proposait de mener ces Vierges à la modération en allant jusqu'à anticiper la honte qu'elles éprouveraient dans l'au-delà, leur faisant craindre dès ici-bas « d'alourdir par la bonne chère une chair qui est destinée à ressusciter » (p.148) révélant à tous, pour l'éternité, leur gourmandise ?

Disons pour terminer que le travail soigné et de qualité de l'éditeur Constant Venesoen s'enrichit de références aux sources ainsi que de corrections, au besoin, qui viennent éclairer les citations de Jean Girard de Villethierry. Celles-ci proviennent principalement de saint Paul et des Pères de l'Église, ce qui permet de voir la manière dont le compilateur a coulé le *contemptus mundi* sans effort dans son discours sur la virginité. Signalons un utile index des références scripturaires à la fin du volume qui fait saisir d'un coup d'œil la part prépondérante de Paul pour le Nouveau Testament et des Psaumes pour l'Ancien.

BRENDA DUNN-LARDEAU, *Université du Québec à Montréal*

Corinne S. Abate, ed. *Privacy, Domesticity, and Women in Early Modern England*. Aldershot, Hants; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003. Pp. ix, 204.

Mihoko Suzuki. *Subordinate Subjects: Gender, the Political Nation, and Literary Form in England, 1588-1688*. Aldershot, Hants; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003. Pp. 330.

Ashgate has taken a leading role in publishing work on women and gender in early modernity, not least with the foundation of "Women and Gender in the Early Modern World," a series which includes Mihoko Suzuki's *Subordinate Subjects*. Suzuki's monograph ventures into new terrain, in terms of the gendered, relational, and dynamic model of political subjectivity it develops for *both* women and subaltern males, and in terms of the range of primary sources it brings to this discussion. The collection of essays edited by Corinne S. Abate largely revisits well-trodden ground.

A reader might expect a collection with "privacy" and "domesticity" in the title to address the question of what precisely these terms meant for early modern Englishwomen and men. The introduction to *Privacy, Domesticity, and Women*, co-written by Abate and Elizabeth Mazzola, tends to collect possible readings of the terms "private" and "domestic" rather than offer a sustained argument about their evolution and deployment: "The home . . . could be a crowded site of subversion, argument, familiarity, contempt, authority and violence, local meanings and unofficial knowledge, improvisation and ritual" (p. 6). Abate and Mazzola want to acknowledge the cultural mutability of "private" and "domestic" space, but they also assume that such space is primally female space, in both its everyday activities and in the inchoate female emotions, "unfettered by patriarchal constraints" (p. 2), that seem naturally to reside there.

This assumption of private and domestic space as essentially feminine is arguable. What about the societal preoccupation with household government? The heads of households who planned gardens and tended orchards? The husbands and wives who collaborated in the collection of recipes? The “private” men who made interventions in public debate, the most famous being John Milton, who sent out *Areopagitica* to the “High Court of Parliament” from his “private condition.” The essays of the collection also do not, on the whole, explore the full range of what the private and the domestic meant for early modern English culture — for instance, the relationship of these terms to an emerging political sphere, their deployment in consolidating social control, or their part in nurturing alternate recusant or dissenting religious cultures. Instead, “privacy” and “domesticity” are terms of entry into the (feminized) world of intimacy, autonomy, and relationships with and power over others (usually men).

Accordingly, Lisa Hopkins sees *The Duchess of Malfi* as governed by “the ethos of interiority” and the Duchess as the character most closely associated with this ethos — thus justly giving her name to the play, despite her death in Act IV. Abate’s essay claims that *The Taming of the Shrew* is about Petruchio’s education of Kate for a life where marital intimacy is the only thing that matters. Theodora A. Jankowski argues for the non-coercive, female-female eroticism of some of Margaret Newcastle’s poems, especially those written as recipes, which Jankowski sees as originating from female, egalitarian culture — a problematic assumption for the seventeenth century. And then there is the ubiquitous question of power, which generally means personal power. Using the analogy of the power exercised by Elizabeth I through her “unique” ability to name her own successor and thus determine her subjects’ future identities, Catherine G. Canino argues that male characters’ identities are at the mercy of female characters in Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*. Sheila T. Cavanagh’s essay similarly tracks the subjection of male characters to the shaping effects of the instances of supernatural female power in Worth’s *Urania*. Kathryn Pratt’s essay, also on *Urania*, plays on the meanings of an “estate of loss” to suggest that Wroth, principally through the character of the poet and princess Pamphilia, manages productively to lay claim to loss and desire against the artistic and material possessiveness usually ascribed to men. Mazzola’s essay continues the preoccupation with Elizabeth’s power, likening it to that of the frightening power of the mother in infancy. Sir Philip Sidney’s poetry is thus examined for its clever simultaneous acceptance of and escape from the constraints of the “nursery” which is Elizabeth’s court.

The two best essays in the volume are by Nancy A. Gutierrez and Cristina León Alfar. Gutierrez provides a welcome complication of the model of marriage as the exchange of women between men. Focussing on the problematic character of Penthea in John Ford’s *The Broken Heart*, Gutierrez shows how this “object” of exchange herself brokers other marriage contracts and

enjoys a range of identities (subject as well as object, resister as well as victim) enabled by the range of her social relations. Alfar's essay argues that, instead of pronouncing the characters of Goneril and Regan "evil" on the basis of their violations of norms of gender and family, we should recognize that they are part of a larger critique of Lear's absolutist power, which they themselves reproduce, and which is itself supported by the structures of gender and family.

Six out of the nine essays in *Privacy, Domesticity, and Women* focus entirely on canonical male authors; the remaining three discuss Lady Mary Wroth and Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle, who are certainly at the top of the most-discussed list of the newer canon of early modern women writers. The most original chapters of *Subordinate Subjects*, by contrast, examine both women and men who are neither known nor noble, particularly the petitioning apprentices and wives of the English Revolution.

In her book, Suzuki traces the trajectories of these two analogous, but also significantly divergent, subordinated groups towards political subjecthood. Alternating between apprentices and women, political history and literary texts, Suzuki charts, on the one hand, the tradition of apprentice rioting, the popular literature of apprentice-heroes, and the developing self-identification of apprentices with the Gramscian "national-popular," which reached a high-water mark during the 1640s. On the other hand, Suzuki explores the ways in which the rebellious wives of plays staged from the 1590s to the Restoration dramatize worries about insubordinate males. She reads the class and gender critiques of Aemilia Lanyer and Rachel Speght as transitional because not yet quite "political"; and, perhaps most interestingly, she discusses the "ambiguous royalism" of Margaret Newcastle and of young, usually anonymous, women who made embroidered caskets that invoked some of the anti-patriarchal and anti-monarchical images and language used by the civil-war women petitioners. This complementary investigation seeks to give a pre-history for the "egalitarian imaginary," which was most fully realized (more, though, for the apprentices than for women) during the 1640s. Suzuki, however, also pursues the post-revolutionary history of apprentices' and women's activism well past the Restoration, examining the continuing popular literature by and about apprentices and the oppositional texts of the Catholic midwife Elizabeth Cellier and the Protestant printer Elinor James.

Bringing women and apprentices together over such a long span of time and across such a diversity of texts offers numerous advantages. Most notably, Suzuki is able to detail very specifically the ways in which gender and class are mutually but unevenly constitutive. The "subordinate subjects" of wives and apprentices are continually identified with each other; yet apprentices tend to resist allegiance across gender, demonizing women in order to support their own aspirations, while women remain unable to develop the sort of historical and collective identity which underpins the apprentices' political interventions.

Despite the book's range, its argument often seems constrained by a certain narrowness in what counts as "political." Like Abate, Suzuki does not give religion much space in her otherwise extremely thorough book. In concentrating on the "egalitarian imaginary," she neglects the "millenary imaginary" and an even more pervasive and powerful imagined entity: religious conscience. After all, the majority of the women and apprentice petitioners at the heart of Suzuki's book explicitly justified themselves as driven by zeal for a "true religion" which expunged all remnants of popery. Suzuki's book, however, advances the conversation, and this, one hopes, is what Ashgate's new series will continue to do.

SYLVIA BROWN, *University of Alberta*

Robert Appelbaum. *Literature and Utopian Politics in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Pp. xi, 256.

In its first incarnation as an 800-page dissertation from the University of California at Berkeley under the direction of Stephen Greenblatt, Robert Appelbaum's *Literature and Utopian Politics* sports an unusual Acknowledgments section that begins with a taxi driver (the author) who, in the middle of a long shift, "hatches" the idea for this study. In final the section of the book, Appelbaum teases, "If I could, I would like to conclude by noting once again the importance of the indifferent, impersonal, social domain of the institutional system in our lives, for it is the institution, for better or worse — the house — that nurtures our lives as creative workers. But I cannot" (p. xi). Readers know before the first chapter that this author is unusual, and we are left to hope that he can deliver more than an amusing tale. After all, "the house" has trained us to demand reasonable accounts, substantial research, and precise prose, particularly when we pay so much for a slim volume.

Appelbaum opens by discussing his title: "'Literature and Utopian Politics.' Or is that 'Politics and Utopian Literature'? Either one would do" (p. 1). Those in the period who desired and were willing to work for an improved political climate cast their dreams in literary form. At the same time, writers were "always grounded in the political conflicts of the day." For these reasons, Appelbaum considers all annunciations of "ideal politics" as utopian, where ideal politics is "discourse in any of a number of forms which generates the image of an ideal society." To discern the particular voices within this extremely broad discourse, Appelbaum defines what he considers its sister phenomenon: "utopian mastery," or "the power a subject may exert over an ideal society." By assessing the degree to which each voice in the discourse of ideal politics — from monarch to Puritan and parliamentarian — can claim