not actually explored, it could just as easily be understood as a simple religious difference between people (156). Similarly, Black notes that the public became engaged with geography during Russia's rise. Much of his evidence focuses on British fear of Russian expansion, which while technically spatial, required little sense of geography or the spatial to grasp. Instead, much of what Black discusses seems more about politics, broadly defined. Perhaps Black could have avoided this confusion with a clearer conversation about what geography is and what makes something spatial.

Unsurprisingly from someone who has published several books on similar topics, one of the greatest strengths of *Geographies of an Imperial Power* is Black's familiarity with a significant variety of sources, including a plethora of different styles of maps. Indeed, the press and maps are clearly his expertise, representing the strongest parts of this work. Regarding maps, while Black does not explore cartographical printing methods in depth, he does understand the different traditions they originated from and the diverse purposes they served. Black uses these sources as the backbone of his ambitious work, which spans more than a century of history in a growing empire. However, Black's reasoning behind making his chapters "range widely" does not obviate their lack of structure and the unwieldy sentences that obfuscate his broader points.

Nathan Bryant Braccio
University of Connecticut
nathan.braccio@uconn.edu

Caroline Boswell. *Disaffection and Everyday Life in Interregnum England*. Studies in Early Modern Cultural, Political and Social History 29. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2017. Pp. 285. $115 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2018.121

Caroline Boswell's study of disaffection seeks to shift the focus of histories of interregnum popular politics away from questions of allegiance to instead explore how local conflicts intersected with the broader, national political context. She demonstrates convincingly how local disputes and discontent were refashioned by pamphleteers and newsbook writers to present an image of popular disenchantment with the interregnum regimes.

Boswell arranges the book into two parts: the first, "Sites of Disaffection," looking in particular at streets, marketplaces, taverns, and alehouses; and the second, "Objects of Disaffection," examining common targets for popular hostility (the soldiery, excisemen, and the figure of the "fanatic"). In these chapters, Boswell's argument is supported by the examination of detailed case studies, such as the attack on Colonel John Hewson and other troops in London in December 1659. She is also attentive to recent scholarship, which has stressed the spatial as well as performative aspects of popular politics.

Boswell's work is most persuasive when she explores how popular disaffection was exploited for political purposes by the opponents of the Commonwealth and Protectorate. In Hewson's case, the resistance of apprentices to the threat to curtail their rights to petition was transformed in the press into a public trial of the colonel for his part in the execution of Charles I. The manipulation of popular disaffection for political ends, however, as Boswell shrewdly notes, involved conceding political agency to "lowly members of the commonality" (243), as well as implicit approval of the sometimes violent tactics that they employed.

There are interesting resonances here with the kind of "popular Toryism" that emerged during and in the aftermath of the Exclusion Crisis, discussed in the work of Tim Harris. Labels such as "fanatic" too clearly had a long shelf life, and, though Boswell's work

understandably concentrates on the period from 1649 to 1660, it might have strengthened the work if she could have looked just a little more at the legacies of interregnum disaffection. Equally, the "royalist commons" that Boswell sees being fashioned rhetorically through the literature of disaffection could be connected with recent work by Blair Worden on actual broad coalition-building, generated in the movements for a "free" Parliament in 1659–1660.

While these wider implications point to the considerable value of Boswell's work, the nebulous nature of popular disaffection itself poses questions about the specificity of the conclusions that she draws from the 1650s. As she acknowledges, the "chimney men" of the 1660s enjoyed similar powers and met with similar popular opposition to the excisemen of the 1650s. Similarly, though there was a particular association between drink and Royalism, health-drinking was a trigger for seditious speech and gesture in other periods as well. Public spaces and sites, such as the market cross, were locations of popular contestation and defiance well before and well after 1650. There is a danger, too, in Boswell's understandable desire to rethink popular political activity during the 1650s in terms other than allegiance. The connections between "disaffection" and the wider context can, in places, seem evident only when local disputes were repackaged by the contemporary press. For example, while she very deftly shows how Sir Arthur Hesilrige's dispute with the tenants of Eslington, Northumberland was later employed by Royalist writers (themselves borrowing from Leveller commentary) to demonstrate his greed and corruption, she pays less attention to the way in which the tenants themselves appear to have utilized Hesilrige's well-known disenchantment with the Protectoral regime to advance their own cause.

Overall, however, this is a sophisticated and valuable treatment of popular disaffection in interregnum England. The flash points Boswell discusses are generally handled with great care and sensitivity. For example, in discussing reports of seditious words occasioned by health-drinking, Boswell notes not only the political divisions such incidents might reveal but also the perceived threat they posed to values of sociability. Equally, she acknowledges that the reporting of such words was likely driven by multiple factors: financial rewards in the case of some informers and political loyalties in the case of others, but also a desire to preserve these spaces of community sociability from the threat of closure.

In her conclusion, Boswell is rightly wary of drawing any parallels between the exploitation of disaffection in the seventeenth century and modern-day "populist" politics. However, if comparisons of that kind would be inappropriate, this monograph should both provide much food thought for historians of later Stuart popular political culture and shed important light on the "popularity" of Charles II's restoration.

Ted Vallance
University of Roehampton
edward.vallance@roehampton.ac.uk

Clare Brant. *Balloon Madness. Flights of Imagination in Britain, 1783–1786*. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2017. Pp. 343. $39.95 (cloth).
doi: 10.1017/jbr.2018.122

In 1785, Tiberius Cavallo reminded the readers of his *History of Aerostation* that the ambition to acquire the art of flying "has been the earnest desire, and exercised the genius, of mankind in every age." On one level, balloon madness was a temporary phenomenon—attracting huge public interest for a couple of years—only to fizzle out as aeronauts failed to realize the much-hyped potential of aerostatic innovation. But on the other hand, it was an extraordinary

https://doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2018.121 Published online by Cambridge University Press