>2</sup> This abstract, and the article to which it relates, indicates a tendency to read the text primarily as a source of historical evidence, and this trend was to continue into the 1980s, a decade which saw the continuation of the journal’s characteristic employment of socio-historical approaches to literature. The 1980s thus got off to a start with a few articles discussing cultural artefacts that have over the course of time accumulated literary, or quasi-literary, significance.

At that stage of the journal’s history, the editorial board contained just one member from the discipline of English literature, Warren Chernaik of what

was then Queen Mary College. And it was Chernaik who began the run of literary-dramatic articles in this decade with a wide-ranging review essay of notable publications in the field, 'Playwrights and audiences, past and present'.<sup>3</sup> The same year saw another article published with a 'literary', or at least cultural, remit, the first part of a two-part study of the autobiography of a late eighteenth-mid nineteenth century cooper, William Hart, by the economic historian Pat Hudson and literary scholar Lynette Hunter (part two was to appear in 1982). This piece too addresses what might be regarded as a documentary source in the light of its modern status as a cultural artefact. Part one begins by situating Hart's journal as a contribution to 'literature of the industrial revolution' and as an example of 'working-class writing of the time'. The autobiography, the editors claim, is of 'considerable interest to students of literature and of social and economic development in this period'. That 'and' is suggestive, and the prevalent approach is made clearer still when it is explained that the 'brief introduction and commentary [will] concentrate on those aspects of the autobiography which are of interest to the economic and social historian'. Even though the article promises some 'analysis of the literary genre within which the work can be placed', the literary dimensions of this text are in the main subjugated to the concerns of other disciplines in a way that was already becoming the norm in *The London Journal*.<sup>4</sup> It is important to stress at this point that I am not arguing for some kind of exclusion zone for literary analyses, rather that such criticism covers a spectrum of approaches, and that those published in the journal, especially in its early years, tended to inhabit the socio-literary-historical end of that spectrum. Indeed, despite the positioning of the account of Hart's autobiography that I have just quoted, there *was* some attention paid to literary questions such as the impact of publishers' preferences on authorial style, and the equally inhibiting impact of genre, as well as to Hart's own 'sensitivity to literary form'.<sup>5</sup>

The journal's editors clearly considered Hart's autobiography to be of sufficient interest to its readers to devote two consecutive articles to it, but in general terms the 1980s featured fairly scant engagement with literary studies. In 1982 Chernaik wrote another review article, this time focusing on theatre since the 1950s, a largely factual piece exploring the varying fortunes of theatre companies, playhouses and playwrights in recent decades, and the following year some historians discussed popular entertainments (an important contribution by Robert Ashton in issue 9:1) and a sixteenth-century travel diary by an Italian merchant (by Caroline Barron, Christopher Coleman and Claire Gobbi in 9:2), which, unlike the Hart piece, took a fairly literal approach, treating the diary as a 'description' offering historical insights into mid-sixteenth-century London from a visitor's perspective.<sup>6</sup>

From that point on, until almost the end of the decade, with the sole exception of a lengthy review by Robert Ashton of Latham's edition of Pepys' diary, *The London Journal* was curiously silent on literary matters, an silence which is all the more notable given the fierce debates that were raging within the discipline at that juncture. University English departments split down the middle as criticism became more polarised; feminist and post-colonial approaches to literature emerged alongside post-structuralism and postmodernism; journals such as *Textual Practice* and *New Formations* grew

in profile and importance; early polemical interventions into what later became known as the 'theory wars' such as Catherine Belsey's pioneering work *Critical Practice* and Terry Eagleton's ubiquitous *Literary Theory* were first published in the early 1980s. Literary criticism was to fracture still further later into the decade with the emergence and eventual hegemony within early modern studies of New Historicism. One would not know such momentous and vociferous debates were going on within the discipline of English from the pages of *The London Journal* at this point in time (the early modern and late medieval periods continued to attract attention but the field was left entirely to historians like Steven Rappaport). This is not to say that the journal was neglecting political matters entirely: on the contrary, as one might expect in such a politicised decade, with governmental attacks on the GLC as well as the impact of monetarist social and economic policy on the metropolis, there was substantial engagement with contemporary concerns, which may have left little space for, or perhaps even appetite for, literary issues.

All this was finally to change in 1989 when literary scholar Lorna Hutson joined the journal's editorial board in place of Chernaik. Hutson's arrival was marked by another of the influential interventions into early modern literary and cultural history that had been a feature of *The London Journal* since its early days. Her article 'The displacement of the market in Jacobean city comedy' (issue 14:1) to an extent took up where Anne Barton's piece of 1980 had left off (Hutson also produced a review of Mullaney's new historicist *The Place of the Stage* in the same edition). By this point the (sub)genre of 'city comedy' was established to such an extent that Hutson was able to evaluate its strengths and weaknesses as a category, and to provide an overview of more recent criticism that had 'challenged' the work of Gibbons and his predecessors such as L C Knights.<sup>7</sup> Equally, to an extent Hutson's article followed the direction of a number of important revisionist historians from the 1980s, such as Rappaport and Valerie Pearl, who sought to interrogate and make more nuanced our understanding of the prevailing social and economic conditions of London in the seventeenth century, and to move away from easy generalisations about the allegiances of various social groups.

Simultaneously, for the first time *The London Journal* engaged directly with certain prevailing trends in literary and cultural theory when Hutson in the same article brought in what was then one of the most exciting new ways of reading early modern literature, the work of Russian theorist and critic Mikhail Bakhtin. Bakhtin's study of Rabelais was not in itself new, of course, having been translated into English back in the 1960s, but the true impact of his approach was not felt until the mid-late 80s. Bakhtin's account of the carnivalesque mode in medieval and early modern culture struck a major chord, especially in the context of studies of Renaissance comedy, and thanks to modern scholars such as Peter Stallybrass and Allon White and Jean Christophe Agnew, Bakhtinian concepts such as 'the grotesque body', 'heteroglossia' and 'festive culture' rapidly established themselves.<sup>8</sup> Hutson's 1989 article therefore served as a timely opportunity to test out the cogency of these ideas in connection to city comedy. Taken together with her careful usage of recent revisionist historiographies, the article produced an authoritative reading of a wide range of urban plays and it still stands as one

of the most significant literary interventions published by *The London Journal* to date.

One might have expected the journal to build on Hutson's work with a continued attention to literary works, but in fact to a large extent things immediately reverted to the pre-Hutson status quo. The next couple of years saw the publication of a couple of familiarly historicist articles on early modern culture: a detailed bibliographical account of Protestant books in circulation in London during the reign of Mary Tudor (15:1, 1990) and, in 1992, a rare exploration of late seventeenth-century civic pageantry by Benjamin Klein (issue 17:1). Despite its being a central cultural form in early modern London, pageantry was not to receive any further treatment in *The London Journal* for another 22 years. As far as the former piece is concerned, its publication was a (tacit) reflection of the growth of book history and textual criticism as a distinctive sub-area of literary studies, a situation that had emerged thanks to the work of scholars including Don McKenzie, Elizabeth Eisenstein and Jerome McGann.<sup>9</sup> The author of the article in question, Philippa Tudor, did not engage directly with that underlying phenomenon, but it is undoubtedly the case that her study was facilitated by the kind of closer attention to the early modern printed book in its original form—she cites around a dozen such books—that was to become increasingly central to the field in the 1990s, and which was to take off in earnest thereafter. Indeed, eight years later the journal was to publish another article in a similar vein, Elizabeth Lane Furdell's fascinating discussion of the premises, stock and clientele of a late seventeenth-century London bookseller, Dorman Newman (issue 23:2, 1998). Furdell is an historian but it is indicative of a recent convergence of scholarly interests—that has, arguably, primarily taken place in early modern studies—that her article could quite conceivably have been produced in the late 1990s by someone from an English literature background, such is the integration of bibliography into 'mainstream' literary criticism these days.

In general terms, however, the 1990s were a fallow period for literary scholars in the journal, with a stretch of five years (1993-7) when nothing in this field came into print. The practicalities and wider contexts of literary culture in the late seventeenth century were to return as a concern for *The London Journal* a while later, with an article by Helen Berry in the first issue of the new millennium on the coffee house periodical, the *Athenian Mercury*, published alongside an equivalent piece on one of the actual coffee houses, the *Grecian* (issue 25:1, 2000). The two articles took rather different perspectives on the same cultural moment: whereas Jonathan Harris embarked on a traditional historical survey of people and places, set in the context of the politics of the day, Berry's article was explicitly informed by cultural theory—in this instance the work of Jürgen Habermas and his notion of the 'bourgeois public sphere'—and her focus is on the periodical's readership as well as its self-image. A few years later, Markman Ellis was to produce another account of coffee house culture with his study of Pasqua Rosee's coffee house in Cornhill in the 1650s and 60s (issue 29:1, 2004). After a short lull of two years with no literary articles at all, the journal then embarked on what in retrospect can be seen as its purple patch. From 2002 with only two breaks (in 2005 and 2009) at least one 'literary' piece was published per year up until 2014.

This flurry of publications took *The London Journal* back into an area of literature it had not explored since its earliest days – the nineteenth century. After a gap of some twenty-five years it is not surprising that different approaches to Victorian culture are in evidence in the 2000s compared to Nadel's 1976 article on Jerrold and Doré. On the whole, the emphasis of the five back-to-back articles focused on the nineteenth century which were published between 2003-2010 was literary-topographical, picking up on a current vogue for studies of literature and place—or what could be called 'the spatial turn'—within the discipline as a whole. Indeed, in this regard the journal has hosted some significant interventions very much in keeping with its interdisciplinary remit. To start this trend off, in 2003 (issue 28:1) Christopher Breward explored the relationship between urban space, fashion and the changing forms of masculine identity presented by the figure of the dandy in the West End of early nineteenth-century London. His innovative article traced the figure of the urban dandy back some 100 years from its Wildean apogee, arguing that the West End of London became the venue for 'a distinctive mode of masculine self-fashioning' at the very end of the eighteenth century, which was to be distinguished from the more restrained 'London style' of male dress that preceded it. The West End, with its retail fashion outlets and numerous venues for self-display thus became, Breward claimed, 'an appropriate context for [the dandy's] narcissistic displays'.<sup>10</sup> In this respect his article took issue with prevalent views of the dandy that emphasised what he calls 'the private realm of individual taste or the symbolic terrain of an abstract modernity', focusing instead on the metropolitan topographical specificity of places such as Savile Row and Regent Street which were central to the formation of 'dandy' identities. The dandy's 'pose', he wrote, 'utilised the spaces of private rooms, gentlemen's clubs, operas and theatres, ballrooms, parks, boxing rings, shopping streets, and squares as pedestals for display', and the article concluded with a reminder 'of the ultimate hollowness of urban life lived as surface signifier'.<sup>11</sup>

The interest in the cultural meanings of space was echoed in two other pieces published in the same issue of *The London Journal*, one on the gendered 'social geography of Grosvenor Square' and an equivalent article on women artists' experience of Fitzrovia. A comparable range of concerns persisted for a time: the following year Rhodri Windsor Liscombe was to examine the cultural import of John Nash's Regent Street as a hybrid, modernised urban space as represented by writers such as Jane Austen (issue 29:2, 2004). The focus of attention shifted slightly in Nick Draper's investigation of the representation of that under-explored, less glamorous part of the metropolis, South London. His article claims that the development of a 'local consciousness' of South London as a 'distinct entity ... with its own significant shared challenges and interests over and against the rest of the city' can be traced to the mid-late nineteenth century.<sup>12</sup> Draper's subject matter, in contrast to some other *London Journal* writers of the early-mid 2000s, was more journalistic and sociological than literary, which perhaps signalled a return to the terrain more regularly explored by the journal in its earlier years. A similar approach was taken by Geoff Ginn's article discussing depictions of the late Victorian East End by writers and campaigners such as Walter Besant, published in 2006, as it was to be in 2011 when Michael Hughes produced a

piece on the modernist flâneur Stephen Graham, addressing a period of literary history—the twentieth century—that has only rarely featured in the journal.<sup>13</sup> Like a number of other *London Journal* writers, Hughes concentrated on how Graham’s personal experiences of the city were transmitted into his writing, enabling the reader to identify the latter’s ‘psychology’ whilst at the same time evoking the commercial context for Graham’s literary-journalistic works. Notions of space came into play here too, and Hughes foregrounded the essential role played by his Soho residence in Graham’s Bohemian life and works. Throughout this article, Graham’s ‘personal circumstances and concerns’ were put centre-stage; the balance of interest Hughes maintained is best exemplified by this summary of the writer: ‘his interwar novels and sketches were generally too leaden and hastily written to be regarded as genuine examples of high art or literary modernism. What they did do, however, was cast light on the way in which a complex individual sought to understand and portray his fascination with the metropolis at a time of both personal and social change’.<sup>14</sup>

Fully literary concerns were (ostensibly) back in the frame the following year, with Jerry White’s account of the neglected semi-autobiographical ‘London novels’ of the early-Victorian journalist Albert Smith.<sup>15</sup> This piece took the journal right back to the subject matter of one of its earliest forays into broadly literary analysis, Nadel’s 1976 article on Jerrold, an immediate contemporary of Smith. This continuity also works at the level of the approach taken by both authors. Like Nadel, White aimed to show that ‘Smith *throws fresh light on metropolitan life and manners* in a decade that we thought we knew well from other hands’ (emphasis mine). Here we see another instance of literary works being treated primarily as resources to elucidate social and cultural conditions of life in a specific period. Smith’s novels, we are told, serve as ‘a source of fresh insight into the many worlds of London in the 1840s’, and accordingly the bulk of this article treats Smith’s life and career as its prime focus, with the novels being adduced in the main to illustrate aspects of the former.<sup>16</sup> Admittedly, the reason for this tactic might be that the novels have little aesthetic merit; like Hughes, who as we have seen downgraded the literary quality of Stephen Graham’s works, White argued that ‘when [Smith] steps out of his own experience—when plotting, for instance—inspiration fails him and he falls into melodrama’.<sup>17</sup>

The Victorian period continued to prove of interest to writers for *The London Journal* for a while longer. Attention returned to London periodicals to build on the analyses of those printed in the late seventeenth century published in the journal back in 2000. This time it was the role of the editor of the *Temple Bar* magazine that was under scrutiny, this being one of the imitations of Thackeray’s *Cornhill Magazine* named after important London places. Peter Blake set his discussion of this periodical in the context of mid-nineteenth-century sensation fiction, arguing that a deliberate attempt was made to ‘pack’ the magazine ‘with material designed to ensnare a “respectable” middle-class readership’, since the editors ‘believed that their respectable readership secretly craved this more salacious and sensational material’.<sup>18</sup> As this suggests, the tenor of this article was more literary-historical than the bibliographical pieces on periodicals that came before it; it provides a rich



picture of the literary culture (and marketing imperatives) of the 1850s and 60s.

Sustained interest in the Victorian era came to an end four years ago with the first article on early modern literature published by the journal for some time. Indeed, if one puts aside the treatments of late seventeenth-century book production and consumption such as Berry's piece on the *Athenian Mercury* as discussed above, one has to go back a long way to find articles solidly on early modern *literature*—in this case, Klein's article on Restoration pageantry, published in 1992. Paul Gleed's analysis of London as 'the male beloved' in Isabella Whitney's important sixteenth-century poem 'The Manner of her Wyll' thus stands as the start of a mini-revival of the early modern period for the journal, and it was succeeded by two more articles in the next couple of years, both of which in different ways engaged with central developments in this field.<sup>19</sup> Indeed, I would argue that such engagement has been a notable feature of *The London Journal's* articles on early modern culture in particular. This area of literary studies has been greatly enriched in recent times by a nascent 'green studies'/ecocritical approach to its literature, and *The London Journal* played an important part in taking this movement forward when it published Toby Travis's highly original discussion of John Evelyn's early proto-environmental tract from 1661, *Fumifugium*.<sup>20</sup> As Travis pointed out, while Evelyn's text may have received attention from historians of early modern London, its *literary* dimensions have been virtually ignored. He therefore devoted considerable space to exploring Evelyn's 're-imagining of London', which was inspired by the 1645 eruption of Vesuvius, in addition to locating the text in the political context of the early years of the Restoration. Evelyn's treatment of his topic is described as 'subtle, ambivalent, and rich in connotations', and Travis convincingly presents his use of imagery and metaphor as having a political function as part of Evelyn's critique of seventeenth-century London.<sup>21</sup>

My survey concludes with a subject very close to my heart which could perhaps have been given more visibility in *The London Journal* over the last forty years: civic pageantry. Over two decades stand between Klein's piece on pageant audiences in the later seventeenth century and Caitlin Finlayson's recent article on the 1632 Lord Mayor's Show.<sup>22</sup> In those intervening years interest in the ceremonial culture of the early modern city has grown considerably: whereas Klein had to rely on a backdrop of some quite antique scholarship and criticism dating back as far as the nineteenth century, Finlayson's work can be located in the context of a lively current field of enquiry.<sup>23</sup> Klein's is a valuable, albeit fairly general and largely historicist, survey of representations of the audience within civic pageantry as well as in other texts of the period such as Pepys' Diary; he provides a wealth of contemporary commentary but does not draw all that many wider conclusions from it. Finlayson, in contrast, is able to focus in detail on one specific example of the mayoral Show mainly because the general groundwork has been well established in recent years. She pays all due attention to the minutiae of Heywood's text, carefully tracing its use of educational institutions and functions in pursuit of her argument that as an example of the genre this work demonstrates an unusually high level of engagement with the idea of London as an 'ideal city'. With its citations of literary critics such as

James Knowles and Lawrence Manley in tandem with historical sources on the early modern City from John Stow to Ian Archer, her discussion of Heywood's 1632 mayoral Show goes some way towards squaring the circle which has been one of the main preoccupations of this survey article: the relationship or perhaps even rivalry between literary and historical approaches to London.

This takes me back to where I began, to the vexed topic of where *The London Journal* situates itself—and is situated by scholars—within the diverse disciplines it aims to encompass. I would say that three main lessons have been learned from this current exercise in 40 years of overview. The first is a useful reminder that 'English' is a broad church with porous borders, especially where they connect with history, and to that extent at least the journal has indeed replicated the concerns of the discipline, especially as they have evolved over these four decades. It has also come to light that the journal has in a quiet—perhaps too quiet!—way published a number of important articles, particularly although not exclusively on early modern culture. Those who run the journal are currently engaging in a review of the strapline, aims and scope and front cover to make its always multi-disciplinary nature clearer, and the editorial board have been more selective in recent years over historical articles that take too simplistic a view of literary works. Finally, I will conclude with an appeal to fellow literary scholars with an interest in London to consider *The London Journal* as a destination for their research: they can be assured that the breadth of its multi-disciplinary setting will serve to enhance rather than to diminish the cogency of specific topics and fields.

---

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Interestingly, the journal was to explore a book which was one of the first to interrogate the myth of the anti-theatrical City, Margot Heinemann's *Puritanism and Theatre*, in the 1981 review essay by Warren Chernaik discussed elsewhere in the present article.

<sup>2</sup> I. Bruce Nadel, '“London in the quick”: Blanchard Jerrold and the text of *London: A Pilgrimage*', *The London Journal*, 2:1 (1976), p. 51.

<sup>3</sup> W. Chernaik, 'Playwrights and audiences past and present', *The London Journal*, 7:1 (1981), pp. 81-6.

<sup>4</sup> P. Hudson and L. Hunter, 'The autobiography of William Hart, Cooper, 1776–1857: a respectable artisan in the Industrial Revolution', *The London Journal*, 7:2 (1981), p. 144.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 64.

<sup>6</sup> C. Barron, C. Coleman and C. Gobbi, 'The London Journal of Alessandro Magno 1562', *The London Journal*, 9:2 (1983), p. 136.

<sup>7</sup> L. Hutson, 'The displacement of the market in Jacobean city comedy', *The London Journal*, 14:1 (1989), p. 5.

<sup>8</sup> See Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (Cornell University Press, 1986) and Jean-Christophe Agnew, *Worlds Apart: The Market and the Theater in Anglo-American Thought, 1550-1750* (CUP, 1986).

<sup>9</sup> See, for example, Elizabeth Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* (CUP, 1979), D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*

---

(British Library, 1986) and Jerome McGann, *The Textual Condition* (Princeton University Press, 1991).

<sup>10</sup> C. Breward, 'Masculine pleasures: metropolitan identities and the commercial sites of dandyism, 1790–1840', *The London Journal*, 28:1 (2003), p. 60. The West End as a centre for conspicuous consumption and display of fashion was a topic explored more fully still in a special issue of the journal a few years on, 'Shopping routes: networks of fashion consumption in London's West End 1945-1979', issue 31:1 (2006).

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 70-1.

<sup>12</sup> N. Draper, 'Across the bridges: representations of Victorian south London', *The London Journal*, 29:1 (2004), p. 25.

<sup>13</sup> G. Ginn, 'Answering the "bitter cry": urban description and social reform in the late-Victorian East End', *The London Journal*, 31:2 (2006), 179-200; M. Hughes, 'The traveller's search for home: Stephen Graham and the quest for London', *The London Journal*, 36:3 (2011), 211-24.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 214.

<sup>15</sup> J. White, 'Unsentimental traveller: the London novels of Albert Smith', *The London Journal*, 32:1 (2007), 29-51.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 30.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>18</sup> P. Blake, 'The paradox of a periodical: *Temple Bar* magazine under the editorship of George Augustus Sala (1860–1863)', *The London Journal*, 31:1 (2010), 185-209.

<sup>19</sup> P. Gleed, "'I lov'de thee best": London as male beloved in Isabella Whitney's "The Manner of her Wyll"', *The London Journal*, 37:1 (2012), 1-12.

<sup>20</sup> T. Travis, "'Belching it forth their sooty jaws": John Evelyn's vision of a "volcanic" city', *The London Journal*, 39:1 (2014), 1-20. For a wider introduction to this emerging field, see William M. Cavert, *The Smoke of London: energy and environment in the early modern city* (Cambridge University Press, 2016), Leah Knight, *Reading Green in Early Modern England* (Ashgate, 2014), Todd A Borlik, *Ecocriticism and Early Modern English Literature* (Routledge, 2011), and the pioneer work in this area, Gabriel Egan's *Green Shakespeare* (Taylor and Francis, 2006).

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.

<sup>22</sup> B. Klein, "'Between the bums and the bellies of the multitude": civic pageantry and the problem of the audience in late Stuart London', *The London Journal*, 17:1 (1992), 18-26; J. Caitlin Finlayson, 'Thomas Heywood's panegyric to London's "University" in *Londini Artium & Scientiarum Scaturigo: or, Londons Fountaine of Arts and Sciences* (1632)', *The London Journal*, 39:2 (2014), 102-19.

<sup>23</sup> See, for example, my *Pageantry and Power: A cultural history of the early modern Lord Mayor's Show* (MUP, 2010) and Richard Rowland, *Thomas Heywood's Theatre, 1599-1639* (Ashgate, 2010).

---

## Abstract

For four decades *The London Journal* has been at the heart of scholarly debate on the history and the culture of Britain's capital city, from the middle ages to the present. Despite the perception in some quarters that this is a journal primarily of relevance to historians, from the outset *The London Journal* has set out to cover 'the fine and performing arts, the natural environment and ... commentaries on metropolitan life in fiction as in fact'. Scholarly and theoretical trends within literary studies have evolved considerably over the last 40 years, and these developments can be traced in the ways in which contributors to *The London Journal* have variously engaged with literature. In exploring such engagements, this survey article discusses some notable articles published in the journal over this time-period, and concludes by evaluating the degree to which it has, as its founding principles stated it should, offered a truly 'multi-disciplinary' approach to London studies.

Keywords/phrases: *London Journal*; metropolitan culture; history; literature; historicism; multi-disciplinarity.

## Author biog

Tracey Hill is Professor of Early Modern Literature and Culture at Bath Spa University. She is the author of two books – *Pageantry and Power: a cultural history of the early modern Lord Mayor's Show* (MUP 2010) and *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture* (MUP 2004) – as well as a number of articles and book chapters on early modern drama and pageantry.

P. Blake, 'The paradox of a periodical: *Temple Bar* magazine under the editorship of George Augustus Sala (1860–1863)', *The London Journal*, 31:1 (2010), 185-209

J. Caitlin Finlayson, 'Thomas Heywood's panegyric to London's "University" in *Londini Artium & Scientiarum Scaturigo: or, Londons Fountaine of Arts and Sciences* (1632)', *The London Journal*, 39:2 (2014), 102-19

T. Travis, "'Belching it forth their sooty jaws": John Evelyn's vision of a "volcanic" city', *The London Journal*, 39:1 (2014), 1-20

M. Hughes, 'The traveller's search for home: Stephen Graham and the quest for London', *The London Journal*, 36:3 (2011), 211-24

C. Breward, 'Masculine pleasures: metropolitan identities and the commercial sites of dandyism, 1790–1840', *The London Journal*, 28:1 (2003), 60-72

L. Hutson, 'The displacement of the market in Jacobean city comedy', *The London Journal*, 14:1 (1989), 3-16

I. Bruce Nadel, '“London in the quick”: Blanchard Jerrold and the text of *London: A Pilgrimage*', *The London Journal*, 2:1 (1976), 51-66

P. Burke, 'Popular culture in seventeenth-century London', *The London Journal*, 3:2 (1977), 143-62

A. Barton, 'London comedy and the ethos of the city', *The London Journal*, 4:2 (1978), 158-80

- 
- R. Ashton, 'Popular entertainment and social control in later Elizabethan and early Stuart London', *The London Journal*, 9:1 (1983), 3-19
- E. Lane Furdell, '“At the King's Arms in the Poultry”: the bookshop emporium of Dorman Newman 1670–1694', *The London Journal*, 23:2 (1998), 1-20
- H. Berry, 'An early coffee house periodical and its readers: the *Athenian Mercury*, 1691–1697', *The London Journal*, 25:1 (2000), 14-33