

cities with another recent book in the same series, Susan Byrne's *Law and History in Cervantes' Don Quixote* (2012), p. 49.

That said, Margaret Boyle has produced a compelling study, based on the ingenious juxtaposition of the rise of custodial institutions and their interconnections with a thriving professional theater business that nurtured many "unruly" female performers, entrepreneurs, and audience members. It will be of great interest to specialists in early-modern *comedia* studies. Scholars of English literature and of comparative drama may want to supplement Boyle's treatment with plot summaries of the plays discussed. So doing, they can find rich rewards, in discovering all manners of unruly and unrepentant women in the vast corpus of "golden age" comedias.

Fiona Williamson. *Social Relations and Urban Space: Norwich, 1600-1700*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2014. x + 234 pp. + 5 illus. \$99.00. Review by JOSEPH P. WARD, UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI.

In this methodologically sophisticated study, Fiona Williamson analyzes the lived experience of urban community in a leading provincial city in seventeenth-century England. Given its significance for the economically vital region of East Anglia, as well as the relatively bountiful variety of its surviving records, Norwich has long attracted the interest of historians. Williamson intends her book to add to the established scholarship by applying theoretical approaches to her subject that have been developed through research into other towns, in England but also in other countries. In particular, she seeks to demonstrate that much knowledge can be generated by studying a regional center such as Norwich, thereby diverting some attention from the study of London, which has not surprisingly tended to dominate the field of early modern English urban history.

Williamson's analysis unfolds across five lively chapters that are arranged thematically, with each chapter including an historiographical and theoretical overview of the topic at hand. She begins with a discussion of the geographical understanding of urban identity that focuses on stylized cartographic representations of Norwich as a whole but also on the parish, the unit with which most Norwich residents

would have been more familiar. She then moves to a consideration of the varied and often contested understandings of Norwich's streets and other public spaces. Her third chapter considers strangers—the large group of Norwich residents from the Low Countries—and their place in the wider community, emphasizing that any abiding sense of the immigrants' separateness within Norwich was the result of social perception much more than physical segregation. She follows this with a consideration of the gendered aspects of public life in the city, arguing that historians should not assume the urban landscape to have been neatly divided into masculine and feminine spaces, an observation she supports with detailed considerations of markets and alehouses, two types of space that scholars have asserted to have been overwhelmingly masculine. Her final chapter examines the spatial aspects of politics in Norwich, emphasizing taverns and alehouses as crucial locations for the dissemination of news, and suggesting ways in which the people of Norwich could shape their own political landscape.

As her goal is to recover the lived experience of Norwich, much of Williamson's argument has, quite understandably, a speculative aspect because only a tiny fraction of Norwich's residents left direct evidence of their views. This approach is noticeable in her discussion of the potential audience for early modern Norwich maps. Building on the work of sociologist Patrick Carroll, Williamson asserts that maps were "an integral part of the formation of knowledge about the world and the individual's place within it" (56). In her discussion of the commercial failure of Thomas Cleer's relatively unadorned prospect of Norwich of 1696, she acknowledges that it is "hard to tell" why the map proved unpopular, though she then suggests that "contemporaries viewed urban cartography in much the same way as a piece of art—as a talking piece, wall hanging or collector's item—rather than as a finding aid." Having moved from an admission of the limitations of her knowledge of the motivation of a Norwich map buyer to a hunch that consumers of maps considered them to be just another piece of art, Williamson then leaps to the assertion that "ownership of a map was an expression of the possessor's culture, education and knowledge of the wider world and the simple, if cartographically superior, plan fell short of the mark" (52). Given that the city leaders often displayed maps in popular places, she suggests that "many of Norwich's inhabit-

ants may have seen a map of their city” (55). She makes a strong case for Norwich residents having opportunities to view maps, but how “many” of them actually took the time to do so with the care that the modern scholar can apply to them? Here and elsewhere, Williamson presents a creative argument that pushes the available evidence at least to its limits, and many readers (like me) may find her approach to be convincing, but some others may not.

As the dates in its title suggest, Williamson’s study focuses on the seventeenth century, but sensibly enough it ranges into earlier and later centuries as appropriate. This chronological breadth combines with the topical arrangement of the chapters to leave the reader wondering if Williamson missed opportunities to connect certain dots scattered throughout her book. This can be suggested by her discussion of gender and space, in which Williamson draws a clear contrast between Norwich and London. Analyzing depositions in defamation cases, a source that Laura Gowing used to good effect in her work on London, Williamson finds that women in Norwich, unlike those in London, did not have a special claim to doorways. In this context, Williamson offers an example of behavior that led to defamation suits involving Mary Frogg accosting William and Anne Austin (129). Earlier, Williamson reported that the Frogg and Austin families had by 1664 generated such animosity that it “developed into a mutual suing session at the Diocesan Court. At least thirty of their friends, relatives, and neighbors, the majority from St Saviour, became involved as witnesses and compurgators as their protracted suit ran on into its second year” (60). Later, Williamson mentions that Frogg and her husband Nicholas ran a licensed alehouse—the Golden Dog—that was rated at six hearths in 1666, making it a very substantial establishment. These narrative details, appearing in different chapters, raise questions about Frogg’s representativeness and, therefore, about Williamson’s critique of Gowing. What, at its root, was the issue that drove the intense antagonism between the Frogge and Austin families? Were the women leading or following their husbands into the conflict? Given, as she maintains, the central place of alehouses to Norwich politics, it is surprising that Williamson did not consider the possibility that there was a political dimension to the animosity in the neighborhood. Although St Saviour is not one of the parishes Williamson considers to have been most

closely associated with political activity in Norwich (203), perhaps regional or national issues inflamed this local conflict? Further, were there any lasting implications of the conflict for the social life of their parish, or for business at the Golden Dog? Available sources may not have allowed such questions to be answered, but drilling further into the Frogg-Austin feud could have given Williamson a setting in which to test her general theories about how space influenced social relations in seventeenth-century Norwich.

The publisher is to be commended for providing several highly useful illustrations, and the book also includes an impressive thirteen-page bibliography. Given the significant historiographical engagement of Williamson's argument, it was surprising to find that the bibliography did not include important, quite relevant research by historians such as Muriel McClendon (on the efforts of city leaders to maintain the image of Norwich as a well-governed community), Mark Jenner (on the seventeenth-century urban environment), and Jeremy Boulton (on urban social life). That said, the very positive consequences of this book for the historiography of seventeenth-century Norwich society and culture are clear, and they are very likely to be long-lasting.

Rhys Morgan. *The Welsh and the Shaping of Early Modern Ireland*. Woodbridge and Rochester: The Boydell Press, 2014. 242 pp. £75.00. Review by CHRIS R. LANGLEY, NEWMAN UNIVERSITY, BIRMINGHAM, UK.

Rhys Morgan's work seeks to throw a spanner into the works of Anglo-Irish historiography. Based upon his doctoral thesis at Cardiff University, Morgan evaluates the human interactions between Ireland and its near neighbour Wales across the early modern period. The author addresses the use of Welsh military personnel in Ireland and the manner in which they acted as a foothold for other Welsh settlers to arrive in later waves of migration. Using muster rolls and documents in Ireland and Wales that survive from the plantation schemes, Morgan combines prosopographical and social historical approaches to underline how a Welsh presence continued to exist in Ireland, in varying numbers, across the period.