

Urban History Review Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

Clark, Peter and Raymond Gillespie, eds. *Two Capitals: London and Dublin, 1500–1840*. Proceedings of the British Academy, volume 107. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2001. Pp. xiii, 311. Black and white illustrations, maps, tables, index. \$140.00

Donna T. Andrew

Volume 32, numéro 1, fall 2003

Perspectives internationales sur l'histoire urbaine : un aperçu des tendances récentes

International Perspectives on Urban History: A Review of Recent Trends

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1015744ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1015744ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (imprimé)

1918-5138 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce compte rendu

Andrew, D. T. (2003). Compte rendu de [Clark, Peter and Raymond Gillespie, eds. *Two Capitals: London and Dublin, 1500–1840*. Proceedings of the British Academy, volume 107. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2001. Pp. xiii, 311. Black and white illustrations, maps, tables, index. \$140.00]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 32(1), 65–65. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1015744ar>

All Rights Reserved © Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine, 2003

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/>

éerudit

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

<https://www.erudit.org/fr/>

Clark, Peter and Raymond Gillespie, eds. *Two Capitals: London and Dublin, 1500–1840*. Proceedings of the British Academy, volume 107. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2001. Pp. xiii, 311. Black and white illustrations, maps, tables, index. \$140.00

This volume, the product in part of a conference held in Dublin in 1998, brings together fourteen eminent historians of London and Dublin and presents us with essays that are both informative and useful. They blend an analysis of the state of scholarship to date with original research and empirical findings. They are well illustrated with plentiful maps and drawings. Each of them is constructed and argued in workmanlike fashion and each is a sound and intelligent piece of work. In addition there is an introduction by the two editors, which sets out the ambitions and gives an overview of the scope of this study.

The essays, bunched in sets, are constructed around seven themes: the urban landscape, the welfare and police of the two cities, their demography and employment patterns, the governance of urban and suburban areas, their cultural institutions, their religious practices, and the nature of their urban identities. But, in fact, many of the essays are not really parallel in structure, in period, or in content. While Joanna Innes's fine piece considers the nature of London's social policies for a hundred and seventy years, Neal Garnham's intriguing analysis looks more narrowly at police and public order in eighteenth-century Dublin. Ian Archer's essay on London's governance covers the period from 1560 to 1700; its companion piece by J. R. Hill, considers Dublin's governance in "the long eighteenth century". Perhaps these sorts of incongruities are inevitable and even interesting; what is of more concern is their lack of mutual engagement. Where parallels are made between the two cities within the volume's pieces, they seem to illustrate the very different natures of these urban structures and to cast doubt on their similarities. While these articles provide much useful and important information, they merely whet the appetite for what the introduction promised. There we are told that the volume will not only shed light on urban convergences and divergences, but will consider the "forms of dialogue, interaction, and emulation." (2) In fact, we get little of this. What would be most useful in some future volume of this sort is to hear the historians involved talking to each other, raising the questions of similarity and difference, addressing the issue of interaction or imitation. In many ways a discussion like this, the conversation of many voices, inconclusive as it may be, would be as useful, and certainly more innovative, than the fine monologues presented here.

There are other structural issues about the volume that are not explained by its editors. Why consider only two of Britain's three capitals, for example? The inclusion of Edinburgh would not only have been a logical, and I think a most fruitful addition. And why this very broad, though unexplained, period for the book's scope? If the editors wished to cover both the early modern and some of the modern period, this might well have been discussed and its merits argued for. There are also curious omissions in the spheres of cultural and intellec-

tual comparison. A discussion of the nature and relation of the two cities' theatrical lives seems one such obvious gap. Another might be a consideration of why Ireland was so important in the intellectual life of the kingdom as a whole in the eighteenth century, why the contributions of Swift and Berkeley, the Sheridans and Burke (to name only those that spring first to mind) could come out of a culture so much more beleaguered and impoverished, at least materially, than her richer and more powerful neighbour. Here again the comparison of Edinburgh might have added an interesting dimension.

But rather than carp on these opportunities not taken and rather than give a recipe for my ideal comparative British urban history, I should like to end by commending all the authors who contributed to this volume, and the editors for arranging it, and bringing them together.

Donna T. Andrew
Department of History
University of Guelph

De Barros, Juanita. *Order and Place: In a Colonial City. Patterns of Struggle and Resistance in Georgetown, British Guiana, 1889–1924*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003. Pp. xii, 252, Illustrations, bibliography, index.

Myers, Garth Andrew. *Verandahs of Power: Colonialism and Space in Urban Africa*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2003. Pp. xii, 199. Illustrations, bibliography, index.

The form of any city is the result of the designs of many people. It expresses power, most obviously of those who control land but also, more generally, of the dominant classes who make space in their own image. Grand boulevards and squares were made by absolute states; high-rise offices and modern planned subdivisions speak of a blander collaboration of planners with corporate developers; the squatter shantytowns, disorderly to outside eyes, express a popular democracy in which real power lies elsewhere.

Colonial cities of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were created by autocratic, at best paternal societies. Colonizers made cities to serve their own ends, and aimed to teach the lessons of civilization, modernity, and cultural superiority. In recent years some writers have explored how European powers shaped the settlements through which they exercised colonial rule. Timothy Mitchell, one of the more influential of these, has identified a strategy of "enframing," which imposed visible order, segregated peoples and functions, and established points of surveillance.¹ But as, for example, Brenda Yeoh has shown, the power that colonizers exercised over city residents was never absolute; the strategy of enframing was always incomplete and compromised.²

Two recent books exemplify and extend our understanding of how colonial power over cities was negotiated, and with what consequences. In *Order and Place in a Colonial City*, the historian Juanita De Barros examines the dialogue of control