

husbands, and they were on equal footing with male members of the Gunmakers' Company. In the home women were advised to use gunpowder to ward off bugs, season meat, and cure toothaches. Gunsmiths even accommodated their female clients by producing lightweight versions of their products, though this occurred mainly on the Continent. A striking example from this section, which shows Schwoerer's dexterity with early modern symbolism, is her detailed description of the portrait of Lady Teresia Sherley (1590–1688), one of the few depictions of an Englishwoman holding a gun. Portraits of gun-wielding aristocratic children, some as young as two years old, show that English youth were exposed to guns as well. They learned about firearms by using them and by playing with toy guns and cannons that could be fired, the most common of all early modern English toys.

Yet the distinctions that Schwoerer draws regarding gun use among men, women, and children, combined with the book's rigid structure, leads to some repetition. Gun accidents and crimes against men, women, and children are covered in successive chapters (7, 8, and 9), but the conclusions drawn in each instance are similar. The new invention certainly influenced each of these groups, but it matters little if the victim of a misfire was a sixteen-year-old boy or a twenty-year-old man. These topics might have been discussed together, though they certainly prove that guns were commonplace among various demographics. Schwoerer also understates the significant backlash that Elizabethan gun advocates faced from authors who remained steadfast in their support of the longbow, England's traditional weapon of choice. She cites Sir John Smythe's *Certain Discourses Military* (1590) as a pro-bow tract, but seasoned soldiers like Sir Henry Knyvett and Thomas Churchyard, along with mathematician Thomas Digges, also argued that longbows were more effective than guns. Even if these writers were more concerned with the military matters that Schwoerer intended to avoid in her book, the fact that guns were loud, heavy, inaccurate, expensive, and slow to fire in comparison to longbows also would have influenced civilian buyers. Clarifying in greater detail the process by which guns overcame the well-entrenched bow would have further strengthened an already well-supported thesis.

One of the clearest indications of a nation's gun culture are its weapons-related laws and statutes. Within a century of their introduction in England, Henry VIII outlawed concealed firearms due to a spate of high-profile murders. In 1548 his son Edward VI devised a registration system stipulating who was qualified to use guns, which "highlights the government's desire to strengthen its control over who was qualified to shoot" (49). The modern British gun massacres that gained Schwoerer's attention similarly convinced the British government to enact the 1988 and 1997 Firearms (Amendment) Acts that banned several types of guns in the United Kingdom excepting Northern Ireland. The United States soon may follow suit, as the nation is plagued by the same gun accidents, suicides, crimes, murders, assassinations, and mass shootings that arose in England five centuries ago. By elucidating this troubled history, by making such connections across time and space, and by asking the big questions, Schwoerer has crafted the definitive work on civilian gun culture in early modern England.

*Nate Probasco*, Briar Cliff University

CATHRYN SPENCE. *Women, Credit, and Debt in Early Modern Scotland*. Gender in History. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016. Pp. 207. \$125.00 (cloth).  
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2016.143

Cathryn Spence's *Women, Credit, and Debt in Early Modern Scotland* provides the first book-length investigation of credit and debt in early modern Scotland. Using burgh court records, testaments, and a unique tax roll from 1635, Spence examines women's involvement in lending and borrowing in four towns: Edinburgh, Dundee, and two smaller market towns,

Haddington and Linlithgow, in the period 1560–1640. This is a substantial body of evidence: more than 37,000 debts cases from Edinburgh and more than 16,000 collectively from the other three towns. Women's involvement was considerable, with over a third of the Edinburgh cases involving a female creditor, and over a third a female debtor. While the study of money lending in England using probate inventories has stressed the role of widows and single-women, Spence's figures show that wives, either acting alone or with their husbands, are the most frequently recorded type of women in the Scottish debt litigation.

After providing an overview of the contours of debt litigation, Spence examines, in turn, women's role as traders of goods, ale producers and retailers, landladies and moneylenders, and various roles of female servants in Scottish towns. As such, despite its title, this is really a book about women's involvement in Scotland's commercial urban economy. The focus on lending and borrowing and the resulting litigation serves as a window in Scotland's economy, showing how different trades functioned and the role of different types of women within them.

A good example is provided by the wine trade, where Spence is able to correct the previous assumption of historians that women were not involved. Overseas traders imported large quantities of wine into Edinburgh's port at Leith. These traders were the merchant elite, mostly men. Women who imported wine were either the wives or widows of merchants. Importers sold large batches of wine to retailers or "merchandisers" (75), many of whom were women, who sold wine from their shops or taverns. At the bottom of the hierarchy were female servants who purchased wine from retailers to sell in small quantities on the street. They were either employed specifically to sell wine in this way or took wine on credit, repaying the wine retailer after it had been sold. This pattern of men dominating the overseas imports while women dominated the retail trade is also found among other trades. In Scotland, "cramers," or merchandisers bought imported goods to sell in their booths, shops, or market stalls (75). The merchandise was a mixture of types of goods such as cloth, cooking pots, spices, and candy. For the sixteenth century, surviving records suggest that most crammers were men, but by the first half of the seventeenth century it was women who dominated this type of trade, as was the case elsewhere in Europe. Another trade dominated by women was the production and sale of ale. In England, women were squeezed out of commercial production in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, as ale was replaced by beer, and large-scale production became more widespread. Spence finds that in Scotland women retained their dominant position. Over a third of all debt litigation involving women in Edinburgh and Haddington had some connection to the ale business, and a quarter of the cases in Linlithgow were similarly connected to ale production. A bold move to undermine women's dominance was made with the establishment of the all-male Fellowship and Society of Ale and Beer Brewers in Edinburgh in 1596, which excluded nonmembers (women) from large-scale production and sale. However, this effort proved unsuccessful, and the society was dissolved in 1619.

Spence grounds her observations in the extensive primary documents in the existing literature on women's work and commercial activities across northern Europe. But she leaves a number of larger questions unresolved. On a number of occasions she cites the presence or absence of guilds that restricted membership to men and their widows as an explanation for women's participation in particular trades. The concern of male-only town governments about "unchaste" behavior is cited as a reason for the exclusion of unmarried women from other activities (107). And yet the debt litigation provides ample evidence of women's active, assertive and successful participation in commerce at all levels. How did men manage to exclude women from some trades—and why did they seek to do so? The Society of Ale and Beer Brewers could be seen as a dramatic and, importantly, failed episode in a long-running battle over the gendered nature of commerce in Scotland that requires further investigation and explanation. Nonetheless, we would not be considering these issues at all if Spence had not done the vital groundwork of unearthing and analyzing such a striking

body of documentary evidence that shines a new and revealing light onto women's lives in early modern Scotland.

*Jane Whittle*, University of Exeter

W. R. STREITBERGER. *The Masters of the Revels and Elizabeth I's Court Theatre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. Pp. 319. \$99.00 (cloth).  
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2016.144

W. R. Streitberger begins his account of the Elizabethan masters of the revels by arguing that scholars of early modern drama should question their dependence on the work of E. K. Chambers. Streitberger is right, of course. Since the publication of *The Elizabethan Stage* in 1923, plays have been found, documents discovered, theater sites excavated, and theories propounded to supplement the history Chambers constructed and to place it into new contexts. Chambers, as Streitberger repeatedly reminds us, was a creature of his time, finding in Elizabethan bureaucracies the same hierarchical organizing principles he saw in his work as a twentieth-century civil servant and basing his conclusions about the Revels Office on a misunderstanding of the structures of Tudor government and the royal household. Given the array of digital tools now available to scholars, an updated version of *The Elizabethan Stage* is long overdue. But in *The Masters of the Revels and Elizabeth I's Court Theatre*, Streitberger's efforts to incorporate decades of new material into the history of the Elizabethan Revels Office illustrate the benefits, as well as the perils, of attempting an account of the professional lives of Thomas Cawarden, Thomas Benger, and Edmund Tilney in the age of digital abundance.

In his preface, Streitberger explains that he had been working on this volume for four decades. He is responsible for the recovery and analysis of many crucial records of early modern English drama. The book is stuffed with facts and figures arranged to explore the evolution of the responsibilities of the masters of the revels and the financing of their activities, as well as to argue that these men influenced, and were influenced by, changes in the structure and repertory of London's public theaters. Streitberger describes numerous productions—of plays, masks, tilts, and other courtly devices—and he includes richly detailed information on texts, props, sets, venues, costumes, and costs. He provides a thorough account of the family and political networks of each of the masters of the revels, showing how the office is linked to various court factions and lords chamberlain while revealing the complexity of producing entertainment that were expected to respond appropriately to political developments. He acknowledges (and sometimes corrects) nearly every recent study of the period. Streitberger's careful apparatus—a thorough index, a thoughtfully curated bibliography, and two valuable appendices (“A Calendar of Court Revels and Spectacles” and “Officers of the Revels”) make this a reference work well worth acquiring. But the impulse to include everything, understandable as it is, makes the book difficult to navigate, particularly as a narrative account of the work of the court officials who oversaw the plays of The Lord Chamberlain's Men and The Admiral's Men.

Streitberger begins with an overview of the functions of the Revels Office, describing the array of productions it was expected to fund and produce, and offering evidence that the operation of this office was chaotic and reactive rather than smoothly bureaucratic, particularly as money became increasingly scarce. What follows are long chapters devoted to each of the masters: Sir Thomas Cawarden (1558–159), affiliated with the Tudor court since Henry VIII's reign, whose political savvy enabled him to devise entertainments that helped cement Elizabeth's reputation and right to rule; Thomas Benger (1559–1572), who reorganized the