

Singapore Management University Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University

Research Collection School of Social Sciences

School of Social Sciences

5-2015

Space and the city: Gender identities in the seventeenth century

Fiona WILLIAMSON

Singapore Management University, fwilliamson@smu.edu.sg

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2752/147800412X13270753068722>

Follow this and additional works at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/sooss_research

 Part of the [Civic and Community Engagement Commons](#), and the [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#)

Citation

WILLIAMSON, Fiona. (2015). Space and the city: Gender identities in the seventeenth century. *Cultural and Social History*, 9(2), 169-185.

Available at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/sooss_research/2655

This Journal Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Social Sciences at Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Collection School of Social Sciences by an authorized administrator of Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. For more information, please email libIR@smu.edu.sg.

SPACE AND THE CITY

GENDER IDENTITIES IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NORWICH

Fiona Williamson

University of East Anglia

ABSTRACT Influenced by interdisciplinary studies and the ‘spatial turn’ in social history, this article explores the relationship between space and the construction of gender identity amongst the poor to middling sorts of seventeenth-century Norwich. To this end I have considered gendered interaction in different ‘types’ of space: domestic, private space, ‘borderline’ space – such as the alehouse or threshold – and, finally, the public space of streets and markets. Each section explores the relevance of recent spatial historiography in the Norwich context, and evaluates whether men and women inhabited different ‘worlds’ in the city, not only in terms of their physical movement or access to certain places but also, more importantly, in terms of how their presence was perceived, and thus their identity shaped by others. The empirical basis is primarily defamation depositions of the Norwich Diocese Court, largely used by the middling sorts, contextualized where appropriate with secular court records.

Keywords: gender, space, urban, public, private, defamation

I

This study has been inspired by the recent ‘spatial turn’ in social history. Borrowing heavily from inter-disciplinary theory, the ‘spatial turn’ has drawn on social geography, political philosophy, sociology, architectural history and anthropology.¹ Henri Lefebvre and Pierre Bourdieu, to name two of the most influential figures, wrote about the role of space in shaping society and culture. Most notable are their arguments that space should be viewed as an active force in constructing social identity, rather than as a passive backdrop against which social interactions were played out.² Bourdieu’s concept of *habitus* highlights how certain places became ‘labelled’ and ultimately understood according to specific social, cultural and political trends.³ Geographer Doreen Massey and anthropologist Shirley Ardener have applied such ideas to identity, drawing parallels between space and gender. Ardener proposed that once a space was ‘gender labelled’, it exerted an influence on the social encounters which were subsequently enacted within it; therefore ideas about that space, or gender, were replicated.⁴

Historians have adopted similar ideas to re-think the relationship between gender and space, especially in light of criticism of the ‘separate spheres’ model.⁵ Nonetheless, historians have found it difficult to move away entirely from the idea of ‘separate

Address for correspondence: Fiona Williamson, School of History, University of East Anglia, Norwich, Norfolk, NR4 7TJ, UK. E-mail: f.williamson@uea.ac.uk

spheres', partly because of the trend in contemporary literature and language to equate men and women with different spaces or roles, and partly because, quite simply, categorization makes gender easier to study.⁶ Indeed, I have had to apply similar 'artificial' methods of dividing space in this article. Today, gender divisions are largely conceived in terms of different 'mental worlds', or the ability to exercise agency, rather than physical access to space and place.⁷ Gender identity is considered to be just as fluid and contestable as were the perceptions of space available to contemporaries; their outlook on the people and places around them was affected by social status, religion, occupation, social networks, individual interests, and even the time of the day.⁸ It is not possible here to consider all these variables, but I do wish to build on the most recent historiography to show how concepts of space and gender identity were intrinsically interlinked, complex and malleable.

The historiography to date has shown encouraging results towards building a conceptualization of gender which drastically re-thinks the boundaries of public and private space. Although the field influenced by the 'spatial turn' is wide, research specifically relating to early-modern English gender and urban space is relatively small, if growing.⁹ Paul Griffiths has shown how the same spaces had contradictory and often conflicting meanings at different times of the day and for people of different social status, themes which Michael McKeon also explores in his history of domestic and public space.¹⁰ Robert Shoemaker and Barbara Hanawalt have both argued that women led active public lives after exploring their physical movements outside the home, although they came to slightly different conclusions.¹¹ Hanawalt's medieval and predominantly rural study argued that women's sphere of movement was closer to home than men's, taking in the neighbourhood, village, town and outlying fields, rather than the open road and forest. Shoemaker's study of seventeenth-century London crucially highlighted status, rather than gender, as the key determinant as to where, and how far, people moved outside their own neighbourhoods. In his own words, 'the experiences and attitudes of female Londoners ... flew in the face of prevailing expectations ... that a woman's place was in the home'.¹² Laura Gowing further argued that simply understanding *where* people moved was not enough, as this was dictated by practical necessity. Instead we should consider *how* they were treated in different places, an issue which she addressed in a study of defamatory speech targeted at women (a methodology which has influenced this article).¹³ Gowing posits that women nonetheless came up against a double standard in public space, stemming from the implicit understanding that women's place was in the home, an idea which Shoemaker and Griffiths have also explored.¹⁴ Amanda Flather has investigated the importance of status in the use of space. Her research into alehouse culture, for example, demonstrated the high numbers of middling-status women drinking and socializing, which challenges preconceptions about alehouses as 'masculine' spaces.¹⁵ In contrast, Lena Cowen Orlin's latest research explores private, rather than public, space. In a study focusing around the experience of a Tudor merchant-class woman, Orlin re-creates the material, architectural and cultural landscape of the household in a close study of domestic interior space.¹⁶

This article draws upon this intellectual framework. It specifically asks how far certain places were gendered and whether women were 'accepted' in public or quasi-

public places. Based largely on defamation depositions from the Norwich Diocese Court (contextualized where appropriate with defamation cases from the County Sessions, City Sessions and Mayor's Court), my research serves as a regional comparison to the largely London-centric work on urban gender and space, bringing to the debate records which have not yet been used for this purpose. In addition, I argue that diocesan records, primarily concerned with sexual honour and morality, have suggested, perhaps unfairly, that sexual morality was the cornerstone of gender identity.¹⁷ Bringing the ecclesiastic and secular records together may redress the balance.¹⁸

Defamation cases, whether ecclesiastic or secular, are useful because they contain specific details about where defamatory words were uttered and what those words were, alongside personal details about the people involved, such as age, title, marital status and occupation. This aids the contextualization of people's thoughts and attitudes with the location in which they were spoken. Predominantly, although not exclusively, the majority of people involved in regional defamation cases were from the middling sort, and therefore this article tends to give preference to this social category, although the secular records are more representative of the poorer sorts.¹⁹

The article is divided into three sections. The first explores domestic space and ideas of privacy, the second considers 'borderline' space, in particular the threshold of domestic property and the alehouse, and the final section focuses on defamation in public space.

II

In 1993 architectural historian Frank Brown argued that:

The way in which spaces are used and the meaning assigned to different parts of the home are plainly not a simple function of plan arrangement; they stem from a complex amalgam of social and cultural influences ... some sort of relation exists between society and space, albeit an elusive one ... [I]f this is so, the internal configuration of the house should be a matter of more than formal interest: systematically analysed, it should yield information which can enrich our understanding of society, and perhaps of social processes too.²⁰

Architectural and archaeological studies have long promoted the idea that homes reflected people's socio-cultural inheritance.²¹ Certainly, early-modern people sought to make such connections, describing the ideal household as a 'little commonwealth'. According to the patriarchal ideal, men headed the household and women, children and servants represented their companions and 'subjects' at different levels of the hierarchy.²² However, this ideal was neither practical nor representative of the realities of life for many, a fact recognized by contemporaries and historians alike.²³ If the household was considered a microcosm of social values, would we not see those values embodied in domestic living arrangements?

During the 1980s two archaeologists undertook a major survey of domestic space in Norwich's seventeenth-century artisanal housing, a study which has proved invaluable

for understanding the social context of domestic space.²⁴ Norwich's large population of broadly middling-status artisans would have lived in homes comprising only two or three rooms, used coterminously for sleeping, working and socializing. The poorer the household, the fewer the options that were available. Front rooms accommodated workshops, shops, alehouses and sleeping quarters for apprentices, creating a 'liminal' space that was neither public nor private. These same houses shared communal yards where access to space, water and light were central to inhabitants' working and domestic chores. Urban living thus necessitated close neighbourly contact, which flimsy building materials in cheaper housing could only have exacerbated. However, it would be wrong to assume that this state of affairs was unwelcome. Where housing development or rebuilding was possible, most people adapted or sub-divided existing spaces rather than rebuilding, suggesting that the creation of private family space was not considered the priority.²⁵

Nonetheless, it comes as no surprise that these houses, yards and alleys were the setting for many arguments between friends, neighbours and passers-by.²⁶ Randolph Godwin, for example, was 'in his owne shoppe being ... next doore and but a wall being between his howse and Susan Goodwards howse' when he clearly overheard Thomas Blossie say that 'Ann Rowse was as arrant a whore as any and ... had had two base children'. Robert Hastings overheard Ester Warren in the next shop gossiping about a neighbour rumoured to be pregnant, and Maria Sheringham had been in her yard in Bur Street when she heard Judith Bernard calling Susan Turner 'Painted Pegg' and 'stripe nosed whore' in the street.²⁷ Mary Mannings was defamed by her neighbour Robert Wright as 'a damned lying whore' whilst she was serving in her family shop, even though Wright was in his own shop on the opposite side of the street. His premises were so close he had overheard Mannings boast about the quality of her tobacco, prompting Wright to retort in front of her customers that not only was she a liar but a bad neighbour.²⁸ Propinquity and tension were recurrent features of seventeenth-century life.

Strict moral ideals also meant that private lives were constantly on view. Indeed, locking doors or closing shutters could be interpreted with suspicion, rather than as an assertion of privacy. Neighbours had a moral duty to regulate standards in their own community.²⁹ If a serious indiscretion was suspected, constables would be informed and issued with a search warrant for private premises. Thus in 1684 Anne Leasey of Pockthorpe was reported to the watch. When they arrived at her house, the locked front door immediately confirmed their fears, and rightly so, as Edward Preston was found hiding naked in her bed in the dark.³⁰ Similarly, Olive Barrowes and John Chettleburgh were caught together in their 'naked bed' after an eavesdropping neighbour reported them, and Elizabeth Purvyes was caught being 'occupied' by 'two strange men' after witnesses saw her changing rooms at an inn.³¹ Likewise, determined neighbours reported Richard Smith for accommodating 'whores ... ill people, strangers and vagabonds' who had been seen coming and going through his back door at night.³²

Nevertheless, close scrutiny could work in a person's favour. Valentine Colbyde, for example, against his better judgement, had been encouraged to spy on William Clarke by Edmund Golding, who suspected him of adultery with Grace Wycham. However,

after spying 'through a hole of the walles' and seeing nothing, Colbyde could not support Golding's accusation.³³ In 1680 a group of friends defended Andrew Faireman, who was suspected to be having an affair. The friends believed that the gossip was a malicious rumour contrived to ruin his reputation, so they proved his innocence by spying on his chamber through a hole in a wall. The men reported that they had seen nothing suspicious and gave character statements declaring Faireman 'hath carried himself soberly and civillie amongst his neighbours & was never ... suspected of anie such crime ... with anie woman'.³⁴ In 1695 John Nailes became angry with his servant Roberta Benn and called her a whore. Benn's response was to go into the street to ask passers-by to testify against Nailes in court.³⁵ The lack of privacy meant witnesses were readily available, firmly embedding the household in the community.

Homes were also used for entertainment. At least half of the defamation accounts took place during domestic gatherings involving mixed or single-sex groups of men and women; indeed a large proportion of the defamatory words spoken against men were uttered in the home.³⁶ Certainly, in these cases domestic entertainment cannot be clearly linked with a feminized 'private' domestic culture.³⁷ In 1617, for example, Anna Turner witnessed 'hot and angry speeches' between Rose Smith and Edward Hayward when she was visiting the Smiths, and in 1636 William Spooner was visiting the house of Robert George when he was accused by another man then present of fathering an illegitimate child.³⁸ In 1693 Mary Preston was defamed whilst she and her husband were entertaining Mr Benjamin Barber, Thomas Neckall and Thomas Fish.³⁹ In all the many similar accounts, the wider community is shown interacting within domestic space, blurring the boundaries of public and private as neighbours, friends and business acquaintances combined entertainment and work.⁴⁰ Interestingly, we could also argue that, by taking 'private' affairs such as domestic arguments into the courtroom, distinctions between public and private space were muddied still further.

III

Although I have argued so far that distinctions between public and private space were at best ambiguous, there is evidence that certain peripheral places had a recognizable symbolism. Boundaries were a familiar part of early-modern culture. City, ward and parish spaces were clearly delineated, marked out and reinforced by civic and religious ceremonies such as Rogation.⁴¹

Laura Gowing has suggested that doorways and thresholds were 'feminized' spaces, as they were traditionally used by women for working and socializing: knitting, sewing or spinning whilst gossiping and keeping an eye on the children. Her research in the London diocesan records also uncovered a correlation between defamatory words which threatened female honour and their being uttered at the threshold, leading her to conclude that the doorway was a place where gender and reputation were evaluated, contested and mediated.⁴² However, the Norwich Diocese records do not support this. The majority of disputes which threatened female honour seemingly happened randomly: in the house, the street, the yard, the market place, the alehouse or the shops. Where a doorway is recorded at all, it is more often than not the site from which

the defamatory words were spoken against somebody passing by and it does not appear that women were targeted any more than men. So in 1602, for example, John Chapman and John Shackle were arguing in the doorway of Chapman's shop when Chapman accused Shackle's mother of being a whore, and in 1664 John Morston was 'sitting in company with ... Katherine Goodwin att her dore when ... William Austin passed by them ... [and] Mary Frogg ... reviled him and his children'.⁴³ In many cases the doorway was where the witness, rather than the plaintiff or defendant, was situated: in 1684, when Sara Woods and her husband were standing in the doorway of their house, they overheard 'Alice Clapham and ... Elizabeth Steele att hot words'.⁴⁴ Their neighbour, Robert Cooke, saw the argument when he was 'sitting att his doore between John Claphams doore and John Steeles doore'.⁴⁵ In these cases and others like them, there is little correlation between defamation, gender and space, although the doorway itself appears often as a location.

Indeed, the most striking cases of the centrality of the doorway are from the secular courts, usually in response to incursions into private space by the authorities rather than neighbours, suggesting that the symbolism of this boundary had little connection with gender. Viewed together with the ecclesiastic court evidence, the boundary between public and private appeared to have a *similar* meaning for both men and women, as a site where public authority and private autonomy were negotiated. In 1628, for example, Constable Thomas Greenfield was sent to arrest Lewis Sharfe. Perhaps not unsurprisingly, when Sharfe discovered the constable on his doorstep, he barred his doorway, exclaiming 'I will not goe ... come into the howse yf you dare', words and actions which curtailed Greenfield's authority in both a tangible and a symbolic sense.⁴⁶ This was not an isolated case. Hugh Page evaded arrest by Constable Hugh Jacques by shutting his front door in Jacques' face and refusing to leave.⁴⁷ On another occasion, Jacques, in hot pursuit of William Jary, 'did ... goe to the howse of Mr Homberston and did there in the Bruehowse speake w[i]th ... Jary who utterly refused to goe ... And the said constable fearing to lay hold of ... Jary hee being alone ... went out to call ayde ... And then one Mary a servant of the said Mr Homberston shutt the gate against him'.⁴⁸ Similarly, when Constable Richard Lawson attempted to arrest Thomas Costerden, the door was slammed in his face. When a different constable made another attempted arrest a few days later, Costerden shut his foot in the door.⁴⁹ The physical act of barring a door may have only temporarily obstructed the law, but the symbolic association was longer lasting, ultimately reflecting upon the authority of the Norwich Corporation. In the absence of corridors or hallways in poor to middling houses, doorways led directly into private space. Thus the doorway emerged as a liminal space, where the multiple meanings of public and private merged and blurred, connected less to a gender divide perhaps than to a rather broader notion of agency.⁵⁰

Doorways were not the only liminal spaces in ordinary everyday life; shops and alehouses also fell into this category. They were open to public custom, yet were often little more than a domestic front room. Alehouses in particular have attracted attention from historians as a 'gendered' space, a perspective which has recently been challenged by Amanda Flather amongst others.⁵¹ Her exploration of female attendance at

alehouses concluded that women made up at least one third or more of alehouse customers.⁵² Interestingly, she also found that these women were predominantly of middling status, implying that alehouse going was as an acceptable part of female social culture.

Nonetheless, female presence did not necessarily equate to full access to drinking culture, and there is some suggestion that women working or drinking in an alehouse or inn might have been more likely to put their reputation at risk than their male counterparts. Of course, the minority of alehouses with a bad name do nothing to dispel the myth, reflecting the connection moralists made between alcohol, licentiousness and, in some cases, the availability of rooms for the night.⁵³ However, evidence from Norwich drawn from the gender composition of witnesses in defamation cases, alongside the context of defamatory words spoken, not only supports Flather's findings but also suggests that the alehouse was not a place where women were frowned upon. Although the records do not present a comprehensive record of female attendance, they do show men and women socializing together, and, more importantly, these women were acting as witnesses to, rather than victims of, the defamation. Arguably, this shows that women in alehouses were not being singled out for inappropriate behaviour any more than men.

The secular records also suggest that moral offences and petty alehouse 'crimes' were more likely to be associated with poverty than with gender. Contemporary moralists condemned the negative influence of alcohol on family life, and magistrates reacted by tightening up licensing laws and cracking down on the poorer, less reputable establishments, which tended to be temporary, closing as quickly as they opened.⁵⁴ In 1632, for example, Widow Garneham was presented for running unlicensed premises 'at [her] howse ... in the Lazer Howse without Magdalene Gates'.⁵⁵ Garneham's prosecution reveals more about her social status as an impoverished widow, living in one of the poorest areas of the city, than her gender, reflecting the Corporation's general concern with regulating the activities of the poor. Thus policy focused on controlling the social status, not the gender, of those who could open new premises. This involved increasing licence fees and targeting those people (generally the poorest) who converted 'dwellinge howses to Innes' by forcing them to 'erect & hange out signes' to draw attention to 'the greatest drinkinge skooles in the City'.⁵⁶ Formalizing the front door with a sign aimed to distinguish between private and public houses, but it was also hoped that it would discourage people with less money from opening temporary premises.

Inside the alehouse itself, the authorities found it almost impossible to regulate the behaviour and speech of either sex. Female informants were an integral part of policing alehouses, as constables found it difficult to monitor the semi-private space.⁵⁷ On occasion they were insulted or even barred. In 1634, for example, drinkers at an unlicensed premises abused the watch with 'hot words' when they arrived to close the place down, John Tillersley shouting that 'he cared not yf [they] fetched all the maiors warrants in the towne'.⁵⁸ On another occasion, Constable William Steward tried to force drinkers to leave the Green Dragon late at night so that they would get up for work in the morning, but he and his fellow watchmen were told 'they were fooles' and

'foole for settinge them on work'.⁵⁹ Women reported alehouse keepers for under-measuring their ale, stood testimony to drunken behaviour, and reported seditious comments they had overheard. So in 1634 Alice Legate and Cecily Symonds reported William Wiggington for keeping an unlicensed alehouse, after he had reported them for not paying, and in 1689 Elizabeth Dabney testified against John Scrimpson for speaking against King William at the Fleur De Lys.⁶⁰ In Norwich, most alehouse cases involved women testifying against men's behaviour, not other women's.

If there was any bias towards gender in the court records, it was men who were seen as the most serious threat to disorder. Certainly men were more frequently punished by the authorities or defamed by their neighbours for drunkenness.⁶¹ In the Norwich Diocesan Court, allegations against drunken women amounted to a tiny proportion of six, as opposed to fifty against men across the whole seventeenth century.⁶² In the Mayor's Court, in a sample taken between 1632 and 1635, only five women were arrested for drunkenness, as opposed to twenty-four men.⁶³ This may of course simply indicate that men drank at alehouses more than women, but it is important to note that if women did indeed make up around a third of alehouse clientele, then proportionally they were massively under-represented. More importantly, there were no occasions where a woman's reputation was questioned simply because she was at an alehouse. Women were criticized for being drunk but not simply for going to the alehouse in the first place. In 1605, for example, Roger Style recalled that he had seen Thomas Turner at the White Horse 'so drunken and overtaken wth drinke as that [he] cold neyther well stande nor speake & was voyde of common understanding'. Turner admitted he 'hadd ben drinking in a chamber of the said howse wth the millers wyffe of Cossey almost all the afternoone & that she was also so drunken ... that she was layd in a chamber of the same howse dead drunke wallowing in filthye sick'.⁶⁴ Although the 'miller's wife' was mentioned, it was Turner who sued for defamation. Women were only defamed or held to account if they were breaking the law, their conduct was drunk and disorderly, or they were disturbing the peace, as indeed were men. Although prosecution levels may reflect the slightly lower numbers of women drinking in, or running, alehouses, they also show that the Norwich Corporation were not automatically connecting women, alcohol, disorder and immorality.

IV

Finally, I wish to explore the 'public' – not politics or 'the public sphere' per se, but simply public space. Of course women were excluded from, or had only limited access to, many facets of public life, including formal political culture and the most exclusive institutions of early modern life: the courts, the political assemblies and the guilds, to name but a few. Arguably, however, these could be considered 'private', that is, exclusive to the elite. Men below the level of freemen (which in Norwich was around 80 per cent) had little or no access to the formal machinery of governance either. To remain inclusive of the majority, this article explores the public spaces open to everyone, rich, poor, men and women: the streets and the market, the open spaces of the city more associated with middling or poorer society and culture.

Laura Gowing's research into defamatory words spoken against women on the streets of London found a connection between urban working women, sexuality and disorder that did not appear so problematic for men.⁶⁵ Women's proper place was in the home and although a certain degree of flexibility was allowed for practical necessity, mobile urban women were more likely to be 'identified with sexual immorality: only enclosure could keep women private and chaste'.⁶⁶ Does the Norwich evidence corroborate this? Is it possible that gender ideals were expressed in the way women were treated in public space? There is some evidence to support this claim. New migrants to the city were viewed with suspicion, and travel, especially for a single woman, could be dangerous. Rumours circulated as to why a woman might want to leave the security of her family and venture to the city. In 1639, for example, Robert Stafford had to defend his honour when a 'great bellied woman' arrived at his stall from Sheringham, and Anna Rutter told Margery Myles she was a 'peddling jade' who 'did ride up and down the country with a packe on [her] back and knaves on [her] belly'.⁶⁷ In 1662 Samuel Brombell told Elizabeth Etherington she was a whore who covered her tracks by keeping her 'rogue' in London, and a year later Thomas Cocke declared Elizabeth Morland was 'a runagate whore' who had 'run over into Holland with a trunkmaker'.⁶⁸

Urban authorities feared 'strangers and foreigners' and the Norwich Corporation was no exception. There was a definite link between the streets, wandering migrants, 'master-less' youths, disorder and immorality, but what is not clear is a specific gender link. Despite the cases quoted above, the secular court records intimate that it was men who came under scrutiny more frequently than women. Between 1632 and 1635, for example, 277 men were reported to the Mayor's Court, picked up from the streets for petty crimes, as opposed to only 131 women.⁶⁹ The cases reflected a general fear of young male vagrants, 'master-less men', immigrants and runaways.⁷⁰ In the same three years, 92 men to 59 women were punished for vagrancy or 'living idly', and 22 men were specifically punished for 'running away' from their masters.⁷¹ The only slight twist to the figures is that women were more likely to be accused of living idly and ordered to find work, whereas men in the same situation were more likely to be accused of vagrancy and moved on. This may reflect a slightly more paternalistic attitude towards women, who were often seen as more deserving of help, or it may simply imply that the women concerned lived within Norwich's walls and so came under city jurisdiction, whereas the men may have travelled from further afield.⁷²

Few records of petty crime on the streets were explicitly related to sexual morality. Crimes which came under the heading of 'lewdness and ill rule' were the only examples, but these were rather vague categories. Some accounts specifically involved sexual misconduct, such as illegitimacy, or an extra-marital affair, but not all. 'Ill-rule' was also used in conjunction with 'michery', which simply meant petty theft, so it is hard to tell exactly what crime had been committed. The figures for ill-rule, lewdness and 'michery' for 1632 to 1635 comprised sixteen women to eleven men, so there is little difference between the two; indeed the lack of convictions suggests that immorality was low on the list of priorities for the constables and watchmen of Norwich. The only overt references to sexual disorder concerned five women likely to have been prostitutes. Two were entered under the heading 'night-walkers' and un-

named, two were well-known prostitutes who went by the names 'Gawdy Black' and 'Beaten Gold', and the final one was a homeless woman with the 'French disease'.⁷³ This unfortunate lady, Bridget Sone, was treated surprisingly kindly and ordered to be placed in hospital until cured, or for the rest of her life if not. She was not punished for sexual misconduct.

In the Diocesan Court, the defamation cases reflect more of a correlation with urban space and gender than do the secular records, although perhaps not quite in the way that Gowing described for London.⁷⁴ Between 1600 and 1641 across the whole diocese, 163 men to 194 women were defamed with words which had a specific sexual connotation.⁷⁵ Interestingly, 65 men to only 33 women were defamed on the grounds of having illegitimate children, or being illegitimate themselves.⁷⁶ The only problem with the figures is that it is almost impossible to trace whether the defamatory words were spoken against women at night or during the day, and many do not record location. Likewise, it is hard to ascertain the social status of the female victims of defamation as only male occupations were recorded. However, in a few cases witnesses made explicit reference to the woman's occupation from which we can roughly ascertain their status. During 1664, for example, Jane Harding sued Alexander Wade. Mary Simonds had been working at her family stall in the market place when Harding had approached her, claiming that Wade had called her (Harding) a drunkard.⁷⁷ In 1694 Elizabeth Boss, 'being at the stall of Mary Dixe ... together with Anne Bush', had overheard Anne Lockwood calling Benjamin Barber 'rogue and theevish rogue'. Lockwood claimed Barber had stolen her brother's money, saying that 'there was not such another rogue in the castle'.⁷⁸ Barber and Dixe were engaged to be married, but as a result of Lockwood's accusation Dixe 'refused to entertaine him any longer as a sweetheart', alleging that she had expected to 'have a drunkard' as a husband 'but not a theife'. Dixe was a woman of independent means, running her own butchery stall, which made this decision a double blow for Barber.⁷⁹ Dixe was clearly not living up to the domestic stereotype for women, but this did not appear to be considered noteworthy by any of the witnesses involved.

Looking beyond individual cases to the location of defamatory words in general, was there a detectable difference between the 'mental-map' of women and men, as Hanawalt or Gowing suggest?⁸⁰ Defamatory words against women in Norwich tended to be spoken in the street adjacent to the home, at the market, at a shop or in a house, much the same as the locations where men were defamed, which, in a city the size of Norwich, is hardly a surprise; everywhere could potentially be classified as 'local'.⁸¹ However, a closer look at the figures demonstrates overall that more women than men were defamed in the city. Between 1600 and 1640 the locations of defamatory words were roughly equal for men and women, although more male cases had recorded locations.⁸² The figures change after 1661, when the court declined in importance. By the late 1680s it is largely only women suing for defamation, which possibly explains the bias towards women in the figures.⁸³ Arguably, this could suggest that gendered defamation did not correlate with space, as the partiality of the figures only occurs later, simply reflecting the proportion of women in the courts. Indeed, as both Gowing and Shoemaker show for the larger city of London, women were not

restricted simply to their own neighbourhood but had a far wider physical and mental sense of the city.⁸⁴

However, the true value of the diocesan records lies in the fact that they covered a much wider area than just the city. Broadening the scope of the investigation to the whole diocese is an interesting exercise.⁸⁵ Between 1600 and 1640, for example, the connection between gender, space and defamatory words suggests that men were more likely than women to be libelled in a house; women were more likely to be defamed on the street, and men and women were just as likely to be defamed in shops or at the market.⁸⁶ The results show that it is not possible to draw a simple correlation between 'public' women and defamation, although women simply on the streets without a clear *purpose*, such as work, may well have been more open to criticism than men, despite none of the defamatory words in these cases specifically referring to their public role. The figures for male defamation and location pre-1640 are unexpected. The high number of 'houses' mentioned may have included alehouses, although this is not clear.⁸⁷ The most unforeseen figure is that of defamation in the church or churchyard, which affected men rather than women for reasons which remain obscure. Taken together, the higher number of men defamed in private space, alongside the higher number of women defamed on the streets, may imply that men and women were more likely to be insulted when they were 'out of place'.

It is possible to conclude that there was little correlation between gender, reputation, defamation and public and private space in the city itself, but in the rural villages and market towns the connection is much clearer. This finding might suggest a differentiation between city and country which deserves further exploration. What is definitely apparent from this research is that, for the poor and middling sorts of Norwich, practical necessity dictated the use of space more than gender ideology. More than this, the way people were spoken about in public space related little to gender ideals, although there is a connection between women on the streets, or men in the home, and negative words. A comparison with the lives of the richer merchant class in Norwich might be an illuminating subject for further study, but as the majority of Norwich's population fell below this bracket, it could be argued that any conclusions drawn would be slight. Certainly there is much scope for spatial studies to re-read traditional gender assumptions, and so demonstrate how lived experience negotiated gender ideals on a day-to-day basis.

NOTES

1. Good starting points from which to explore the historiography of social geography and urban space include S. Ardener (ed.), *Women and Space: Ground Rules and Social Maps* (Oxford, 1993); Liz Bondi, 'Feminism, Post-modernism, and Geography: A Space for Women?', *Antipode*, 22(2) (1990), pp. 156–67; Liz Bondi, 'Gender and Geography: Crossing Boundaries', *Progress in Human Geography*, 17(2) (1993), pp. 241–6; W.K.D. Davies and D.T. Herbert (eds), *Communities within Cities: An Urban Social Geography* (London, 1993); L. Holloway and P. Hubbard, *People and Place: The Extraordinary Geographies of Everyday Life* (London, 2001); A. Mandanipour, G. Cars and J. Allen (eds), *Social Exclusion in European Cities: Processes, Experiences and Responses* (London, 1998); D.

- Massey, *Space, Place and Gender* (Cambridge, 1994); Linda McDowell, 'Space, Place and Gender Relations', *Progress in Human Geography*, 17(2) (1993), pp. 157–79; D. Pellow (ed.), *Setting Boundaries: The Anthropology of Spatial and Social Organization* (London, 1996).
2. See P. Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge, 1977); P. Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* (Cambridge, 1991); M. de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley, CA, 1984); Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Oxford, 1994).
 3. Bourdieu, *Theory of Practice*, p. 72.
 4. See Ardener (ed.), *Women and Space*, pp. 11, 34.
 5. For an introduction to the 'separate spheres' debate see J.W. Scott, 'Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis', *American Historical Review*, 91(5) (1986), pp. 1053–75, or A. Vickery, 'Golden Age to Separate Spheres? A Review of the Categories and Chronology of English Women's History', *Historical Journal*, 36 (1993), pp. 383–414.
 6. Michael McKeon argues that historians' understanding of 'public' and 'private' are 'modern abstractions'. The 'spheres' are artificially separated so that they can be explored more effectively, resulting in an 'explicit' and 'self-conscious' awareness of 'public' and 'private' not present in 'tacit, contemporary experience'. See M. McKeon, *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private, and the Division of Knowledge* (Baltimore, MD, 2005), pp. xix–xx.
 7. The seventeenth-century concept of 'Res Publica' stressed a difference between a public forum for (male) citizens and the domestic (private) sphere; see J. Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 1–6, or T.A. Sinclair (ed.), *Aristotle: The Politics* (London, 1969) for definitions. Habermas has been critiqued by many historians; see in particular S. Pincus and P. Lake, 'Re-thinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England', in S. Pincus and P. Lake, *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2007), pp. 1–31, or Phil Withington, 'Public Discourse, Corporate Citizenship and State-Formation in Early Modern England', *American Historical Review*, 112(4) (2007), pp. 1016–38.
 8. See Paul Griffiths' essay on 'night-walking' in which he explains how the perception of city streets changed at night: P. Griffiths, 'Meanings of Nightwalking in Early Modern England', *The Seventeenth Century*, 13(2) (1998), pp. 212–38.
 9. For an introduction to the wider field of gender studies and space see J. Rendell, Barbara Penner and Iain Borden (eds), *Gender Space Architecture: An Interdisciplinary Introduction* (London, 2000), or for the 'spatial-turn' and early-modern culture see J. Monteyne, *The Printed Image in Early Modern London: Urban Space, Visual Representation, and Social Exchange* (Aldershot, 2007). Of course social historians have not only looked at city space. See, for example, D. Rollison, 'Exploding England: The Dialectics of Mobility and Settlement in Early Modern England', *Social History*, 24(1) (1999), pp. 1–16, and P. Graves, 'Social Space in the English Medieval Parish Church', *Economy and Society*, 18(3) (1989), pp. 297–322.
 10. Griffiths, 'Meanings of Nightwalking', and McKeon, *Secret History*, chapters 3–4.
 11. R. Shoemaker, 'Gendered Spaces: Patterns of Mobility and Perceptions of London's Geography, 1660–1750', in J.F. Merritt (ed.), *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598–1720* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 144–66, and B. Hanawalt, *'Of Good and Ill Repute': Gender and Social Control in Medieval England* (Oxford, 1998).
 12. Shoemaker, 'Gendered Spaces', p. 163.
 13. L. Gowing, 'The Freedom of the Streets: Women and Social Space, 1560–1640', in P. Griffiths and M. Jenner (eds), *Londinopolis: Essays in the Cultural and Social History of Early Modern London* (Manchester, 2000), pp. 130–51.

14. Gowing, 'The Freedom of the Streets'. She continues this theme in a later book which concentrates on the socio-cultural construction of the female body: L. Gowing, *Common Bodies: Women, Touch and Power in Seventeenth-Century England* (New Haven, CT, 2003). Gowing also argues that some contemporary literature portrayed city streets as 'feminized and disordered ... fickle, wanton, and lewd'. This idea is also explored in E. Wilson, *The Sphinx in the City: Urban Life, the Control of Disorder, and Women* (Berkeley, CA, 1991), which draws parallels between women, urbanity, chaos, irrationality and disorder.
15. A. Flather, *Gender and Space in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, 2007).
16. L. Cowen Orlin, *Locating Privacy in Tudor London* (Oxford, 2008). This also focuses on themes such as boundaries, social negotiation and concepts of public and private.
17. Examples include Paul Hair, *Before the Bawdy Court: Selections from the Church Court and Other Records Relating to the Correction of Moral Offences in England, Scotland and New England, 1500–1800* (London, 1972); G.R. Quaipe, *Wanton Wenches and Wayward Wives: Peasants and Illicit Sex in Early Seventeenth-Century England* (London, 1979); J.A. Sharpe, *Defamation and Sexual Slander in Early Modern England: The Church Courts at York*, Borthwick Papers, 58 (York, 1980); Martin Ingram, *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570–1640* (Cambridge, 1987); Laura Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford, 1996).
18. Ralph Houlbrooke and Garthine Walker have notably suggested that female gender identity was much broader. See R. Houlbrooke, 'Women's Social Life and Common Action in England from the Fifteenth Century to the Eve of the Civil War', *Continuity and Change*, 1 (1986), pp. 171–89, or G. Walker, 'Expanding the Boundaries of Female Honour in Early Modern England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6(6) (1996), pp. 235–45.
19. The 140 diocesan defamation cases for the city of Norwich record the occupation of male witnesses. The overwhelming majority were artisans and skilled labourers. The social composition of seventeenth-century Norwich roughly equates to 60% poor (exempt from taxation) and between 23% and 39% freemen artisans in 1600 and 1699 respectively. See P. Corfield, 'A Provincial Capital in the Late Seventeenth Century: The Case of Norwich', in P. Clark (ed.), *The Early Modern Town* (London, 1976), pp. 233, 244.
20. F.E. Brown, 'Continuity and Change in the Urban House: Developments in Domestic Space Organization in Seventeenth Century London', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 28(3) (1986), pp. 558–90. On this topic see also M. Johnson, *Housing Culture: Traditional Architecture in an English Landscape* (London, 1993).
21. For a historiographical overview see Rendell, Penner and Borden, *Gender Space Architecture*, pp. 1–17.
22. See, for example, Sir Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum* (1583); J. Dod and R. Cleaver, *A Godly Forme of Household Government* (1614); W. Whateley, *A Bride-Bush. Or a Direction for Married Persons* (1623).
23. See, for example, Amy Froide, *Never Married: Single Women in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2005), which argues that the patriarchal norm of a male-headed household was often far from the truth.
24. U. Priestly and P. Corfield, 'Rooms and Room Use in Norwich Housing, 1580–1730', *Post-Medieval Archaeology*, 16 (1982), pp. 93–123.
25. In a study of housing in London during the same period, Frank Brown discussed how the permeability of rooms and homes can help us to understand contemporary ideas of privacy: Brown, 'Continuity and Change'. See also J. Bold and E. Chaney (eds), *English Architecture: Public and Private* (London, 1993).
26. Examples include Norfolk Record Office (hereafter NRO), DN/DEP/41/46, folios 236r,

- 269r, 404r, 1633, or NRO, DN/DEP/51/55, folios 230r, 189r, 178r, 121r, 1680–86.
27. NRO, DN/DEP/31/34, fol. 38r, 20 July 1600, Anne Rowse v. Thomas Blossie; DN/DEP/53/58A, fol. XI, 27 October 1698, Ann Horne v. Ester Warren, and DN/DEP/51/55, fol. 136r, May 1684, Margaret Wade v. Judith Bernard.
 28. NRO, DN/DEP/53/58A, fol. XI, 11 November 1699, Mary Mannings v. Robert Wright.
 29. In the Norwich Diocesan Court it was usually the ‘chief inhabitants’ or the ‘better and greater part of the inhabitants’ who took responsibility for rooting out immorality.
 30. NRO, NCR, 12a-b/1, 1684–1689. The information of John Bensley, William Jell and John Barnham, 5 December 1684.
 31. NRO, DN/DEP/31/34, fol. 11v, 10 May 1600, John Chettleburgh v. William Camplyn; DN/DEP/31/34, fol. 17v, 19 June 1600, Purvyes v. Kant.
 32. NRO, DN/DEP/52/57, fol. 1r, 2 April 1690, Thomas Browne v. Mary Tarnell.
 33. NRO, DN/DEP/31/34, fol. 64v, 22 October 1600, Clarke v. Golding.
 34. NRO, DN/DEP/51/55, fol. 349r, 26 January 1680, Faireman v. Metcalfe.
 35. NRO, DN/DEP/53/58A, fol. XVI, July 1695, Roberta Benn v. John Nailles.
 36. In a survey of 769 defamation depositions between 1600 and 1700. However, this figure covers the entire Norwich Diocese, not just Norwich. For a full review of the location of figures see note 86.
 37. Carole Shammas’ research on materialism and consumption using probate inventories led her to conclude that domestic entertaining and material culture were not ‘feminized’ before the eighteenth century. Even then this trend was restricted to the middling and richer sorts. C. Shammas ‘The Domestic Environment in Early Modern England and America’, *Journal of Social History*, 14(3) (1980), pp. 3–24. See also O. Lofgreen, ‘The Sweetness of Home’, in S.M. Low and D. Lawrence-Zuniga (eds), *The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture* (Oxford, 2003).
 38. NRO, DN/DEP/37/40, fol. 12v, 9 April 1617, Smyth v. Hayward; DN/DEP/42/47A, fol. 564r, 1636, Spooner v. Jeringoe.
 39. NRO, DN/DEP/53/58A, fol. XX, 15 May 1694, Preston v. Fish.
 40. Similar examples include NRO, DN/DEP/32/35, fol. 6v, 1602, Rose v. Pettewe; NRO, DN/DEP/38/43, fol. 147r, 6 May 1629, Woodgate v. Skurlett; NRO, DN/DEP/53/58A, fol. XVI, 12 November 1697, Rant v. Wick; DN/DEP/53/58A, fol. XI, 9 March 1697, Elizabeth Ward v. Samuel Swift; DN/DEP/53/58A, fol. X, 30 July 1700, Ringstead v. Hall.
 41. Boundaries were also social, expressed by notions of inclusion and exclusion, especially towards ‘strangers’ or the poor. See S. Hindle, ‘Hierarchy and Community in the Elizabethan Parish: The Swallowfield Articles of 1596’, *Historical Journal*, 42(3) (1999), pp. 835–51; S. Hindle, ‘The Political Culture of the Middling Sort in English Rural Communities, c. 1550–1700’, in T. Harris (ed.), *The Politics of the Excluded, c. 1500–1850* (Basingstoke, 2001); S. Hindle, ‘Destitution, Liminality and Belonging: The Church Porch and the Politics of Settlement in English Rural Communities, c.1590–1660’, in C. Dyer (ed.), *The Self-Contained Village? The Social History of Rural Communities, 1250–1900* (Hatfield, 2006), pp. 46–71.
 42. Gowing, ‘The Freedom of the Streets’, p. 134.
 43. NRO, DN/DEP/32/35, fol. 233v, January 1602, Shackle v. Chapman; NRO, DN/DEP/47/51, fol. 135r, 4 November 1664, Frogg v. Austin.
 44. NRO, DN/DEP/51/55, fol. 122r, 1683, Elizabeth Steele v. Alice Clapham.
 45. *Ibid.*, fol. 123r.
 46. NRO, NCR, 16a/16, fol. 219r, November 1628.
 47. NRO, NCR, 16a/16, fol. 223r, 17 December 1628.
 48. NRO, NCR, 16a/16, fol. 229r, 4 February 1628.

49. NRO, NCR, 16a/20, 1634–1646, fol. 86r, December 1635.
50. Ardener (ed.), *Women and Space*, p. 11.
51. Clark is one of the best-known historians to equate alehouses with a masculine drinking culture: P. Clark, *The English Alehouse: A Social History, 1200–1830* (London, 1983). More recently, historians have challenged his views. See K. Wrightson, 'Alehouses, Order and Reformation in England, 1590–1660', in E. Yeo and S. Yeo (eds), *Popular Culture and Class Conflict, 1590–1914: Explorations in the History of Labour and Leisure* (Brighton, 1981); Beat Kümin and Ann Tlustý (eds), *The World of the Tavern: Public Houses in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2002); Beat Kümin, *Drinking Matters: Public Houses and Social Exchange in Early Modern Central Europe* (Basingstoke, 2007); Mark Hailwood, 'Alehouses, Popular Politics and Plebeian Agency in Early Modern England', in F. Williamson (ed.), *Locating Agency: Space, Power and Popular Politics* (Newcastle, 2010).
52. Flather, *Gender and Space*, pp. 110–20. For an introduction to women's changing role in brewing see Judith M. Bennett, *Ale, Beer and Brewsters in England: Women's Work in a Changing World, 1300–1600* (Oxford, 1996).
53. For contemporary examples see A. McShane-Jones, 'Roaring Royalists and Ranting Brewers: The Politicisation of Drink and Drunkenness in Political Broadside Ballads from 1640 to 1689', in A. Smyth, *A Pleasing Sinne: Drink and Conviviality in Seventeenth Century England* (Woodbridge, 2004), p. 77, or Hanawalt, 'Of Good and Ill Repute', pp. 108–11.
54. See the list of statutes in the Norwich Mayor's Court records for 1634: NRO, NCR, 16a/20, folios 11r–15v. These statutes specifically target drunkenness, alehouse haunting, 'tipling', selling 'lesse than a full Ale quart for a penny' and the problem of licensing small alehouses.
55. W.L. Sachse (ed.), *Minutes of the Norwich Court of Mayoralty, 1632–1635* (Norwich, 1967), p. 53.
56. NRO, NCR, 16a/20, fol. 11v, 1634.
57. Anthropologist James C. Scott proposed alehouses were 'sequestered social sites' in which 'hidden transcripts' were enacted in resistance to civic power. See J.C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven, CT, 1990), particularly pp. 15–22.
58. NRO, NCR, 20a/10, fol. 53v, 8 December 1634.
59. NRO, NCR, 20a/10, fol. 36v, 25 July 1633.
60. Sachse, *Norwich Court, 1632–1635*, p. 169, and NRO, NCR, 12b/1, 4 November 1689. The Information of Zachariah Mulyow.
61. Alexandra Shepard discusses how drunkenness was seen as the 'antithesis' of rational manhood: A. Shepard, *Meanings of Manhood* (Oxford, 2003) and "'Swil-bols and Tos-pots': Drink Culture and Male Bonding in England, c. 1560–1640", in Laura Gowing, Michael Hunter and Miri Rubin (eds), *Love, Friendship and Faith in Europe, 1300–1800* (Basingstoke, 2005).
62. NRO, DN/DEP/31/34 to DN/DEP/58A, 1600–1700.
63. Figures compiled from the transcriptions of cases in Sachse, *Norwich Court, 1632–1635*.
64. NRO, DN/DEP/33/36A, fol. 255r, 1605.
65. Gowing, 'The Freedom of the Streets', pp. 131–8. Gowing suggests that women in the city streets, especially at night, risked their reputations.
66. *Ibid.*, 139.
67. NRO, DN/DEP/44/48A, fol. 104r, October 1639, Stafford v. Davie; NRO, DN/DEP/44/48A, fol. 160r, November 1639, Myles v. Rutter.
68. NRO, DN/DEP/46/50, fol. 267r, April 1663, Etherington v. Brombell; NRO, DN/DEP/46/50, fol. 378v, 27 October 1663, Morland v. Cocke. The term 'runagate'

- meant a wanderer or vagabond.
69. The petty crimes counted in this sample were vagrancy, living idly, drunkenness, swearing, keeping an unlicensed alehouse, selling substandard measures of ale, verbal abuse, slander, physical abuse, petty theft, ill-rule, illegitimacy, running away from a master and general 'civic' offences including dumping muck, keeping swine or erecting unlawful buildings. These figures do not include weights and measures or the adulteration of meat, which affect the statistics even more dramatically as they were predominantly male 'crimes'. Including these, the figures become 441 men to 135 women.
 70. See P. Griffiths, 'Masterless Young People in Norwich', in P. Griffiths, A. Fox and S. Hindle (eds), *The Experience of Authority in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 146–87. Griffiths discusses how young people of both sexes described as 'living at their own hand' were singled out by the Norwich Corporation. These young men and women fell outside the patriarchal control of a master, father or husband.
 71. Figures collected from the Mayor's Court transcriptions by Sachse, *Norwich Court, 1632–1635*. For a general discussion of city-specific crimes see R. Jütte, *Poverty and Deviance in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 178–90, or S. Devereaux and P. Griffiths (eds), *Penal Practice and Culture, 1500–1900: Punishing the English* (Basingstoke, 2004).
 72. In a comparison of defamatory words in urban and rural areas in Norwich and Norfolk, there is little evidence to suggest that city and country women were treated differently, or that female reputation was more likely to be questioned in the city. As a good contrast see NRO, DN/DEP/41/46, fol. 30r and fol. 64r, 1633. Both were recorded in Norwich in contrast to fol. 46v of the same year from Hasborough, a Norfolk village. See figures in notes 82, 83 and 86.
 73. See Sachse, *Norwich Court, 1632–1635*, pp. 171, 197, 207–8 and 214.
 74. Defamation cases deemed serious enough to be heard at Norwich's criminal courts were largely aimed at men, usually local office-holders, mayors and aldermen. Their prosecution reflected concern with public order rather than libel. Interestingly, a popular mode of verbal assault was an attack on the honour, reputation and morality of the office-holder in question, occasionally with a sexual undertone.
 75. In a survey of 769 defamation depositions: NRO, DN/DEP/31/34 to DN/DEP/58A, 1600–1700.
 76. *Ibid.* As a contrast, the Norwich Mayor's Court between 1632 and 1635 records only eleven cases of illegitimacy, five men and six women.
 77. NRO, DN/DEP/47/51, fol. 43r, September 1664, Harding v. Wade.
 78. NRO, DN/DEP/53/58A, fol. XXI, 25 July 1694, Barber v. Lockwood. Norwich castle was at this time used as a gaol.
 79. Dixe was a widow, so presumably had inherited her stall from her late husband, one of the few ways a woman could legitimately run her own business. See Froide, *Never Married* and Amy Froide and Judith Bennett (eds), *Single-Women in the European Past, 1250–1800* (Philadelphia, PA, 2003).
 80. Barbara Hanawalt's research took as its starting point the records of medieval deaths and the locations where they occurred. She found that the locations of male deaths tended to be far more geographically spread than women's. However, women died in the wider town or village and not simply in the home, reflecting their role within the community. Men tended, on the whole, to die in open fields and woods or whilst travelling more frequently than did women, but this may simply reflect the differences in male and female working patterns rather than a gender divide between public and domestic space. See Hanawalt, 'Of Good and Ill Repute', pp. 77–81.

81. Norwich's city walls encompassed an area of three square miles.
82. Between 1600 and 1640 figures relating to defamation and location in Norwich are as follows (men:women): house 0:3; street 1:4; doorway 1:0; alehouse 3:1; shop 1:1.
83. Between 1600 and 1700 for Norwich (men:women): house 5:19; street 4:12; doorway 1:3; alehouse 5:5; shop 1:3. Interestingly, the one man who was defamed in a shop was defamed by the female shop-owner, and one of the five men insulted in the alehouse was defamed by the female landlady. The woman defamed in a shop ran the premises with her husband.
84. Gowing, 'The Freedom of the Streets', p. 137, and R. Shoemaker, 'Gendered Spaces'.
85. The diocese of Norwich extended across Norfolk and Suffolk as far west as Bury St Edmunds and Ipswich.
86. Figures for the entire diocese from 1600 to 1640 are as follows (male: female): house 41:18; field 1:2; highway between village or town 5:0; street 5:12; market 3:2; yard 2:6; doorway 1:0; church 14:0; churchyard 6:3; alehouse/inn 16:3; shop 8:5; 'in parish' 3:10. Of course these figures are not representative of all the cases, many of which did not refer to a location. Thus it is not possible to draw definite conclusions, only to infer possibilities. The final figure 'in parish' seems to equate to the street, although it is not referred to as such. Adding this figure to 'street' defamation suggests a substantially higher ratio of women, 8:22. Interestingly, out of the figures for men defamed in the highway, two were by women who were passing by on the street at the same time. One other point to note is that the number of cases where a location was given for men was double that for women (103:51), which may explain the higher numbers.
87. In many cases alehouses were referred to by name, but it is possible that some of these cases may have taken place within the alehouse. At least eight out of forty-one could have been alehouses, but there is no definite evidence one way or the other. On the other hand, at least three of the cases involving women in a house could have been alehouses.