

preconceptions about the republican political tradition. Still, this appears to be Connolly's preferred approach: Horace's republican credentials, for example, are ultimately his interest in freedom and virtue (pp. 121–5), two themes that Connolly elsewhere suggests we should associate with an entirely different “strand of republican filiation” than what she will address in this book (pp. 17–18; see also her more general dissatisfaction with treatments of Roman republicanism that focus on “concepts” and “values” on p. 205).

The bigger question, however, is why Connolly feels it necessary to frame her project as a contribution to the history of republican thought at all. Reading *The Life of Roman Republicanism*, one senses that Connolly is less excited about how these texts stand in relation to something called “republicanism” than how they incorporate and respond to features of a political climate remarkably similar to our own. Facing “highly unstable conditions . . . under which a culture of rational deliberation was difficult if not impossible to sustain or even imagine,” Connolly explains, Roman writers produced texts “linked by concern for how men in such conditions come to know the world, how they make judgments about it, and how they communicate knowledge and judgments to others” (p. 204). Rather than mire herself in a debate about what republicanism “really was,” Connolly might have built her book more solidly around *this* insight, for which her chapters provide more and better evidence. What it might have permitted her to argue is that Roman political thought has value *beyond* its contributions to the republican political tradition: Indeed, it may be *most* relevant to contemporary audiences when processing the trauma of Roman republicanism's final collapse. If Connolly is right to hold that ours is a time of “crisis” (p. xiii) in which “public order” has replaced meaningful political participation as the preeminent value in American political life (p. x) and democracy has become nothing more than a façade whereby elite power acquires the veneer of popular approval (p. xii), *Life After Roman Republicanism* would appear to be the book we really need.

Household Politics: Conflict in Early Modern England.

By Don Herzog. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013. 209p. \$45.00. doi:10.1017/S1537592715003655

— Lena Halldenius, *Lund University*

In a recent piece for the *New Statesman*, the signature Glosswitch writes this about the political dynamite that is the female body: “Female bodies (well-fed, unshaven, unperfumed, free) are the truly powerful bodies. If they were not, men would not have created so many laws, institutions and doctrines aimed at controlling them and appropriating the work they do” (August 14, 2015). I will return to this thought momentarily.

In *Household Politics*, Don Herzog opens with a lengthy quote from Jonathan Swift's poem “The Lady's

Dressing-Room.” In it, the male gaze makes an inventory of the smelly and greasy paraphernalia left behind after a woman's careful and lengthy toilette: sweat, spit, scabs, and the smelly contents of a chamber pot. The man recoils; how disgusting the female body is under the stays and the powder. Herzog wants us to believe that Swift is not on a misogynist rant; he is making fun of men who cannot handle the physical reality behind the fantasy of “The Lady.”

By using Swift's poem so early in the book, Herzog wants to do two things: first, give the reader a taste of his sources—poems and plays, satire and songs—and, second, assert that his interpretation of Swift's poem contributes to the book's main aim, which is a myth-busting of ideas of gender and the household in early modern England. So, what is the myth? His starting point is that there is a widespread idea that early modern England was so comprehensively steeped in misogyny and the belief in men's natural superiority over women that people were blind to it and never questioned it. Male superiority, according to this myth, was generally regarded as natural or necessary. Herzog refers to this as “the big sleep thesis” and sets out to dismantle it by showing that there was, in fact, lots of debate and controversy over these issues. The poems, plays, and songs are his main evidence. The busting of the big sleep thesis is part one of his aim. Part two sets out to bust yet another alleged myth: that there was a sharp separation of spheres—public and private—and that men were identified with the public while women were relegated to the private. Here, Herzog argues that the public—private distinction is multifaceted and that even though women were “private” in one sense—they were kept out of political influence—they were very much public in the sense that they were regarded as generally sexually accessible and that their sins (equaling loss of chastity at the hands of men) made them legitimate targets of prying intervention.

In addition, Herzog seeks to establish that the early modern English household is correctly regarded as “political.” His point here is a conceptual one. Politics should not necessarily be understood as having to do with the institution of government. Politics is controversy over legitimate authority, including domestic authority. Contemporary sources reveal—songs and poems again, but now also court cases of domestic violence—that there was a whole lot of conflict in family settings, notably between servants and masters. These conflicts never threatened the social order, since (and here the author claims to have busted his last myth) it is wrong to think that social order requires consensus. Conflict is not a threat to social order but a part of it. In fact, there is a constitutive relation between conflict and social order. Because of the prevalence of conflict, then, Herzog concludes that the early modern household was political.

Now, this reader does not have a problem with any of Herzog's conclusions: In early modern England, there were diverse views over and debate about women and the family; male authority over wives, children, and servants was not simply and meekly accepted by all. The biggest problem with this book is that we kind of knew that already. This need not have mattered very much if the book had been set up differently. Historians and other scholars of the period might be unfamiliar with these songs and plays. If Herzog had started out saying something like "We know that early modern England was a complex and violent place, marked by upheavals in almost all respects: political, philosophical, scientific, theological, and so on, so let us see what picture we get when we look at popular culture," then this could have been a good read. The discussion about the concept of politics has the material of an interesting article.

Instead, Herzog sets out—in sardonic tones—to dismantle what can only be described as a straw man. Who subscribes to the big sleep thesis? After reading the book to the end, we still do not know. There is a footnote (n. 8, p. 3) with three references, none to work published later than the 1980s, which are claimed as examples. As foes go, that is a bit meager. Can he seriously think that this is the common view? Occasionally he merges the reader with the foe, slapping a "diagnosis" of conflict aversion on a "you" (p. 193) who is supposed to be who—*me*?

Herzog's sources are to a large extent satire, but satire is a distancing genre; it mocks the mainstream, the establishment, received wisdom, pompous certainty, and the vanity of the powerful. Satirical depictions of ridiculous men and of women wearing the breeches do not disprove that the established norm structuring society was male superiority and female subordination. On the contrary, it strongly indicates that the norm was just that. And the existence of controversy shows that the norm was not uncontested; it does not disprove that the norm bottomed out in hierarchical ideas about male and female nature. "Nature" was a normative concept. Songs of satire neither prove nor disprove that female subordination was regarded as natural and necessary among those men whose power might be contested, but not to the extent that they could not wield it freely and—ridiculous or not—make and promulgate the laws and doctrines "aimed at controlling [women] and appropriating the work they do," as Glosswitch put it. Many early modern women never questioned their appointed lot, but some did. We know that. But they also knew that behind any merry song or lewd poem, they were up against an overwhelming monolith of power, intent on capitalizing on perceptions of women's nature to keep them ignorant and pliant. Herzog gives scant attention to feminist thinkers of the day, maybe because they are part of the "learned abstractions" (p. 38) of theory, or "blather," as he puts it. "Men are possessed of all Places of Power, Trust, and Profit," wrote Mary Astell in *Some*

Reflections upon Marriage (1700): "Who shall contend with them?" Who indeed?

Herzog's argument taking place against the vacuum that is the "big sleep thesis" easily prompts a reviewer to say the obvious: Any reasonable person knows that there was no big sleep! But we do not know this because there was satire. We know it because power does not work like that. Power cannot afford to sleep, not then and not now.

Dangerous Crossings: Race, Species and Nature in a Multicultural Age. By Claire Jean Kim. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. 346p. \$99.99 cloth, \$29.99 paper. doi:10.1017/S1537592715003667

— Jeff Spinner-Halev, *University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

The topic of multiculturalism and animal rights is underexplored, but certainly interesting. Claire Jean Kim raises the lens of multiculturalism early in the book but dismisses it as not being particularly useful because it is essentialist (an old accusation that is by now misleading), and because it ignores the issue of animals. We do not learn much about how thinking about animals would alter theories of multiculturalism, but the issues the book treats are nonetheless fascinating. Kim urges us think through the issues with her through different optics: the optic of cruelty, the optic of racism, and the optic of ecological harm. When political actors look at each issue through their particular lens, the world clarifies and simplifies, but each side refuses to really understand the other. The largest part of the book covers the political fights between animal rights activists and the live animal merchants of Chinatown; there is also one short chapter on whaling and the Makah tribe and another one on Michael Vick, the NFL quarterback who was convicted and jailed for dogfighting.

The Chinatown saga begins in a simple way: a walk to work in San Francisco through Chinatown by Patt Briggs, a part-time animal activist who worked on a litany of animal issues: spay and neuter, the circus, fur farming and rodeos. Looking around in Chinatown she sees a big tank filled with crabs who can barely move and who would be killed by being thrown in a vat of boiling water. As Briggs and other agitate for change in how these animals are treated, a report by the San Francisco Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SFSPCA) notes the deplorable treatment of animals in the live animal market in Chinatown: fish packed so tightly in tanks that those that remained alive were pinned upside and sideways, unable to move; a turtle having its shell sliced from its body while alive, which the report suggests is like skinning or scalping a person alive; frogs piled one on top of each other, with those on the bottom crushed, in plastic bins smeared with black slime (pp. 80–81).

The initial animal activists were careful to note that their arguments were not that Chinese culture was