work on early modern convent life other than the 'Who Were the Nuns' project – referred to on several occasions – although even the publications stemming from the project are neglected. What else is referenced tends towards the old, with very little representation from twenty-first century scholarship. Significant work on English convents in exile and early modern European nuns more generally is curiously absent, leaving the three nunneries presented here disconnected from the wider European context. This absence of historiographical awareness leads Williams to conclusions about convent life which can appear somewhat simplistic.

The awkward contrast between the richness of the immediate background and the sparseness of wider contextualisation, however, does not detract from the usefulness of the primary sources reproduced here, particularly as the original documents are held privately (though seemingly reasonably accessible to researchers at present). The inclusion not only of the immediately interesting letters penned by the nuns themselves but also of the less glamourous, but equally important, accounts and bills of exchange, marks this as an important contribution to accessible documentary material on early modern women religious. Accounts, less likely to raise the excitement of researchers, are especially rich sources that can offer unparalleled insights into the closed worlds of nunneries, from mundane matters of the purchase of provisions, to more dramatic battles over inheritances. It is this area of early modern finance and accounting that is the real strength of this volume, and one which cannot be overlooked when approaching the study of nuns and nunneries in this period.

Gillian Jack, The Open University
DOI: 10.3366/inr.2018.0189

G. J. Hyland, *The Architectural Works of A. W. N. Pugin*. Spire Books: Reading, 2014. 319 pp. £40 hardback. ISBN 9781904965473.

The historiography of the architect A. W. N. Pugin has been so bizarre that the publication of a comprehensive and reliable gazetteer is a much more significant achievement than might at first be evident. Nearly everything written about Pugin's work during his lifetime, including by himself, needs to be taken with a pinch of salt, as does the early biography by Benjamin Ferrey. Publications following Pugin's early death in 1852 (according to the architectural historian, Peter Howell) actively sought to exclude his name. An influential High-Church Anglican journal, such as *The Ecclesiologist*, could not afford association with a polemical and idiosyncratic Catholic. So he disappeared altogether until the 1890s.

But Pugin had been so much of an inspiration to architects of the Arts and Crafts generation, which came of age in that period, that his name burst out again – in professional circles at any rate. The *Architectural Review*, founded at the end of 1896 by some of these, dedicated a long, illustrated series of articles to Pugin's work, written by Paul Waterhouse. C. F. A. Voysey, one of the outstanding architects of his generation, drew an admiring plate of Pugin to ornament an article by Harry Sirr published in the *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects* in 1918. But there is scant evidence than anyone outside this circle was listening, and first-hand witnesses were vanishing.

There then followed 50 years in which a Pugin myth developed on two fronts. The principal of these came from devout writers who had not done much in the way of actual historical research. Michael Trappes-Lomax, later Rouge Dragon Pursuivant of Arms in Ordinary, published in 1932 a biography called *Pugin: A Mediaeval Victorian*, a work of considerable interest at the time to individualistic Catholic bachelor antiquarians like himself. Two years later the priest, Henry Rope, brother of the stained-glass artist, Marga, published – 'nihil obstat' – a hagiography; the 1946 study by Denis Gwynn, called *Lord Shrewsbury, Pugin and the Catholic Revival*, is a superior example of the genre. At the same time myths grew up in Catholic institutions across England that Pugin had designed their buildings – I was still hearing these when researching for my doctoral dissertation on his residential architecture fifteen years ago. Some of them were actually by Peter Paul Pugin, A. W. N.'s youngest son, but others were by the Hansoms and various other architects who copied the father's style. On the second front, the successors to the Arts and Crafts generation at the *Architectural Review* – John Summerson, John Piper, and others – began to travel out to St Marie's Grange, Pugin's early house near Salisbury, and to the Grange in Ramsgate, apparently not realising that both had already been altered almost beyond recognition, and to see in these the kind of English picturesque that the magazine was beginning to champion, an association which in retrospect the architect himself would have hated with passion.

And then, probably through the *Architectural Review* connection, came Nikolaus Pevsner – someone who actually researched things. Pevsner first wrote in detail about Pugin in 1943; his student, Phoebe Stanton, wrote her thesis on his work during 1947–1950, thorough but hampered by limited documentary evidence and the author's own attempts to pin a proto-modernist label onto her hero, with whom she seemed to become increasingly obsessed. In 1971 she published her short monograph, *Pugin*, intended to be starting block for a major work that never materialised, her own archives becoming more and more full of undigested material. Stanton's work nevertheless relaunched the project. A second Pevsner student, Alexandra Wedgwood, catalogued

Pugin's drawings for both the Victoria and Albert Museum and the RIBA collections, to modern professional standards, and a little later the New Zealander Margaret Belcher embarked on what turned out to be one of the great milestones of Victorian historiography, a comprehensively annotated edition of Pugin's letters. All contemporary analysis of Pugin owes a vast debt to these two scholars, as the next generation of specialists from Roderick O'Donnell to Michael Fisher will readily acknowledge.

Yet somehow the Pugin myths continue to proliferate in their inexplicably unique way; it seems to have been his extraordinary personal character that is responsible for it. Pugin's biographer Rosemary Hill published in 2003 an article on Pugin's small houses that is much used by students (and, regrettably, up to now by the editors of Pevsner's *Buildings of England*); at the time, I counted in it over thirty observations that seemed either unjustified or inaccurate. One of these was its opening claim. 'This is the first study devoted to Pugin's small houses' was true only in a purely legalistic sense, for in 1994 Wedgwood had published a thorough introduction to his domestic architecture as a whole which covered many of the minor examples, a landmark study curtly dismissed by Hill in a footnote. Biography is not architectural history and there should be no rivalry between their respective practitioners: some Pugin scholars began to wonder what they had done to deserve what felt like an assault. It came as a relief to many when that particular whirlwind eventually moved onto another target.

This context is important because it emphasises the magnitude of Hyland's achievement: here is every known project, built or unrealised, classified, dated, described, linked to its source and critical documentation. Thus, finally, Pugin studies have reached a degree of consummate normality of a kind that will, in time, launch further and fresher speculative enquiry. In many cases the author has provided excellent recent photographs or other clear images, and that could not be taken for granted up to now. Stanton's 1971 image of Pugin's Liverpool convent, for example, was actually of a later building. Hyland is a theoretical physicist who on retiring from the University of Warwick has devoted his formidable intellectual capacities to sorting out first, the works of A. W. N.'s son Edward Welby, which can be found on the Pugin Society website, and then this exemplary, authoritative gazetteer. Every Catholic institution should have it in its library.

Timothy Brittain-Catlin, University of Kent
DOI: 10.3366/inr.2018.0190