

the neo-Elizabethan counterpublic” (155). One part of the conclusion of this book is in fact a shorter chapter in its own right, centered on the figures of Quaker women missionaries Katherine Evans and Sarah Cheevers, who in their *Short Relation* (1662) narrate their long journey and the reception of their preaching in distant lands, while at home their co-religionists were already facing the difficult phase of the Restoration.

The thick structuring of these five parts is somehow eased by parallel subdivisions. Each chapter begins with the contextualization of the composition in the wider frame of contemporary events, ranging from the crises of the 1610s to Charles II’s return, keeping an eye on the probable source-texts, before passing on to the analysis of several passages of the works, aiming at the definition of the peculiar relationship between the private sphere where the activity of these women writers began and the wider public sphere they were involved in. The attention then shifts to other texts of the same authors and lastly to coeval or later publications which seem to build up the textual legacy of the works studied, in order to confirm scope and strength of these notable seventeenth-century artifacts, which, beyond occasional gender vindications and apart from any re-definition of literary canons, remain enlightening testimonies “of an active and engaged citizenry who create[d] widespread debate” (19).

Kate Chedgzoy. *Women’s Writing in the British Atlantic World: Memory, Place and History, 1550-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. viii + 267 pp. \$95.00. Review by LISSA BEAUCHAMP DESROCHES, ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY.

In *Women’s Writing in the British Atlantic World: Memory, Place and History, 1550-1700*, Kate Chedgzoy sets out to “mak[e] new connections between two important areas of Renaissance studies—the politics of space, place and nation; and memorial and historiographic practices—that, thriving separately, have not been adequately considered in relation to each other” (2). Chedgzoy is rhetorically sophisticated in that she identifies place and memory not only as key components of the methodology she employs but also of the works she considers.

In other words, rather than “British” or “American” or “colonial” or any of the other usual modifiers, the “British Atlantic World” comprehends both the significance of regional and historical boundaries as well as the common elements between regions and their histories; belonging is important to these women and to their writing, and the common and disparate attitudes regarding local and familial attachments are also crucial in Chedgzoy’s methodology.

Chedgzoy also spends considerable time recovering material from various manuscript sources, and performs some admirable excavations indeed. If there is any fault here, it might be that there is relatively little commonly known contextual material. Apart from Lady Anne Clifford, Anne Bradstreet, and Aphra Behn, many of these writers seem to belong to a somewhat recondite field, and she could have made more brief but significant connections to familiar contexts and sources by way of augmenting the relevance of her thesis. Still, Chedgzoy manages to “introduc[e] gender into the debate” (2) with some very trenchant readings of her chosen texts, readings that resist conventional feminist analysis while developing the feminist agenda of recovering women’s voices in interesting and new ways. Her contribution to the fields she interweaves—namely women’s writing, the politics of place, memory work, and various formal genres like autobiography, captivity narrative, commonplace books, dialogues, and elegies—is meaningful and worthy of considered attention, if only because she insists that women’s writing is such an archival process of interweaving traditions.

In Chapter one, “‘The rich Store-house of her memory’: The metaphors and practices of memory work,” Chedgzoy discusses Lady Anne Clifford’s various efforts to perform the Erasmian tenet that “teaching others is a particularly effective way of ensuring that one understands and remembers something” (18) in her household. Clifford, famously, dictated to her servants and instructed them on how to arrange notable quotations about her bedroom. “Active, interpretive listening” and the “art of hearing” (25) here instill a sense of literary sensibility that overrides literacy itself, however much Lady Clifford herself chose to record: “Reading aloud was an extremely common practice at almost all levels of society, and so reading . . . was often a collective, aural, performance activity, not merely a solitary, literate

one” (25-26). Chedgzoy then takes issue with the common feminist dismissal of Erasmus, Ramus, and Vives as authoritative figures interested in merely shaping women, as she points out that boys, too, were taught with many of the same methods, and that the figure of the waxen tablet for a woman’s mind can also denote a desirable adaptability and even agency. With reference to Vives, for instance, she comments that “The emphasis here on equipping the young woman with a repertoire of witty, smart and entertaining remarks complicates the doleful picture painted by [feminist analysis]” (32). Lady Clifford is a strong case in point, as she exemplifies “The practices of reading and writing associated with manuscript notebook compilations [that] construct the self not primarily as originator of an individual story, but as something formed in conversation, listening, reading and exchange” and which yet does not “deny the shaping power of that gathering, selecting, organizing subjectivity” (36). To this established context of Renaissance reading culture, Chedgzoy adds a less well-known subject in her analysis of *Katherine Thomas her Book*, a manuscript from the 1690s, which is an illustration of the “mother’s legacy” genre that is offered “as the textual representative of her maternal guidance” which “functions as both her surrogate in her children’s future lives, and her guarantee that they will remember her” (45). Altogether, this chapter is a wonderfully complex consideration of the nuances of the “reciprocal relation between listening, reading, speaking and writing” (19) in terms of how memory and texts co-operate to form monuments in the period.

Chapter two, “‘Writing things down has made you forget’: Memory, orality and cultural production,” takes as its topic the role of orality and its interactions with writing in memory practices in Ireland, Wales and Scotland. Since the bardic culture of these regions relies on performance rather than on publication, its key conventions are significantly familiar to women, who, as listeners and spectators, helped to perpetuate repertoires. Again, as with Lady Anne Clifford, “listening was not a passively receptive activity, but an engaged, attentive one that could and did lead to speaking, singing, and the generation of fresh contributions to repertoires of orally performed and transmitted verse and song” (57). Importantly, in such contexts, neither authorship nor publication signify privilege; the absence of manuscripts attributed to

women “does not bespeak lack of respect for women’s writing” (72; see also 65). Rather, the material in this chapter constitutes a strong reminder that performance of any kind introduces the sense of men *and* women as readers/interpreters, and that the material in question is profoundly collaborative: neither writing nor authorship matter here.

In Chapter three, entitled “Recollecting women from early modern Ireland, Scotland and Wales,” Chedzoy turns her focus back to textual matters, mining the archives of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales in separate sections both to indicate distinctions as well as to identify common themes. In Ireland, Caitlín Dubh’s poetry “blend[s] the formal public elegy for a male leader with the more feminine mode of the keen” (85) and Fionnghuala’s poetry recognizes how “keen-ing and other practices of public lamentation can be politicized and made to serve as a cultural ‘weapon of the weak’” (88, qtg James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* [New Haven: Yale UP, 1987]). Elizabeth Dowdall, “an Irish-born child of the colonial class” (90), and Alice Thornton, “an Englishwoman who spent formative childhood years in Ireland” (92), provide politically interesting accounts of the Irish rising that complicate notions of place and belonging. Scotland’s internal contrast of rural, orally-based traditions in the Highlands and sophisticated urbanity in the Lowlands supplies interesting variations on Ireland’s model, as there is continuity with Irish bardic practices (Màiri MacLeod and others) as well as self-reflexive parody of English literary models (Elizabeth Melville, Anna Hume). Finally, “The Welsh language ... is already nothing more than a site of memory, the ‘remains’ of a once-great, now obsolete poetic tradition” (112) for Katherine Philips. But it is also a way of expressing self-perception, as Magdalen Lloyd’s letters to her family assert via her linguistic identity how she is “bound to [her service to various English families] by a range of ties of mutual obligation and care” (122) rather than by presumed subordination.

The topic of mourning takes a new turn with the focus of Chapter four, “‘Shedding teares for England’s loss’: Women’s writing and the memory of war.” Anne Bradstreet, Elizabeth Brackley and Jane Cavendish, Hester Pulter, and Lucy Hutchinson each provide complementary perspectives of the trauma of lost identity endured in wartime and “Articulated in domestic dramas, prose life-writings, and

formally diverse poetry” (125-126). While Bradstreet’s concerns are not significantly different from those of male political poets, she offers a distinctly feminine domestic context within which to establish her enduring monuments to those principles. For the Royalist sympathizers Brackley and Cavendish, the form of drama is itself a memorial practice during the civil war, shifting English national identity into exile (for men) and incarceration (for women), and Pulter’s elegiac poetry figures the female body as a lost memory palace. Post-war, the elegiac form takes on a more tragic sense for the Parliamentarian Hutchinson, who mourns the past in order to forge hope for the future. Interestingly, here, Chedgzoy notes that the “language of secondariness and insubstantialness articulates the melancholia of unresolved mourning at least as much as it expresses a simply gendered self-deprecation” (155). Ultimately, the Parliamentarian appropriation of the Royalist trope of tragedy (lost war vs. regicide) configures both sides as equally subject to loss, just as women and men lose each other through war.

Finally, in Chapter five, “Atlantic removes, memory’s travels,” Chedgzoy considers the significance of trauma in the captivity narratives of Mary Rowlandson’s *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God* and Aphra Behn’s *Oroonoko*. Both texts claim autobiographical authority, but in somewhat different ways: while Rowlandson narrates her own story, Behn claims to record Oroonoko’s and Imoinda’s story from various first-hand testimonies. Both texts “aspire to the status of histories, while grounding their claims to historical record in the interplay of personal and reported or collective memories” (169). Rowlandson is both witness to others’ suffering as well as an agonised subject of divine witnessing, and she uses a narrative structure to overcome the disjunctive effects of her traumatic experience of captivity. Behn claims to give voice to one who is otherwise silenced, and Chedgzoy observes the emergence of the Defoe-like claim to veracity via spontaneous sensibility over rational accuracy (189). But the multiplicity of testimonial voices here makes Behn more a mediator than an historian (190-191), which leads Chedgzoy to the interesting idea that the text seeks to reassemble, or re-member, the dismembered Oroonoko as a textual, written monument.

The significance of this book lies clearly in its thorough recovery of texts that range across the British Atlantic and yet which address

the similar themes and topics of loss, mourning, war, captivity, and perhaps most importantly, a keen sense of the importance of forging both personal and communal connections to place through language and over time. The notions of domestic space and the female body as cultural memory theatres, and the variations on forms that establish literary monuments, not only reflect but augment the canonical (and largely masculine-authored) work on memory in the period.

Anne Dunan-Page, ed. *The Religious Culture of the Huguenots 1660-1750*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2006. xvi + 218 pp. \$99.95. Review by RUTH WHELAN, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND MAYNOOTH.

The title of this collection of ten studies, which originates from a colloquium held in Montpellier in 2004 on the Huguenots in the British Isles and the American Colonies (1550-1789), does it an injustice, for its authors range broadly over a series of themes, some of which are only loosely connected to religious culture. The uncomfortable fit between Huguenots, who were Reformed Christians in the Calvinist tradition, and the Anglicanism of the receiving societies of England and Ireland—the latter being ruled by an Anglican minority—is the subject of two essays. The Huguenots who made it into the new *Oxford DNB*, particularly the Du Moulin family, is studied by Vivienne Larminie, who correctly notes that anti-popery created a common bond between French Reformed refugees (or nonconformists), French Episcopalians (or conformists), and English Anglicans. “Poor relief” captures the attention of Randolph Vigne, who outlines the institutions founded in Britain to address the need of the thousands of destitute French refugees who poured into London, particularly after the Glorious Revolution. The Huguenot military that swelled the ranks of William of Orange’s invading army and fought under Schomberg against their own compatriots, because of the alliance between James II and Louis XIV, also figure, alongside a summary of the life and sermonising of that contentious character in the New York Refuge, Louis Rou, pastor of the French Reformed Church of St. Esprit.

The most original essays in the volume, however, are devoted to the Huguenots as cultural intermediaries via their publications, which