

Monuments of Truth: Domesticity, Memory, and Politics in the English Civil Wars and  
Restoration

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
BY

Dana Schumacher-Schmidt

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Advised by John Watkins

May 2014

© Dana Schumacher-Schmidt, 2014

## Acknowledgements

For their time, helpful comments, and guidance I extend heartfelt thanks to the members of my committee: John Watkins, Rebecca Krug, Katherine Scheil, and Ruth Mazo Karras. As my adviser, John made sure I never had to wait long for detailed, insightful feedback on any chapter draft that I submitted and I am thankful for his continuous encouragement. Becky pushed me exactly when I needed it and helped me remember what I love about writing and about this project.

The three weeks I spent in the Center for Writing Dissertation Writing Retreat made me a better writer, a better reader, and a better teacher of writing. Enormous thanks to Katie Levin for coordinating this program, which has helped so many students find their way to finishing.

Graduate students and faculty in the English department's medieval and early modern workshop read parts of several chapters and I am grateful for their questions and suggestions. I would especially like to thank Shirley Garner, Ben Utter, and Amanda Taylor for their thoughtful responses to my writing and thinking. I had the opportunity to share portions of this research at a number of conferences, including the Early Modern Women: New Perspectives symposium at the University of Miami, a seminar on "Early Modern Women and the Discourse of Death" at the Shakespeare Association of America conference, and a panel on "Early Modern Women and Food" at the Modern Language Association convention. I am thankful to have found such a welcoming, generous, and invigorating community of scholars in early modern women's studies.

Warmest thanks to my graduate school friends and colleagues, especially Jessica Narum, Amy Griffiths, Chris Flack, and Rachel McWhorter. Sharin' Schroeder was my trusty writing partner on many occasions and my long-distance cheerleader in the final stages of my work. On many afternoon walks my husband Brian listened to me ramble on about spectacles, haunted houses, Puritans, and other bits and pieces of this project. His thoughtful questions, unwavering belief in me, and home-made bread and beer sustained me through the writing process. Finally, I owe a huge debt of gratitude to my parents, John and Margaret Schumacher, and to my brother, Johnnie Schumacher, for their infinite love and support.

## **Dedication**

This dissertation is dedicated to my great-grandmother Katharina Bellmann (1915-2013).

## Table of Contents

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>Introduction.....</b>  | 1   |
| <b>Chapter One</b>  |     |
| “This unnatural War came like a Whirlwind”: Remembering and Rebuilding in Margaret Cavendish’s <i>A True Relation of My Birth, Breeding, and Life</i> ..... | 9   |
| <b>Chapter Two</b>  |     |
| Domestic Violence, or How to Preserve the Past in <i>The Court and Kitchin of Elizabeth, Commonly Called Joan Cromwell</i> .....                            | 48  |
| <b>Chapter Three</b>  |     |
| “What is Necessary to Be Remembered”: Lucy Hutchinson and the Politics of Restoration Memory.....   | 90  |
| <b>Chapter Four</b>   |     |
| Seeing Through “Sacred Spectacles”: Memory and Composition in Lucy Hutchinson’s <i>Order and Disorder</i> .....   | 140 |
| <b>Bibliography.....</b>  | 209 |

## Introduction

In Margaret Cavendish's military biography of her husband, *The Life of ... William Cavendishe* (1667), she criticizes those

who have written of the late Civil War with but few sprinklings of Truth, like as Heat-drops on a dry, barren Ground; knowing no more of the Transactions of those Times than what they learned in the Gazettes, which for the most part (out of Policy to amuse and deceive the People) contain nothing but Falsehoods and Chimeras.

Cavendish sets her own work against these, as having been written “as faithfully and truly as my memory will serve me” based on “Eye-witness” experience. This prefatory positioning of her account attests to the fact that many of those who, like Cavendish, lived through the upheaval of the civil wars, the Commonwealth, and the Restoration, were moved to record victories and losses, both personal and public, that they had experienced as part of “the Transactions of those Times”. This dissertation focuses on written war memory and commemoration of “the late Civil War” and its aftereffects and traces how writers like Cavendish attempt to reframe the recent past and control access to it for imagined audiences in the present and in the future.

Turmoil marks the years covered by this project, and throughout this period the authors I consider and the politically-defined communities to which they belong experience multiple turns of fortune’s wheel. While at some point all deal with injustice, injury, and instability that originates in war, they experience this most urgently at different times depending on their political allegiances. Thus the first two chapters of my dissertation consider royalist commemoration from the Commonwealth years, in the forms of autobiography and recipe book, that helped construct and sustain a community in exile and defeat prior to the return of the Stuart monarchy. The latter half of the

dissertation turns to the work of the republican Lucy Hutchinson, who struggles to come to terms with the Restoration as a source of personal and political grief. Both sections trace the meanings about war that individual authors make for themselves and express in their own stories, but in ways that link them up with and make them available for shared commemorative efforts, including publication and the use of particular keywords or vocabularies of metaphor. Throughout the dissertation, I show that writers from across the spectrum of religious and political affiliation and working in diverse genres nevertheless turn to languages of the domestic in order to collectivize their individual memories of the wars.

In their discussion of approaches to the study of war memory and commemoration, T.G. Ashplant, Graham Dawson, and Michael Roper find that studies have tended to fall into two main paradigms. The first consists of arguments that construe the significance of war memory and commemoration as fundamentally political, while the second holds it to be significant primarily for psychological reasons, as an expression of mourning (7). I am interested in how commemorative texts written from the 1650s-1670s blend the political and the psychological, specifically through a depiction of domestic relationships, activities, and spaces. Ashplant, Dawson, and Roper argue for a recognition of the intertwining of politics and mourning in war remembrance, writing “The politics of war memory and commemoration *always* has to engage with mourning and with attempts to make good the psychological and physical damage of war; and wherever people undertake the tasks of mourning and reparation, a politics is *always* at work” (9). My focus is on how these various memorial texts, emerging from defeated communities, situate themselves in the context of “official” meanings and understandings

of the wars and attempt to influence who or what can be commemorated and in what terms. Each author strives to foreground certain memories out of a clear sense that what is at stake in gaining recognition for their version of the past is a means for them and their community to move forward into the future. The need to imagine a future moment when things will be otherwise than they are now and from which writer and readers alike will be able to look back with a difference, whether that means the return of an earlier order or the initiation of something radically new, animates all of the commemorative texts considered in this dissertation.

Studies of war memory and commemoration have tended to privilege the idealized figure of the masculine soldier with the effect that “the meanings and memories of others who have sacrificed and suffered--above all women--are relegated to the margins” (Ashplant, Dawson, and Roper 21). Margaret Cavendish and Lucy Hutchinson resist this relegation and instead attempt to demonstrate the centrality of their experiences to the narrative of the wars and their aftereffects through the Restoration. For example, Cavendish defends her authority to write on the subject in strong terms in the preface to *The Life of... William Cavendishe*: “Nor it is inconsistent with my being a Woman, to write of Wars, that was neither between *Medes* and *Persions*, *Greeks* and *Trojans*, *Christians* and *Turks*; but among my own Countreymen, whose Customs and Inclinations, and most of the Persons that held any considerable place in the Armies, was well known to me.” The wars are hers to record, as much as they are anyone else’s, because they were fought in her lifetime, in her home country, by people “well known” to her either personally or as members of the same cultural community. As Cavendish and Hutchinson reflect on the lived experiences of war, its causes and its meaning, they

support Joanne H. Wright's questioning of the failure of military historians and historians of political thought to acknowledge women's perspectives on war: "In thinking about women political writers and war writers in the seventeenth century, the challenge is not so much that no women were writing on war but that scant attention has been paid to this aspect of their writing" (2).<sup>1</sup> Wright further argues that "To take women's war writing seriously is to discover that women's perspectives on war may sound different, and may come from a place outside or beyond the bounds of what we normally consider the sites for knowledge production, spaces that are personal, private, or domestic" (20). This dissertation shows the centrality of such spaces to war commemorations produced through the Restoration. Though the likely male-authored *Court & Kitchin* does not constitute women's war writing in the same sense as Hutchinson or Cavendish's works, it does claim to share knowledge about war that comes from traditionally overlooked private, domestic space: the recipe collection and the kitchen.

The first chapter of this dissertation, "'This unnatural War came like a Whirlwind': Remembering and Rebuilding in Margaret Cavendish's *A True Relation of My Birth, Breeding, and Life*," shows how Margaret Cavendish figures the war's impact on her birth family, the Lucases, in terms of sacred family places that have been destroyed by parliamentary forces who have, in her view, forgotten themselves. The force of forgetting, as Grant Williams and Christopher Ivic have argued, can "expose the fragility of the social order in early modern literature" where "to forget oneself" often "signals a slide from one social category to the other" (4-5). For Cavendish, rebellion

---

<sup>1</sup> Wright does not discuss *A True Relation* in her examination of "Cavendish's multiple narratives and stories of war," choosing to focus on the Restoration works *Orations of Divers Sorts* (1662), *Bell in Campo* (1662), and *Sociable Letters* (1664).

against the king requires a fundamental forgetting that also marks a slide from civility to barbarism. Cavendish opposes this collective self-forgetting and its damaging effects through a process of recollection figured as the rebuilding of household space. In *A True Relation*, the space at the center of these processes is the Lucas family home, St. John's Abbey, a site of frequent violence during the wars up until its destruction in 1648 during the siege of Colchester. Throughout *A True Relation* Cavendish reconstructs St. John's Abbey from the ruins and takes her readers on a guided tour, showcasing carefully curated spaces within the house while intentionally leaving other locations off limits. In the spaces she reveals to her readers, as well as those she conceals, Cavendish attempts to reestablish boundaries that were violated during the wars and enclose her family within a sanctuary that does not exist outside of the pages of her book. In this way, Cavendish's text stands in for an imaginary St. John's Abbey, one that she can protect from plunder and destruction, while preserving it as a site of personal and collective memory. Although recently scholars have called attention to the multiplicity of Cavendish's political viewpoints as expressed in her later war writings, in the construction of this particular textual haven, Cavendish activates a royalist vocabulary of enclosed spaces that confirms her loyalty to traditional models of order and authority and her participation in a broader effort of Commonwealth commemoration.<sup>2</sup>

The power of a text to serve as a site of memory for a fragmented royalist community continues to serve as the focus of the second chapter, which turns to the

---

<sup>2</sup> For an exploration of how Cavendish's political views sometimes veer from royalist ideologies, see Hilda L. Smith "A General War Amongst the Men . . . But None Amongst the Women": Political Differences Between Margaret and William Cavendish," *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain*, ed. Howard Nenner, Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1997, 143–160; Mihoko Suzuki, *Subordinate Subjects: Gender, the Political Nation, and Literary Form in England, 1588–1688*, Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003, 165–202; Elizabeth Walters, "Gender and Civil War Politics in Margaret Cavendish's 'Assaulted and Pursued Chastity,' *Early Modern Women: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 8 (2013): 207–240.

politicization of printed recipe books during the Commonwealth and early years of the Restoration. While recipe books printed during this period tend to display allegiance with the Stuart monarchy and offer readers a means to preserve lost royal and aristocratic culture, only one does so within a satirical framework.<sup>3</sup> “Domestic Violence, or How to Preserve the Past in *The Court and Kitchin of Elizabeth, Commonly Called Joan Cromwell*,” considers this collection that advertises its ability satisfy readers’ appetite for revenge through the revelation of the monstrous housewifery that sustained the Protectoral household. *Court & Ktichin* satirizes the attempts of Oliver and Elizabeth Cromwell to imitate royalty, focused through a dissection of the vulgar and Puritanical Elizabeth’s unsuccessful efforts to keep house at Whitehall Palace. The anonymous author constructs an audience of defeated royalists who blame all of their suffering, past, present, and future, on the Cromwells. Blending recipe book and commonplace book, *Court and Kitchin of Elizabeth* (1664) wishfully transforms Oliver Cromwell’s martial violence into his wife’s meager cookery through an imaginative recreation of their private household. To “slight” Oliver’s “Butchery” into his wife’s “Cookery,” as the book promises, is to domesticate memories of the horrors of war, transforming them into something more comprehensible and even comic. As Elizabeth Cromwell and her husband are shown to turn the royalist household into a site of battle, *Court & Kitchin* invites readers to take on the “she-Usurper” in her own stolen kitchen.

Margaret Cavendish’s claim that, with her writing, she “will build [a] Monument of Truth though [she] cannot of Marble,” aligns her with Lucy Hutchinson, but these

---

<sup>3</sup> Madeline Bassnett illuminates the royalist politics of recipe books printed during the Commonwealth in “Restoring the Royal Household: Royalist Politics and the Commonwealth Recipe Book.” *Early English Studies*. 2 (2009): n.pag.

writers experienced, and therefore depicted, the forces of memory and forgetting through an opposing set of political and religious allegiances. My third chapter, “What is Necessary to be Remembered”: Lucy Hutchinson and the Politics of Restoration Memory,” places Hutchinson’s *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* within the context of a Restoration culture in which remembering and forgetting carry an explicit political charge. Responding directly to what she sees as the destructive force of oblivion, Hutchinson strives to produce a textual monument that does justice to the life of her husband John, a regicide and leader of the parliamentary army who died a political prisoner. Hutchinson’s commemoration of her husband and their shared political cause should be understood as an oppositional gesture to what she perceives as an act of national amnesia initiated by the passage of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion by the House of Commons in July 1660. From her perspective, the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion makes a show of forgetting to enable the recreation of a collective identity fragmented during the wars and in the absence of a king. For Hutchinson, then, the obligation to remember centrally defines what it means to be a widow and throughout her account she confronts efforts by her enemies to use her husband’s life and death to make meanings suited to their own political purpose.

Though Hutchinson pits her remembering against Restoration forgetting in the *Memoirs*, elsewhere she figures the processes as complementary. In the preface to her Genesis epic *Order and Disorder* (1679), she embraces forgetting as a kind of mental cleaning that decontaminates her memory, leaving her better able to remember more important material, in this case Scriptural language. These workings of memory behind the composition of *Order and Disorder* serve as the basis for my final chapter, “Seeing

through ‘Sacred Spectacles’: Meditation and Memory in Lucy Hutchinson’s *Order and Disorder*.’’ Though initially this work may seem to be the least personal and most removed from the wars of the texts discussed in this dissertation, it represents Hutchinson’s continued efforts to reconcile with loss and write her way out of a crisis of memory while showing readers how they might appropriate her methods to do the same. *Order and Disorder* emerges from meditation, a process of internalizing language for the purpose of sustained contemplation. Hutchinson dramatizes the process by which these meditations and the ensuing collision between the internalized language from Scripture and other sources already inscribed in her memory enable a new creative agency. This occurs in the post-Fall conversation she imagines between Adam and Eve in Canto 5 of her poem. Here Hutchinson alternately resurrects earlier representations of herself and her husband crafted for the “Elegies” and the *Memoirs* and, ultimately, appropriates the language of textual authority that she had previously ascribed only to her husband. The power of Scripture to act as “sacred spectacles,” which Hutchinson explicates in a theological work addressed to her daughter, is depicted through this imagined conversation and the narrator’s closing meditations on it, presented in Hutchinson’s own newly illuminated voice. This moment at the close of Canto 5 represents in miniature the long struggle of Lucy Hutchinson’s transformation from the sad shade that haunts the final pages of the *Memoirs* into a fully-realized authority whose “certain truths” spoken at the close of *Order and Disorder* provide readers the means to look back on their own doubt and suffering of previous decades from a different perspective.

## **Chapter One: “This unnatural War came like a Whirlwind”: Remembering and Rebuilding in Margaret Cavendish’s *A True Relation of My Birth, Breeding, and Life***

At first there is only the ruin... What was last week a drab little house has become a steep flight of stairs winding up in the open between gaily-coloured walls, tiled lavatories, interiors bright and intimate like a Dutch picture or a stage set; the stairway climbs up and up, undaunted, to the roofless summit where it meets the sky. The house has put on melodrama; people stop to stare; here is a domestic scene wide open for all to enjoy. To-morrow or to-night, the gazers feel, their own dwelling may be even as this.

-Rose Macaulay, *Pleasure of Ruins*, 454

When Rose Macaulay writes “A Note on New Ruins” in the early 1950s, she reflects on how the cities and towns of England and Europe have been transformed by the bombing campaigns of World War II. Without ever naming the war directly, Macaulay comments on the painful freshness of these ruins which have not yet acquired “the weathered patina of age...nor yet put on their ivy, nor equipped themselves with the appropriate bestiary of lizards, bats, screech-owls, serpents, speckled toads, and little foxes,” not yet been distanced from the present and “softened by art” (453, 454). “Caen, Rouen, Coventry, the City churches, the German and Belgian cathedrals” and even the anonymous “drab little house” in the epigraph above still sting because those who stumble among their fragments still remember how they came to be and what they were before. In Macauley’s view, these new ruins evoke not only a “resentful sadness” and a longing for wholeness, but also prompt a moment of empathy with earlier generations: “one reflects that with such pangs of anger and loss people in other centuries looked on those ruins newly made which today have mellowed into ruin *plus beau que la beauté*” (454). As “one reflects,” one could turn her mind back to Margaret Cavendish who, surveying the destruction left by the English Civil Wars three centuries before the

publication of Macaulay's text, also worries about the collective trauma materialized in new ruins. Apart from the ivy and owls Macaulay identifies, new ruins lack a stable meaning or a coherent story. Cavendish's treatment of civil war ruins attempts to find and preserve their meaning in a way that resonates with her initial audience, those still coping with their own fresh memories of the wars, and that will endure for her audience in "after-Ages," those who will encounter the ruins once they have aged.

The ruins with which Cavendish is most concerned are those of her family home, St. John's Abbey. In an often-quoted passage at the conclusion of her memoir *A True Relation of My Birth, Breeding, and Life*, Cavendish responds to the question she anticipates her publication will raise: "why hath this Ladie writ her owne Life?" (63). She has done so, she explains, in order to make her mark on history while she has the chance, "lest after-Ages should mistake, in not knowing I was daughter to one Master *Lucas* of *St. Johns* neer *Colchester* in *Essex*, second Wife to the Lord Marquis of *Newcastle*, for my Lord having had two Wives, I might easily have been mistaken, especially if I should dye, and my Lord marry again" (63). Critics have focused on Cavendish's anxiety over being potentially conflated with Elizabeth Bassett Howard, William Cavendish's first wife. However, before she became "second Wife to the Lord Marquis of *Newcastle*" she was "daughter to one Master *Lucas* of *St. Johns*" and she takes this relation as the foundation of her identity. Cavendish's formulation equally highlights the significance of place in the public identity she crafts for "after-Ages" by grounding it in her childhood home at St. John's Abbey. St. John's becomes a productive memory site for Cavendish. While other Royalist women, including her own stepdaughters Jane Cavendish and

Elizabeth Brackley, spent the wars confined within their stately homes and castles, which both protected and imprisoned them, Margaret Cavendish left St. John's in 1643 and then fled England for Paris as a maid of honor in Henrietta Maria's court. She remained in Europe after her marriage to William Cavendish and was there in 1648 when St. John's Abbey was destroyed during the Siege of Colchester.<sup>4</sup> Throughout *A True Relation* Cavendish reconstructs St. John's Abbey and revisits particularly traumatic moments from her family's history there in order to make the space resonate for a wider community of royalist readers coping with exile and defeat. Cavendish seeks to establish an authoritative story of these ruins in order to establish limits on what they can mean in the present and for future audiences.

To that end, Cavendish's work depends on the strategic recuperation of sites within St. John's Abbey and on a controlled disclosure of what she defines as private, domestic space. *A True Relation* reunites the members of the Lucas family in a textual reconstruction of the home they once shared. In this way, the text directly counteracts the disruptive and destructive force of the wars, which Cavendish describes as coming "like a Whirlwind, which fell'd down their Houses" (45). This felling of houses, in Cavendish's account, comes to stand for a more profound rupture in the social fabric that connects past and future and that depends on a particular relationship between property, propriety,

---

<sup>4</sup> The literary productions of the Cavendish sisters have received increased attention in recent years, especially with regard to how their work emerges from and responds to the crisis of the civil wars. See, for example: Kate Chedgzoy, *Women's Writing in the British Atlantic World: Memory, Place, and History, 1550-1700*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007; Ann Hughes and Julie Sanders. "Disruptions and Evocations of Family Amongst Royalist Exiles," *Literatures of Exile in the English Revolution and its Aftermath, 1640-1690*, Ed. Philip Major, Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010, 45-63; Marion Wynne-Davies, "'My Fine Delitive Tomb': Liberating 'Sisterly' Voices during the Civil War," *Female Communities, 1600-1800: Literary Visions and Cultural Realities*, Ed. Rebecca D'Monté and Nicole Pohl, New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000, 111-28.

and order. Cavendish rebuilds St. John's Abbey from the ruins and takes her readers on a guided tour, showcasing carefully curated spaces within the house and chronicling their destruction, while intentionally leaving other sites closed to the public. In the spaces she reveals to her readers, as well as those she conceals, Cavendish attempts to reestablish boundaries that were violated during the wars and enclose her family within a sanctuary that does not exist outside of the pages of her book.<sup>5</sup> In this way, *A True Relation* stands in for an imaginary St. John's Abbey, one that she can protect from plunder and siege, while preserving it as a site for personal and collective memory. Though in the past *A True Relation* has sometimes been read as a compendium of Cavendish's idiosyncrasies, her treatment of the ruins of war activates symbols and metaphorical vocabulary that confirm her participation in a broader effort of Commonwealth commemoration of the royalist cause.

### **“For the sake of After-Ages”: Building a Monument of Truth**

In this section, I will explore how Cavendish expresses her intention to build a textual monument that both houses the particular memory of her family, the Lucases, and serves as a locus of memory for a community of royalists grieving over a lost age. Cavendish presents commemoration not just as a responsibility but also as an inheritance, and strives to guide readers towards coherence in the rubble.

Cavendish writes in a direct manner about the toll the civil wars take on her family and about her subsequent sense of duty as a witness and survivor to record the

---

<sup>5</sup> Jerome de Groot identifies this as a royalist literary strategy, claiming that royalist writers regularly figured the text as “a space which can be controlled, a safe haven” from political and social turbulence (55). de Groot does not discuss Cavendish’s use of this figure, nor does he discuss any women writers or readers, even in the chapter titled “Gorgeous Gorgons: Royalist Women.” See *Royalist Identities*, New York: Palgrave, 2004.

devastation. Just under halfway through the memoir Cavendish recalls the deaths of five family members that occurred in the years 1646-48 when she was living in France. This is “the ruin” of her family.

My Mother lived to see the ruin of her Children, in which was her ruin, and then dyed: my brother Sir *Thomas Lucas* soon after, my brother Sir *Charles Lucas* after him, being shot to death for his Loyall Service, for he was most constantly Loyall and Couragiously active, indeed he had a superfluity of courage; My eldest sister died some time before my Mother, her death being, as I believe, hastned through grief of her onely daughter, on which she doted, being very pretty, sweet natured, and had an extraordinary wit for her age, she dying of a Consumption, my sister, her Mother dyed some half a year after of the same disease. (50)

In this passage, Cavendish recalls her mother, two of her brothers, one of her sisters, and her niece. The deaths of Thomas and Charles can be directly attributed to the wars-- Charles is, as she says, executed, and Thomas “died not immediately of his Wounds” but “a Wound he received on his head in *Ireland* shortened his life”--while the women die from a combination of disease and desolation (45). Nevertheless, Cavendish groups these deaths together because of their temporal proximity to one another and their occurrence during the wars and while she is in exile. This grouping of the Lucases stands in sharp contrast to the familial scene represented in the frontispiece to the work with which *A True Relation* was published, *Natures Pictures*.<sup>6</sup> Here Margaret and William Cavendish preside over a domestic scene in which a family gathers together to tell tales by the fire. Critics have read the imagined assembly in this engraving as William’s adult children, all

---

<sup>6</sup> The frontispiece printed in many copies of *Natures Pictures* has been the subject of much recent discussion of Margaret Cavendish’s constructions of family in exile. The design contrasts with the two main frontispiece engravings Cavendish commissioned for her books, which feature her in isolation, either crowned on a pedestal or at work in her solitary room. For discussions of the frontispiece, see Hero Chalmers, *Royalist Women Writers, 1650-1689*, Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004; Ann Hughes, *Gender and the English Revolution*, New York: Routledge, 2012; Hughes and Sanders; Su Fang Ng, *Literature and the Politics of Family in Seventeenth-Century England*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

of whom had remained in England during their father's exile and thus whom Margaret had not yet met at the time of the work's publication. While Cavendish's domestic fantasy of reunion with her husband's family could be realized after the wars, there is no such possibility for the ruined Lucases.

Cavendish embraces the responsibility to commemorate her family and identifies herself as particularly apt for the task in terms that defy the passage of time. She declares "though time is apt to waste remembrance as a consumptive body, or to wear it out like a garment into rags, or to moulder it into dust, yet I finde the naturall affections, I have for my friends are beyond the length, strength and power of time: for I shall lament the loss so long as I live" (50). In her assertion of unassailable affection and life-long lamentation, Cavendish embraces a kind of continual haunting by her dead relatives. Her use of the metaphor of a consumptive body to represent the deterioration of remembrance takes on a striking materiality when she has just informed readers that both her sister and niece died of this disease. A few pages earlier in the text Cavendish praises her mother for keeping her dead husband "so lively in her memory" that she could never mention his name without "love and grief caus[ing] tears to flow, and tender sighs to rise" (48). Taken in connection with this earlier portrait, Cavendish's statement of her remarkable memorial capacity appears to claim an inheritance of sorts from her mother. A Lucas never forgets.

The experience of being haunted by the recently deceased is shared by other royalist women writers. In her poem "Aurora", Lady Hester Pulter describes being alarmed by her visions:

Then my sad soule doth see before her eye  
Some of my freinds (aye me) that late did die  
Whose loss fils my poore heart soe full of griefe  
That nought, but Death can give my soule relieve. (qtd. in Chedzoy, 146).

Like Pulter, Cavendish finds in her grief a source of literary productivity, but unlike Pulter she does not seek relief in joining the ghostly company of friends that she sees “before her eye.” Instead, she attempts to provide a proper resting place and fitting memorial to those troubled souls, externalizing her grief in order to proclaim the significance of their deaths to audience present and future. *A True Relation* provides Cavendish with the means to preserve this voice of lamentation even beyond her lifetime and situate it within a complex project of familial commemoration. Though some early modern women did design and commission funeral monuments for their loved ones and composing epitaphs to be inscribed upon them, Cavendish is unable to do so because of her exile and the political climate at home.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, she finds an alternative medium from which to construct an expression of her mourning. Cavendish promises to build a “Monument of truth, though [she] can not of Marble” and “hang [her] tears as Scutchions” on the tomb. Like a stone monument in a chapel, Cavendish’s “Monument of truth” emerges from the complex relationship between publication and privacy, serving as a testament to immense private loss contextualized within a moment of national crisis and directed towards a public readership. Her choice of a textual monument rather than a

---

<sup>7</sup>Work on early modern women’s roles in designing and commissioning funeral monuments includes Lucinda Becker, *Death and the Early Modern Englishwoman*, Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003; J.S.W. Helt, “Memento Mori: Death, Widowhood and Remembering in Early Modern England,” *Widowhood and Visual Culture in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Alison Levy. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003. 39-54; Patricia Phillippy, *Women, Death and Literature in Post-Reformation England*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

stone one might also be understood to derive from a sense that they are too vulnerable to the ravages of time; too many have fallen into ruin already.

For those imagined to visit Cavendish's monument by reading her memoir in the present moment of its publication, its ability to preserve the past might bring comfort. In her examination of women's civil war writing, Kate Chedgzoy highlights the consolatory and reparative function played by memory in the aftermath of war and in the face of hardship and distress. "For those on the defeated side," those who would have made up Cavendish's intended audience, "memories of a happier past can counterpose grief by insisting on the continued value and significance of what has been lost and destroyed" (166). *A True Relation* does insist that what has been lost in the devastation of the Lucas family and their home has significance beyond personal tragedy. This is what monuments do. Monuments may be erected to commemorate individual men and women, but they often do much more, situating those people as central characters within broader familial and cultural narratives. Thus monuments not only teach visitors how to read the significance of a single life, but through the representation of that life and its placement in relation to others, they also teach visitors how to read the past. Peter Sherlock highlights the creative work behind this kind of public commemoration: "Monuments told posterity what should be known about the past...Monumental commemoration represented an intention to change the present and secure a better future by rewriting the past, not merely preserving it" (5). Cavendish reaches out to posterity, "after-Ages" in her words, with a promise to her present audience that the significance of what has been lost will continually be accessible via the pages of her book.

As *A True Relation* circulates in print, Cavendish's recollection becomes available to activate the memories of others and can be understood to function along the lines of Pierre Nora's concept of the *lieu de mémoire*. *Lieux de mémoire* are "places in which memory is crystallized, in which it finds refuge." Nora locates the creation of *lieux de mémoire* with a specific moment in French history, "a turning point in which a sense of rupture with the past is inextricably bound up with a sense that a rift has occurred in memory." Out of the rift come *lieux de mémoire*, sites where traces of continuity with the past coalesce and remain. Essential to Nora's concept of the *lieu de mémoire* is that they "exist because there are no longer any *milieux de mémoire*, settings in which memory is a real part of everyday experience" (1). "If we still dwelled among our memories," Nora writes, "there would be no need to consecrate sites embodying them" (2). Cavendish offers her book to readers as just such a site. The "*milieux de mémoire*," physical and social spaces integral to the continuity of royalist community, disappeared during the wars: the court moved to Oxford and then, in pieces, into exile; homes were besieged or destroyed; social and kinship networks were fragmented. Cavendish claims her project as an excavation of these spaces: "neither did I intend this piece for to delight, but to divulge, not to please the fancy, but to tell the truth" (63). When Cavendish emphasizes the truth of her narrative, referring to it as the only story included in *Natures Pictures* in which there are "no feignings," she asserts her authority to create this kind of memory site, to reach back beyond the rift into the past and provide a textual home for what she uncovers there.

As we will see, Cavendish figures the war's impact on her family through violations of family and household space, specifically the home at St. John's Abbey and the family vault at nearby St. Giles Church. In these violations and their popular retellings in print, such spaces are revealed, made common. As she "divulge[s]" information to her readers, Cavendish reconstructs some of those same spaces and once again opens them up to public view. The difference is that in the writing of her memoir, Cavendish initiates the movement into a recuperated private space and exercises control over her readers through a process of strategic domestic disclosure. That which is made public is mediated.

Critics have previously recognized the monumental nature of some of Cavendish's work, but have tended to focus on *A True Relation* purely as a project of self-commemoration. For example, Sharon Cadman Seelig sees in Cavendish's attempt to secure a place in cultural memory "a fear that if she does not present herself, no one will; that if she does not present herself, no one will care; that if she does not present herself, she will cease to exist" (133).<sup>8</sup> This fear comes to the surface when Cavendish claims, "I am very ambitious, yet 'tis neither for Beauty, Wit, Titles, Wealth, or Power, but as they are steps to raise me to Fame's Tower, which is to live by remembrance in after ages" (61-62). To "live by remembrance in after ages" as Cavendish desires is to be regarded as an authority so that her ideas might continue to shape collective memory. From "Fame's Tower," Cavendish can control the narrative. I suggest that *A True*

---

<sup>8</sup> See also Harold Weber's chapter "'Building Castles in the Air': Margaret Cavendish and the Anxieties of Monumentality" in *Memory, Print, and Gender in England, 1653-1759*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

*Relation* can be productively understood not just as Margaret Cavendish's monument to herself, erected to ensure that she is not forgotten by “after-Ages,” but as a monument commemorating the entire Lucas family as representative of a lost way of life aligned with Royalist values and constructed out of a sense of both personal and public responsibility.

### **The Lucases, Revealed**

*A True Relation* presents a carefully crafted balance of revelation and concealment, both of information and of space. The family home at St. John's Abbey becomes a key site of memory within Cavendish's book, as she expresses the national trauma of civil war through a focus on personal and familial experiences. Her depiction of domestic relations, domestic activities and domestic spaces participates in a representational strategy of “politicized domesticity” that Laura Lunger Knoppers identifies as becoming central to depictions of sovereign power in England during the civil wars and later in the absence of monarchy. Although revelations of the domestic life of Charles I and Henrietta Maria “seemed initially to turn the language of privacy, family, and marriage against the king and queen,” portraying the king as submissive to his domineering wife, critics have shown how royalists reclaimed this language to portray Charles as a devoted husband and father and Henrietta Maria as a good English housewife (5).<sup>9</sup> The outpouring of royalist responses to the publication of Charles's and Henrietta Maria's captured correspondence in *The King's Cabinet Opened* in the form of

---

<sup>9</sup> See Madeline Bassnett, “Restoring the Royal Household: Royalist Politics and the Commonwealth Recipe Book.” *Early English Studies*. 2 (2009): n.pag; Knoppers, “Opening the Queen’s Closet: Henrietta Maria, Elizabeth Cromwell, and the Politics of Cookery,” *Renaissance Quarterly*, 60.2. (2007) 464-499; Knoppers, *Politicizing Domesticity from Henrietta Maria to Milton’s Eve*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

newsbooks and pamphlets establishes a metaphorical language of picked locks, peeping, and prying into the secret, enclosed spaces of cabinet and closet, a language shared with other royalist literature, especially romance.<sup>10</sup> While initial responses to the publication of the letters decry the “breaking open of the King’s owne cabinet” as a violation of his person and symbolic of the even greater violation of established boundaries committed by the rebels, they also claim to offer a true reading of the letters that reveals to the people “the choice Endowments of their King” such that they should “be brought to love and honor him” (*A Letter 7*).<sup>11</sup> These authors reclaim and recuperate the private space of the cabinet as a means for idealized royalist representation, a strategy continued in the “king’s book” *Eikon Basilike* and a recipe collection titled *The Queens Closet Opened* that can be understood as Henrietta Maria’s textual counterpart.

Cavendish’s *A True Relation* shares with these works the project of reclaiming and recuperating space from enemy hands. She tells the story of the wars through the breaking open and plundering of specific spaces within St. John’s Abbey. By the time

---

<sup>10</sup> Critics have explored how different political factions appropriated various genres to their causes during the civil wars. These include: David Norbrook, *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric, and Politics, 1627-1660*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000; Lois Potter, *Secret rites and secret writing*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989; Annabel Patterson, *Censorship and Interpretation: The Conditions of Writing and Reading in Early Modern England*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1984; Nigel Smith, *Literature and Revolution in England*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1994.

<sup>11</sup> A selection of royalist responses to *The King’s Cabinet Opened* that appeared in the summer of 1645 include: *A Key to the Kings Cabinet Opened: Or Animadversions upon the three Printed Speeches, of Mr Lisle, Mar. Tate, and Mr. Browne, spoken at the Common Hall in London 3 July, 1645, Detecting the Malice and Falsehood of their Blasphemous Observations made upon the Kings and Queeens Letters*, Oxford, 1645; *A Letter in Which the Arguments of the Annotator, And three other Speeches Upon their Majestie’s Letters Published at London, are Examined and Answered*, Oxford, 1645; *Mercurius Anti-Britanicus: OR, Part of the King’s Cabinet vindicated From the Aspersions of an Impotent Libeller, who commonly calls himself MERCURIUS BRITANICUS*, Oxford, 1645; *Mercurius Aulicus: Communicating the Intelligence and affaires of the Court to the rest of the Kingdome. From July 13. To July 20. 1645*, Oxford, 1645; *A Satyr, Occasioned by the Author’s Survey of a Scandalous Pamphlet Intituled, The King’s Cabinet Opened*, Oxford, 1645.

Cavendish writes her memoir, St. John's Abbey has been destroyed in war. Along the way, the “private” space of the household became public, most obviously as it was repeatedly invaded by strangers but also as it was opened up in the imaginations of enemies and defenders alike. Asserting a kind of proprietary control over her lost childhood home, Cavendish offers an authorized reconstruction of St. John’s Abbey as a site of well-ordered and virtuous domesticity. Cavendish opens the reconstructed space to the public through her book, but what she lets them see has been carefully curated to create a specific impression of the home’s former inhabitants and of what happened to them there. And some doors just remain closed. What she reveals and what she conceals, the controlled performance of disclosure, allows Cavendish to build a textual monument that commemorates her family while displaying allegiance to royalist values in exile.

The function of Cavendish’s book as a substitute St. John’s Abbey can be seen in the way she introduces the wars into her narrative. The wars intrude suddenly upon the text, always appearing to rupture scenes of the domestic tranquility of the Lucas family. In the early sections of the narrative, Cavendish opens paragraphs with introductory phrases that present the topics of her discourse: “As for my breeding;” “As for our garments;” “As for my Brothers, of which I had three;” As for the pastimes of my Sisters when they were in the Country” (42-45). She moves abruptly and by free association from one topic to the next. However, this movement should not be understood as careless or haphazard. Sharon Cadman Seelig speaks to how Cavendish’s methods shape the experience of reading *A True Relation*, writing “readers of this text can attest that its methods of organization (if that’s not too strong a term) and presentation are neither

ordinary nor obvious; yet *A True Relation*, though often bewildering, is remarkably vivid and forceful” (135). Cavendish’s integration of the wars into her narrative demonstrates this effect particularly well. At no point in the narrative does she explicitly present the wars as a topic of discourse; there is no paragraph that begins “As for the wars.” She does not treat specific events that occurred during the wars and provides neither dates nor names of individual actors, apart from the members of her family. Instead readers are confronted with the expansive and anonymous destructive force of “this unnatural War” or “these unhappy Wars” (45, 48). This force breaks suddenly into the text, disrupting the flow of her recollections and then receding beyond the margins only to reappear a few paragraphs later. In this way, Cavendish recreates the disruptive violence the wars wrought on her family.

This effect can be seen in the section beginning “As for my brothers, of which I had three.” A discussion of the brothers’ upbringing and recreational activities is followed by “As for the pastimes of my sisters in the Country,” which leads to depiction of the close-knit and self-contained social world of the Lucas family. When in the country, we are told, they live together with her mother at St. John’s Abbey, and when in their separate homes in London, still “for the most part they met every day” (45). Just as Cavendish settles her readers into this cozy family world, disaster strikes. The biblical allusion made in the Lucas siblings “feasting each other like *Job’s Children*” foreshadows suffering and provides Cavendish an apt metaphor for the war’s impact on her family: “But this unnatural War came like a Whirlwind, which fell’d down their Houses where

some in the Wars were crusht to death” (45).<sup>12</sup> As for her brothers, of which she had three, two are listed here among the “crusht”: “as my youngest Brother Sir *Charles Lucas*, and my brother Sir *Thomas Lucas*” (45). Rather than developing a discussion of the wars, Cavendish attempts to pick up the previous topic of her sisters’ country living and begins the next paragraph “But to rehearse their Recreations.” Again Cavendish elaborates on the closeness of her family and their preference for each other’s company over anyone else’s, observing that her sisters only ever went out “in a Flock together agreeing so well, that there seemed but one Minde amongst them: And not onely my own Brothers and Sisters agreed so, but my Brothers and Sisters in Law...for to my best remembrance I do not know that ever they did fall out, or had any angry or unkind disputes” (45). And again the vision of family harmony is interrupted, as the next paragraph begins, “But sometimes after this War began, I knew not how they lived” (46). Through the sharp transition from her existence as part of “one Minde” to being severed from any knowledge of her siblings’ lives, Cavendish recreates the violence of her family’s fragmentation during the wars.

Cavendish’s presentation of St. John’s Abbey as bubble of domestic tranquility unexpectedly burst by war ignores the tensions that had been building in Colchester for some time before the first attack in 1642. The Lucases, led by eldest son John and his mother Elizabeth, were generally disliked by the population of Colchester throughout the 1620s and 1630s because of their attempts to maximize income from their estates.

---

<sup>12</sup> In the Book of Job, Job has seven sons and three daughters, and each son takes turns feasting his other siblings. On the first day when God allows Satan to intervene in Job’s life, in addition to Job’s oxen, asses, camels, and servants being stolen, slain, or burnt by the fire of God, a wind comes and blows down the house of his eldest son where all his children are eating and drinking together.

Gradually these local troubles became linked with national political and religious disputes. The Lucases were high Anglicans in the enthusiastically puritan county of Essex, and John was a loyal and high-ranking political servant to the king, even hosting the French Queen Mother, Marie de' Medici, at St. John's Abbey during a visit to England in 1638. Margaret's other brother's Thomas and Charles served in the king's army during the Scots wars and, after Parliament disbanded the army, Thomas served as a member of the Irish Privy Council while Charles joined the king's bodyguard, the "reformadoes," in London. As a family firmly intertwined in royal social networks, the Lucases become a significant target for violent action. Growing political unrest on the national stage was manifested locally in the destruction of Lucas property and attacks on their servants. In May 1641, after the execution of the Earl of Strafford, organized crowds thrice marched out of Colchester to local heaths where they tore down and burned the fences around the Lucas's enclosures (Whitaker 38). By 1642, as armed conflict threatened between the London militia, lately installed as a guard for Parliament, and the king's bodyguard, preparations for war were underway in Essex as well. Finding large-scale mobilization impossible given the lack of support in the area, John Lucas began privately arranging military support for the king. He collected shipments of arms at St. John's Abbey and planned to ride to Nottingham, where the king was mustering his army, along with ten of the Lucas family servants who would also serve as soldiers. They were to be joined by a local vicar, Thomas Newcomen, who had agreed to serve as chaplain. John Lucas's preparations within the walls of St. John's Abbey had not gone unnoticed in Colchester, however, and when he and his assembled men attempted to leave secretly on

the night of August 21, 1642, they were met by the local militia. At the raising of the alarm, a mob formed outside of St. John's Abbey and proceeded to attack the house and its inhabitants.

Cavendish's recollection of the attack on St. John's Abbey in August 1642 makes a remarkable attempt to shape readers perception of the event. She deliberately excludes or obscures these circumstances in the composition of her narrative, not even giving a date for the event, and instead fashioning her family as completely removed from political unrest until the wars showed up suddenly and blew their house down.<sup>13</sup> As in the examples above, her representation depends on a strategic revelation of private, household space. She arrives indirectly, as reflections on her husband's losses suffered in exile prompt a return to the topic of her birth family:

But not onely the Family I am link't to is ruin'd, but the Family from which I sprung, by these unhappy Wars, which ruine my Mother lived to see, and then died, having lived a Widow many years, for she never forgot my Father so as to marry again; indeed he remain'd so lively in her memory, and her grief was so lasting, as she never mention'd his name, though she spoke often of him, but love and grief caused tears to flow, and tender sighs to rise, mourning in sad complaints; she made her house her Cloyster, inclosing her self, as it were therein, for she seldom went abroad, unless to Church, but these unhappy Warrs forc'd her out, by reason she and her children were loyall to the King; for which they plundered her, and my Brothers of all their Goods, Plate, Jewells, Money, Corn,

---

<sup>13</sup> It is not clear whether Cavendish witnessed the attack in 1642. *Mercurius Rusticus* reports that "The People lay hands on Sir John Lucas his Lady and Sister," but does not clarify which sister. Later the account mentions "two Gentlewomen" who ran away and escaped the fury of the mob (though they found no refuge from their neighbors), and refers to the "Ladyes" who had been taken from St. John's Abbey being released from the common jail after four days. Likewise the newsletter *A Continuation of Certaine Speciall and Remarkable Passages from both Houses of Parliament* reports "a great uproare in Essex" in which about 2,000 enraged people "with great violence" seized John Lucas, "his Mother, Wife, and Sisters" (3). Perhaps Margaret was a part of either of these nameless groups who suffered through the attack. By 1648 Cavendish was already living on the continent, having first gone into exile with Henrietta Maria's court as a maid of honor in 1644 and then remaining there with her husband William after their marriage in 1645, and so she would have had to rely on reports from others for news that her mother's and sister's tombs had been violated and her brother captured and executed. Whether or not Cavendish experienced these attacks directly, the trauma of the wars' destructive impact on her family shapes her commitment to royalist values.

Cattle, and the like, cut down their Woods, pull'd down their Houses, and sequestred them from their Lands and Livings. (48)

The phrase “these unhappy Wars” appears twice in the brief passage, and these appearances frame a portrait of Cavendish’s mother, Elizabeth Lucas. Though the portrait of Elizabeth Lucas as faithful widow might initially seem like a digression from the topic of the wars, it engages the discourse of politicized domesticity that had gained currency in royalist writing throughout the wars and into the Commonwealth period. Cavendish’s reconstruction of St. John’s Abbey erases her brother’s military preparations, removing the cause that motivated the mob to attack the house. Instead, when she opens up the walls to her readers, Cavendish reveals a space defined by the virtuous memorial practices of Elizabeth Lucas. Cavendish’s practice of recuperation allows her to suggest that her house was attacked not because John Lucas made it a base for building military support for the king, but because Elizabeth Lucas made it into her “Cloyster” at a time when the parliamentary rabble had no respect for sacred spaces. In this representation, the cloister joins the cabinet and the closet in the vocabulary of enclosed, royalist spaces. As she employs this language, Cavendish presents her mother’s eviction from St. John’s Abbey as a precursor of the overthrow of Charles I and her family’s fragmentation by exile with that of the Stuart royal family.

Whether or not she intends it to have such an effect, Cavendish’s use of the word “Cloyster” brings the history of St. John’s Abbey and, more broadly, the recent religious history of England into this passage, a move which complicates the potential meanings evoked by her use of the term. The building which served as home to the Lucas family was once the Benedictine Abbey of St. John the Baptist, founded in 1096. The abbey had

flourished until the dissolution of the monasteries in the 1530s. In 1548 St. John's Abbey was purchased by John Lucas, Margaret's great-grandfather, and converted into a private estate. John Lucas had accumulated his wealth in the preceding years, building connections at the court of Edward VI and rising through various lucrative jobs in national government—including serving on the commissions for the confiscation of church properties and the sale of Crown lands (Whitaker 3, 5). Cavendish's use of the term “Cloyster” could be a strategic invocation of the history of St. John's Abbey in order to shape the perception of what happened to Elizabeth, but her family's own place in that history complicates this rhetorical move. In a figurative sense, Elizabeth Lucas's decision to “make her house her Cloyster” restores the space to the purpose for which it was originally built. And perhaps some of the earlier sanctity lingers in the walls, protecting Elizabeth Lucas in her seclusion for a time and elevating her in her devotions to her deceased husband. Following this pattern, the parliamentary soldiers who violate Elizabeth's cloister to drag her out would be cast as replaying the destructive actions of 16<sup>th</sup>-century reformers and iconoclasts. Except that Elizabeth Lucas would not be able to “make” this particular “house her Cloyster” were it not for those earlier actions, in which John Lucas is fully implicated. Thus Cavendish's use of “Cloyster” overwrites the history of St. John's Abbey through her family's much more recent experience as victims of an assault on their home.

Cavendish depicts her mother's transformation of the house into a cloister as a choice to uphold traditional domestic authority. Lucas's choice to enclose herself allows her to exercise autonomy as a widow while demonstrating loyalty to the memory of her

deceased husband. The act of enclosure is presented as the culminating example offered in support of Cavendish's claim that her mother "never forgot [her] Father so as to marry again," following the evidence that "indeed he remain'd so lively in her memory, and her grief was so lasting, as she never mention'd his name, though she spoke often of him, but love and grief caused tears to flow, and tender sighs to rise, mourning in sad complaints" (49). Lucas's grief is performative; it can be seen and heard. Additionally, her grief motivates her to reshape the space around her by redefining her home as her "Cloyster," what should be an enclosed, protective space where she can live in seclusion from the world. Initially the purpose of the cloister appears to be to contain these displays of mourning, which would have been understood as typically feminine within the early modern gendering of grief. Within this logic, Cavendish shows readers the female mourner who metaphorically entombs herself in empathy with the male body being mourned. Thus the cloister could become the site for a kind of living death in widowhood.<sup>14</sup>

The remainder of the portrait of Elizabeth Lucas leads sharply away from this interpretation, however. While the construction of the cloister initiates the paean to Elizabeth Lucas, at the other end Cavendish celebrates her mother's successful management of St. John's Abbey. Cavendish consciously deploys conventional

---

<sup>14</sup> This representation of Elizabeth Lucas could be seen to prefigure the character of Madame Jantil from Cavendish's Restoration play *Bell in Campo*. In their article "Memory, Monuments, and Melancholic Genius in Margaret Cavendish's *Bell in Campo*," Holly Faith Nelson and Sharon Alker describe Madame Jantil as "a mourning war widow...who dies of grief after designing and overseeing the erection of an elaborate monument to her husband, a casualty of war" (13). The monument includes not only a tomb for her husband, but a three-room house in which Madame Jantil will live until her death. Nelson and Alker emphasize Madame Jantil's empowerment as a female memorializer. Neither passive nor self-effacing (attributes typically associated with female grief), Madame Jantil creates a monument that demonstrates productive grief in response to the tragic death of her husband as well as "the creative anguish necessary to cope with and surmount all royalist military losses during the civil war" (Nelson and Alker 15).

expressions of early modern women's mourning and emphasizes her mother's continued devotion in order to justify Elizabeth Lucas's assumption of the domestic responsibilities her husband left behind. Because she keeps him "so lively in her memory" she can step up into his position of governance. In addition to "breeding her children with a most industrious care" she "was a good Mistress to her servants" and

though she would often complain, that her family was too great for her weak Management, and often prest my Brother to take it upon him, yet I observe she took a pleasure, and some little pride, in the governing thereof: she was very skilfull in Leases, and setting of Lands, and Court-keeping, ordering of Stewards, and the like affaires.(49)

Rather than being a site of effacement then, Cavendish presents the cloister as enabling the development of a more authoritative subjectivity from which Elizabeth Lucas successfully engages the wider world while remaining within the accepted expectations for a widow's behavior. In her husband's absence, Elizabeth Lucas becomes absolute. This transformation does not disrupt the household order within St. John's Abbey but instead is shown to have been necessary in order to preserve it.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> In this respect, the representation of Elizabeth Lucas can be productively read alongside the title character from the last of the fictional tales contained in *Natures Pictures*, "The She-Anchoret." In one of the many prefatory epistles to the collection, Cavendish recommends this tale as "the most solid and edifying" in her book. As in the representation of Elizabeth Lucas, the She-Anchoret's enclosure is not motivated by a spiritual calling but instead by loyalty to a deceased male relative (her father) and the desire to live in isolation. When the She-Anchoret sacrifices her life rather than give up her enclosure and be forced to marry the king of a neighboring country (recalling another popular medieval genre, the virgin martyr's tale), the people create extravagant memorials in her honor. Cavendish concludes the tale with a description of the most significant commemorative effort undertaken for the She-Anchoret: "And the Historians writ her life and death in golden letters, and recorded them in Fames brazen Tower, that all the world might know and follow the example of her heroick spirit, generous soul, chast body, pious life, and voluntary death" (357). The She-Anchoret's enclosure in the textual monument represented by Fame's tower replaces her enclosure in her cloister, preserving her memory while respecting her vow. As the grate through which she communicated her wisdom allowed her to control access to her person in life, so the "golden letters" of the Historians mediate access to her example in death. Cavendish's description of the manner in which the Historians commemorate the She-Anchoret aptly prepares the reader of *Natures Pictures* for the exemplary treatment she bestows upon her mother in *A True Relation*. Cavendish's account

The privatization and feminization of the absolute allow her to depict her mother as a formidable presence occupying St. John's Abbey as a representative of (what will come to be defined as) royalist values. Through these methods, Cavendish reconstructs and reveals the domestic space of her childhood home as a microcosm of the royal court in a time of war. In her now-classic article "Embracing the Absolute: The Politics of the Female Subject in Seventeenth-Century England," Catherine Gallagher identifies Cavendish's tendency to link personal "singularity" with absolute monarchy: through this metaphorical usage "the monarch becomes a figure for the self-enclosed, autonomous nature of any person" (26). Furthermore, looking across her works, Gallagher finds that Cavendish explicitly genders this model of subjectivity as feminine, showing it to be a natural development of women being denied full political subjecthood. Because women are so restricted from exercising their ambitions, they are driven inward, into private spaces and into their own minds, wherein they create microcosms over which they may rule as sovereign monarchs. Thus, Gallagher writes, "the absolute is reimagined as that which [Cavendish] conceives to be the private and the feminine. But this entails the concomitant reimaging of the feminine as absolutely private, subjective, and yet nonsubjected" (30). While Gallagher traces evidence of this reimaging in Cavendish's self-reflective poetry and, especially, in *The Blazing World*, it also provides a way into understanding the strategies at work behind Cavendish's representation of her mother in *A True Relation*. Cavendish's enclosed widow Lucas, who memorializes her husband while maintaining order in his household and heading a family "loyall to the King"

---

preserves the memory of her mother's "Heroick Spirit," simultaneously enclosing her in protective text and curating her image for the edification of "after-ages."

emerges from this representational program of recuperating and repurposing the domestic for royalist political ends.

When Cavendish writes that “these unhappy Warrs forc’d [Elizabeth] out,” she means not just out into the world, but out of her sphere of power, her realm contained within the walls of St. John’s Abbey. She becomes in miniature what Charles I had been, a monarch without a country. In this representation of her mother’s withdrawal, Cavendish’s work aligns with what Hero Chalmers has identified as “an Interregnum royalist need to represent the space of retirement or interiority as the actual center of power” (105).. I argue that Cavendish activates the same dynamic, though perhaps more subtly, in the revelation of her mother’s cloister at the heart of St. John’s Abbey. In focusing the reader’s attention on the violation of this space during the raid on the house, Cavendish highlights its function as a center of power and site of political engagement in spite of its apparently private placement.

Cavendish portrays Elizabeth Lucas as powerful, not pitiful, in her retreat. Cavendish writes, “She was of a grave Behaviour, and had such a Magestick Grandeur, as it were continually hung about her, that it would strike a kind of an awe to the beholders, and command respect from the rudest, I mean the rudest of civiliz’d people, I mean not such Barbarous people, as plundered her, and used her cruelly, for they would have pulled God out of Heaven, had they had power, as they did Royaltie out of his Throne” (48). In this passage, Cavendish reconstructs her mother’s cloister as a center of authority, and aligns it with other such centers that came under attack during the civil wars. The fact that Elizabeth could be “forc’d out” of home indicates just how chaotic the

times had become. Because the attack on St. John's Abbey occurs nearly at the same time as the raising of the royal standard at Nottingham, Cavendish is able, in hindsight, to represent this traumatic event as prefiguring the unnatural upheaval that would occur over the following years. Cavendish draws upon familiar divine-right imagery and the family-state analogy with a twist to align God in his heaven, the king on his throne, and Elizabeth Lucas in her cloister as indicators of a well-ordered society. Through this metaphorical equivalence, when Lucas's personal sovereignty within her home, the world she has created for and governs herself, is threatened, then monarchical and divine sovereignty are in similar peril. Through this representation, the forcible removal of her mother from her home becomes symptomatic of disorder on a much larger scale. Redefining her mother's retirement and response to eviction in retrospect, Cavendish can reveal these actions as defiant affirmations of royalist values.

Cavendish's controlled opening up of St. John's Abbey to reveal Elizabeth Lucas performing the duties of a pious widow and loyal subject allows her to shape readers' perceptions of the parliamentary soldiers who evicted Lucas and looted the house. Those who "plundered her, and used her cruelly" are condemned as lower than "the rudest of civiliz'd people", as, in fact, "Barbarous people" (48). As Ann Hughes points out, such accusations were often based in assumptions about properly gendered behavior: "honourable men were expected to show proper respect to women and children, so consequently accusations of brutality were common currency in propaganda wars between royalists and parliamentarians" (35). Cavendish sees the mob who abused her mother as having lost sight of the requirements of masculine courtesy and having

behaved unbecomingly towards a loyal widow in her own home, and she places this subversion, though perhaps seemingly small in the grand scale of the war, in correlation with much more devastating breaches of the established order. Her condemnation goes even further; in describing these people as “Barbarous,” Cavendish suggests that they have in some essential way ceased being “English”—the central beliefs, values, and corresponding behaviors which comprise that identity have been discarded. This loss can be understood as a kind of collective self-forgetting. To “forget oneself” means “to lose remembrance of one’s own station, position, or character; to lose sight of the requirements of dignity, propriety, and decorum; to behave unbecomingly” (OED).

Garrett Sullivan suggests the logic behind such a leap as he unpacks the significance of “self-forgetting” in his work on early modern drama: “Much more is at issue than the violation of social *mores*, for the early modern self that is forgotten is, as has often been noted, originally constructed in terms of its place in a social network” (15). Focusing on “propriety,” Sullivan elaborates, “To forget oneself by violating propriety—by no longer performing the actions inherent in occupying a specific place in a (largely land-based) social order—is to become dislodged from a such a network, disengaged from that which determines your identity” (15). Thus those who intrude into St. John’s Abbey, damage and plunder household goods and destroy features of the grounds can be understood as uncivilized, and as having abandoned the very concerns around which English identity coheres. Once “dislodged” from the network in this way, to use Sullivan’s term, they become those who “would have pulled God out of Heaven, had they Power, as they did Royaltie out of his Throne” (48). In her poem “Upon the Double Murder of King Charles

I,” Katherine Philips likewise worries “No bounds will hold those who at scepters fly” (28). Susan James, summarizes Cavendish’s conservative view: “if a society is to remain stable, people must be able to recognize those to whom they owe obedience and be willing to obey them--ceremony creates the first of these conditions by making power visible...the second condition is met when the trappings of power inspire awe and subservience” (xxviii). The royalist social order depends upon people learning to interpret and choosing to respond appropriately to performances of power. Writing from exile, Cavendish publicly laments the English people’s failure to fulfill either obligation, as much in their invasion of Elizabeth Lucas’s cloister as in their later violation of the royal cabinet and court, culminating in the execution of Charles I. Cavendish’s careful memorialization of her family through the textual reconstruction and publication of their lost home should be read in this context as a loyal daughter’s tribute to her family and a royalist woman’s tribute to a monarchical order that still has value in defeat.

### **The Lucases, Concealed**

Cavendish controls access to the spaces her family inhabited both in the construction of the spaces she reveals, and in the construction of boundaries around the spaces she conceals. In other words, some site are left off the public tour, most notably the Lucas family vault at St. Giles’s Church, located just outside the walls of St. John’s Abbey. In her work on civil war iconoclasm, Julie Spraggan notes that though iconoclasts did not often target funeral monuments (and they were specifically protected in the official Parliamentary ordinances of the 1640s), there were isolated incidents of the destruction and defacing of funeral monuments (Spraggan 38). In spite of the overall

rarity of such incidents, the Lucas's funeral vault at St. Giles has the distinction of being broken into twice, in 1642 during the mob raid on St. John's Abbey and again in 1648 during the siege of Colchester. The violence committed on the Lucas dead on both occasions was widely reported in popular news accounts of the day. The presence of such accounts contextualizes Cavendish's decision in *A True Relation* to omit any details of the breaking open of her family vault. By refusing to grant readers access to the vault, as the authors of previous accounts had done, Cavendish attempts to take control over the rhetorical uses to which the space and the bodies contained therein may be applied.

A record of the 1642 attack written by royalist Bruno Ryves was the lead story in his 1643 pamphlet *Mercurius Rusticus, or The countries complaint of the murthers, robberies, plunderings, and other outrages committed by the rebels on His Majesties faithfull subjects* (1643) and was reprinted at the head of a 1646 collected edition of *Mercurius Rusticus*. Through these publications which frame it as the unprovoked precursor to years of ensuing barbarity, the attack on St. John's Abbey becomes, in the words of Anna Battigelli, "a permanent part of royalist martyrology" (20). While Ryves depicts the house at St. John's Abbey as vulnerable because of its status as a kind of monument to the past, he shows that the people of Colchester also seek out Lucas family monuments beyond the old abbey walls. Ryves follows the mob from their pillaging of St. John's to the parish church of St. Giles, where "to show that their rage will know no bounds, and that nothing is so sacred or venerable which they dare not violate, they break into St. Giles his church, open the vault where his [John Lucas's] Ancestors were buried, and with Pistols, Swords, and Halberts, transfix the Coffins of the Dead" (3). In the

context of Ryves's account, the desecration of the family tomb represents a culminating performance of defiance for any established boundary or sense of propriety. If rebels will break open a funeral vault and impale corpses through coffin lids, what won't they do?

Accounts of soldiers breaking into the vault in 1648 pose similar questions to royalist readers. During the siege of Colchester, St. John's Abbey was captured by Lord Fairfax. The house had already become a casualty of war when when the royalist force's powder magazine, which was stored there, exploded and destroyed half the house. What was left of the house became spoils for the parliamentary soldiers (Whitaker 104-5). As in 1642, the plunderers are shown to vent their fury on the family vault at St. Giles's only after their rapacity cannot be satisfied by the slim pickings remaining in St. John's Abbey. Multiple published accounts of the events of the siege and surrender of Colchester include descriptions of the breaking open of the Lucas family vault, and in particular focus on the soldiers' treatment of the corpses of Elizabeth Lucas and her daughter Mary Killigrew. The royalist accounts universally condemn this action, presenting it as an ultimate manifestation of the inhumanity and irreligiosity of the parliamentary army. The authors of these accounts politicize the Lucas family vault and use the violation of Elizabeth's and Mary's bodies to accomplish their purpose of demonizing those who fight on the opposing side.

This strategy can be seen in *A Most True and Exact Relation of that as Honourable as unfortunate Expedition of Kent, Essex, and Colchester*, printed in 1650 with a title-page claim to have been written "by M.C., A Loyall Actor in the Engagement, Anno Dom. 1648". Once the house is captured, "as it is their custome in all other places,

the first thought on is plunder.” However, not much remains for the soldiers to take, given St. John’s Abbey’s history of vulnerability, “that house having been diverse times before, and indeed the first in the Kingdom, as is believed plundred.” M.C. attributes what happens next to the soldiers’ sense that they had been cheated out the proper reward for their service, as well as a desire to become known through the performance of their “villainy.” M.C. recounts how the soldiers “broke up the vault wherein the ancestors of that Family were usually Interred” and in doing so makes visible to his readers the mutilated bodies of Elizabeth Lucas and Mary Killigrew. The soldiers “tore open that coffine” and finding the corpses of mother and daughter to be “not yet quite dissolved,” they acted

beyond what ever was known or read of before, or amongst the most unhumane barbarous thoughts, dismembred their trunks, throwing a legge in one corner of the vault, and arme in another, and were so Impudent in this so and worse then brutish act, as to beare away the haire of their heads in their Hats as a triumphant bravadoe in honor to their villanie” (164-5).

M.C. characterizes this action as wholly unprecedented in the records of wartime violence and emphasizes not just the soldiers’ ability to commit such an act but their apparent relish in such subversive brutality. The passage depicts a perversion of the honorable soldier bearing a lock of hair as a token from his lady, and the hair from the corpses becomes emblematic of the parliamentary side’s general willingness to act “beyond what ever was known or read of before.” Writing in 1650, M.C. bitterly asks “Is not that Commonwealth happy that must receive reformation from such Saints? Who have these ten years been practising acts, absolutely monstrous to even nature it selfe: Beyond parallel, president, or politicall complotment of the most subtil Machvillian, or

bloody Tyrants in the world” (165). Through this question the desecration of the vault, particularly of the coffins of Margaret Cavendish’s mother and sister, is made to appear as a single incident indicative of equally unprecedented criminality at the national level.

The anonymous author of *The loyall sacrifice presented in the lives and deaths of those two eminent-heroick patternes, for valour, discipline, and fidelity; the generally beloved and bemoaned, Sir Charls Lucas, and Sir George Lisle, knights* employs a similar strategy, discovering the mutilated bodies of Mary and Elizabeth as a means to highlight the inhumanity of the parliamentary side. His report repeats the details given by M.C. and uses the same adjectives to convey the gravity of the offense:

Some of those insolent and inhumane Souldiers, upon opening of the Monument, wherein diverse Bodies lay wrapt in lead, intending (it seemes) to discover their barbarisme, in the highest measure, forbore not only to cut away the lead wherein those Bodies were infolded, but to pull off the very haire (O matchlesse impiety!) which grew upon their Scalps; whereof diverse among them, made them *Hatbands* and *Bracelets*, which they no lesse contemptiblly then disgracefully wore; glorying (as it seemes) in their pillage of those native remains and Ornaments of the dead. (88)

As in M.C.’s account, the uncovering of the corpses is reframed as a revelation of the cruelty and brutality of the soldiers, qualities emblematized in the accessories they craft from the hair of the dead. The author of *The Loyall Sacrifice* likewise foresees national tragedy following from the continuation of such actions: “If such brutish spirits be not timely subdued; *England* will lose both name and nature, and become *Barbarian*” (88). Though *The Loyall Sacrifice* makes no mention of the dismemberment reported in *A Most True and Exact Relation*, it nevertheless brings readers into the Lucas family vault, replaying the violence done on the corpses of Elizabeth Lucas and Mary Killigrew in

order to demonstrate “with what impunity these mercilesse times can dispence with the inhumanest actions” (87).

Cavendish completely omits these events from her representation of the wars’ impact on her family in *A True Relation*. Readers who know about it from alternative sources can find it conjured up in the “Oration to a Dejected People Ruined by War.” The adjective “ruined,” which is so often applied to her family in the memoir, seems to invite the association. The oration begins with images of plunder familiar from *A True Relation*, presented in a series of rhetorical questions echoing the *ubi sunt* tradition of medieval poetry: “Where are your brave furnishings, your gay adornings Your far-fetched curiosities, and your curious rarities? Your numerous varieties and rich treasures? All plundered and gone” (156). The orator turns to a different kind of loss with the inquiry and response, “Your ancestors’ monuments? All pulled down, and your fathers’ bones and ashes dispersed” (156). Cavendish says nothing of the pulling down of monuments and dispersal of bones, even though such reports could certainly serve as evidence for the uncivilized nature of her family’s enemies. Cavendish describes the people who plundered her mother’s home and treated her cruelly as beyond “the rudest of civiliz’d people” and as “Barbarous people” (48). At this point in the memoir she could further demonstrate their savage cruelty by describing their desecration of the Lucas family vault and the violence they committed on the bodies of the dead, as other authors did in their reports of “outrages” committed during the war.

As suggested above, it is not the case that in omitting these events from her memoir, Cavendish was suppressing the details of a secret family trauma. Her

contemporary audience would most likely already have known about these events from reports that had circulated widely in popular newsbooks. What happened to the Lucas family crypt (twice) was a matter of public record, part of the collective memory of the recent past, though its significance would have varied among audiences of different political allegiances. Since Cavendish's immediate audience is likely to have been familiar with the attacks on the tomb, we might consider how much more obvious her omission might have appeared to them than it does to readers of her memoir today. Many more readers now turn to *A True Relation* than to *Mercurius Rusticus* or *A most true and exact relation of that as honourable as unfortunate expedition of Kent, Essex, and Colchester*, and if such readers stick to Cavendish's works alone they would find no evidence of coffins torn open or corpses stabbed or scalped. The accession of Cavendish's account to canonical status has allowed for a gradual collective forgetting of this violence by "after Ages," an effect which I suggest is just what Cavendish hoped her text would accomplish.

Cavendish makes separate appeals both to her contemporary and future audiences in omitting the desecration of the family tomb from her memoir. She chooses not to use this potential source of ammunition against her enemies, perhaps knowing that it will be missed in the short term and hoping that it will be forgotten in the long term. Recall Cavendish's claim from the conclusion of *A True Relation* that she does not "intend this piece for to delight but to divulge" (63). Though a passage on the plundering of a tomb is unlikely to "delight" any audience, it could make a strong emotional appeal that would overwhelm readers' rational response to the text, and therefore I think Cavendish

operates under this same general principle when she leaves out any such passage. She performs discretion by not rehearsing the violation of the Lucas vault, a performance she revives for the biography of her husband William. In this later work, Cavendish also endeavors “to set forth and declare to after-ages, the truth” of William’s loyalty and service and finds the resulting text satisfactorily lucid with the exception of one dark mark: “which is, that your Grace commanded me not to mention any thing or passage to the prejudice or disgrace of any Family or particular person (although they might be of great truth, and would illustrate much the actions of your Life) which I have dutifully performed to satisfy your Lordship, whose Nature is so Generous, that you are as well pleased to obscure the faults of your Enemies, as you are to divulge the virtues of your Friends” (“To His Grace the Duke of Newcastle”). Whereas in the later work Cavendish drops pointed hints at what she could have included had she been permitted to do so, in the earlier autobiographical account she relies on her audience’s recognition that some details remain unmentioned. To those in the know, Cavendish demonstrates that while her enemies had no qualms about violating the sanctity of a tomb and thus making its contents public, she will not reenact that violation in print. The omission suggests that any advantage which might be gained by repeating these events (which were already widely known anyway) would not be worth the pain and indignity of reopening the tombs to public view and reopening the wounds that accompanied these acts in the first place. The graves never should have been opened to begin with, and by refusing to write for “delight” Cavendish can assert that she’s not going to open them again to satisfy the curiosity of her readers. While not depoliticizing the space of the vault, Cavendish

transforms it back into a private, family space, erasing it from the public record she authors in order to reinscribe what happened there as the subject of personal recollection. Cavendish's silence on the matter represents an attempted assertion of her memorial power, as she conceals the bodies of her mother, sister, and other family members behind her monumental text. As a monument, the text stands as a substitute site of commemoration replacing the vault which had become marred by trauma. While the accusatory "Oration to a People Dejected by War" speaks of the fate of the Lucas family tomb, the oration which answers it in the collection, "A Comforting Oration to a dejected People, ruined by War" more accurately captures the sentiment conveyed by the calculated absence of that broken vault from *A True Relation*: "Shall we have not only enemies without us but also within us? Shall we torture our minds with grief, sorrow, fear, and despair for our misfortunes? No, *Dear Countrymen*, let us wipe the tears from our eyes and defy Fortune's malice, and when she knows we regard not her frowns she may chance to favour us" (157).

The tomb at St. Giles's Church remains out of bounds in the reconstruction of Lucas family space in *A True Relation*, a means of "defy[ing] Fortune's malice" and assuming control over the processes of revelation and concealment. Cavendish encloses her family in her text, providing an alternative space for their eternal rest and commemoration. This strategy becomes apparent in Cavendish's treatment of her brother, Sir Charles Lucas, as much as in her silence regarding the fate of her mother's and sister's bodies. The subject of numerous publications, Charles Lucas hardly needed to be rescued from oblivion. Instead, once again, Cavendish's commitment to commemorating

Charles can be seen as rooted in an attempt to subsume his representation within a family narrative.

Charles submitted himself to the mercy of his enemies following the parliamentary army's entry into Colchester on August 28, 1648 and was summarily condemned to death, along with Sir George Lisle and Sir Bernard Gascoigne. Though Gascoigne was reprieved as a foreigner, first Lucas then Lisle were executed the next day. The execution produced a flood of print responses condemning the action as cold-blooded murder and commemorating the heroic sacrifice of two such loyal servants to the king.<sup>16</sup> In *A True Relation*, Cavendish memorializes her brother as he was memorialized elsewhere, with praise for his loyalty and valor: he was “shot to death for his Loyall Service, for he was most constantly Loyall and Couragiously active, indeed he had a superfluity of courage” (49). As in any proper martyr’s tale, the myth that grew around Lucas and Lisle included an element of the miraculous: it was said that no grass ever grew again on the spot where their blood was shed. Margaret Cavendish contributes to the myth in one of the tales included towards the end of Book One of *Natures Pictures*, a

---

<sup>16</sup> A detailed discussion of contemporary responses to the executions of Sir Charles Lucas and Sir George Lisle, comparing royalist propaganda with Parliamentary and army propaganda can be found in Brady, 9-30. For an additional contemporary poetic response to the loss of Lucas and Lisle by a Royalist woman, see Hester Pulter’s “On those two unparalleled friends S<sup>r</sup>: G: Lisle and S<sup>r</sup>: C: Lucas, who were shott to death at Colechester,” printed in Stevenson and Davidson, eds., 193-95. Like Cavendish, Pulter worries that the days of honorable commemoration have ended with Royalist defeat. She reflects:

Had these undaunted loving Heros died  
In former times they had bin Deified  
Then theire Renown and love had spread as far  
As those two famous Thunderbolts of War  
Effigies, Piramids, Collums, Collosses,  
Had bin erect to memorise our losses  
But we are now denied, our Just desires  
Trew gratefull love in this our expires (55-62)

Still, she hopes that some “sad Swan” will emerge to memorialize them in verse and ensure their eternal place in the temple of Fame, while “that black Armie after their shrot Dreame” will ultimately be lost in “oblivious Horrid womb” (63, 67, 70).

tale told by a young woman whose brother “was murther’d in cold Blood” during the wars. The female storyteller recalls:

Volleys of Shot did all his Body tear,  
Where his Blood’s spilt, the Earth no Grass will bear.  
As if for to revenge his Death, the Earth  
Was curs’d with Barrenness even from her Birth. (89)

These popular publications ensure that Charles Lucas is widely mourned and commemorated, and some modern sources suggest that he becomes the most significant royalist martyr apart from Charles I. Cavendish’s commemorations of her brother in verse and prose thus enter into a crowded arena; she is not the only one writing to make certain that “though his Body in the Grave doth lye, His Fame doth live, and will eternally” (89). Nevertheless, Cavendish’s works stand apart as the public expression of a sister’s private grief for her brother’s death. Cavendish’s exile kept her from being present at Charles’s burial which, as I will discuss below, may not have offered much satisfactory closure even had she been present. Thus the records of the trauma of Charles’s death that appear throughout her work provide Cavendish an alternative space in which to reassert the family bond and mourn her brother from a distance.

Though Charles Lucas quickly becomes enshrined as a martyr, there seems to be some ambiguity about the immediate resting place of his remains (just where “his Body in the Grave doth lye,” at least prior to the Restoration). A pamphlet from 1648 claims to preserve Charles’s “last speech which Hee made at the place of Execution,” including a plea for the safe-handling of his corpse:

As for my body, I doe desire you that it may be decently carried to my owne house, and that my friends have liberty to interre it with my Ancestors, and set it in the vault of the Church where they were laide before me; And in the interim,

that there bee no incivility offered to my body here when I am dead, and that my corps may remaine quiet without molestation when it is carried away. (*Sir Charles Lucas* 4)

Was this request granted? Katie Whitaker writes that Charles was “buried by his enemies in an unmarked grave,” finding his “true tomb” in his sister’s memorial poetry until he was disinterred and reburied in the family vault at St. Giles Church in 1661 (146). Citing Whitaker, Joanne Wright elaborates on the question of what happened to Charles’s body following the execution, suggesting that “under the circumstances--his execution by parliamentary forces, the absence of family members who would have mourned his death in England, along with the fact that Civil War soldiers were so often disfigured they were ‘buried hastily, in unmarked graves’--Lucas’s body was initially not given a proper burial” (260). Barbara Donagan, writing in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, presents a slightly different picture, stating that Charles was buried in St. Giles Church right after the execution, fulfilling his stated wish to be interred with his family, but that the burial was kept private until June 1661 when a great public funeral was held, including a procession through Colchester. Whether Charles is initially interred in an unmarked grave or he is silently slipped into the family vault at St. Giles, it is likely that neither action would have seemed to Cavendish to allow for proper solemnization of the burial. The state of the Lucas family vault in August 1648 should also complicate a reading of Charles’s burial there as a glorious reunion with his ancestors in their eternal resting place.

The recent intrusion into the vault had remade it as a site of family horror rather than commemoration. According the account printed in *The Loyall Sacrifice*, this

desecration only occurs on the occasion of parliamentary soldiers bringing Charles's body into the family vault, "a civil curtesie which he much desired before his death" (88). Though they make a show of performing this "curtesie" their civility proves extremely limited, as shown above. Even if it is not the case that the burial of Charles Lucas provided the occasion for the disinterment and mutilation of his mother's and sister's corpses, those crimes would have been committed not long before hand and evidence of them would surely have confronted those who entered the vault. And though Charles is quickly resurrected as a martyr in print, his burial occurs against a backdrop of ruin and defeat in Colchester. All of these circumstances come together to suggest that whatever sort of burial Charles had received by the time Margaret Cavendish set to work composing *A True Relation*, it would not have carried a satisfactory significance. The destructive chaos of civil war had been shown to reach even into the grave, a fact of the times lamented widely by royalist writers. The author of *The Loyall Sacrifice* grieves for the future of his country, in terms that resonate with Cavendish's own bitter critique, "If such brutish spirits be not timely subdued; *England* will lose both name and nature, and become *Barbarian*. If the *Memorials* of the *Dead*, those *last houses*, their *Urns*, may not be secured from violence; what safety may *Civil societies* presume to have!" (88-89). Katherine Philips likewise uses the metaphor of desecration to wonder at the terrible significance of attacks on the memory of Charles I: "Oh! to what height of horror are they come, / Who dare pull down a crown, tear up a tomb?" (33-4). Into such an uncertain environment Cavendish presents *A True Relation* as a substitute "last house," restored

from ruin and safe from further violence, wherein the family members taken from her, in one way or another, by war can be reunited and remembered.

In the absence of proper physical sites of commemoration, *A True Relation* takes its place as a textual *lieu de mémoire* for distressed and displaced Royalist readers. Cavendish offers her book as an authoritative statement of the significance of what was before the wars and how it came to be lost. Her attempt to tell a story, the story, that ascribes meaning to the new civil war ruins provides a touchstone for her contemporary audience of readers struggling to reconcile their own fresh memories of the wars. Additionally, she writes in anticipation of a future audience in “after-Ages,” those who will encounter the ruins once they have aged and turn to her work for an explanation. The intertwining of domestic and public spheres in support of Royalist ideology and the function of texts to collectivize memories of a fragmented community will continue to serve as our focus in the next chapter, which turns to the politicization of recipe books during the Commonwealth and early Restoration.

## **Chapter Two: Domestic Violence, or How to Preserve the Past in *The Court and Kitchin of Elizabeth, Commonly Called Joan Cromwell***

### **Court & Kitchin as Cookbook**

The subgenre of cookbooks that promises a peek into the private life of a politician through the domestic practice of his wife retains its ability to entice readers: witness the 2012 publication of Michelle Obama's *American Grown: The Story of the White House Kitchen Garden and Gardens Across America* (May 2012) or, more recently, Ann Romney's *The Romney Family Table: Sharing Home-Cooked Recipes & Favorite Traditions* (October 2013). Like everything else, this genre has a history. In 1655, readers curious about the housewifery of Henrietta Maria, the then exiled widow of Charles I, and perhaps eager for relics of the Stuart royal household, flocked to *The Queen's Closet Opened*. The title page of this work promises readers "Incomparable Secrets in *Physick, Chirurgery, Preserving, Candying, and Cookery*; as whereof were honoured with her own practice, when she pleased to descend to these more private Recreations." Concern over the work's authenticity is preempted by the assertion: "Transcribed from the true Copies of her MAJESTIES own Recipe Books, by W.M. one of her late servants." While not diminishing her royal role ("the QUEEN," "her MAJESTIES own"), these lines imagine Henrietta Maria playing housewife, receiving recipes through her elite social network and then testing them with her own hand, as many women did at the time. In doing so, the title page also introduces a fantasy of royal domestic harmony that does not exist in 1655 and that runs counter to the dominant image of the monarchical household made popular in parliamentary propaganda of the 1640s. That representation emphasized the subversion of gender roles in the royal

marriage, condemning Henrietta Maria for usurping Charles's authority as husband and king in order to further her own plot of Catholicizing England. Already on its title page *Queens Closet Opened* sets to work recuperating the queen's image, and her husband's along with it, by positing Henrietta Maria as a woman who used her "private Recreations" not to concoct the nation's downfall but to nourish her family through the practice of medicinal and culinary arts.<sup>17</sup> The publication brings readers into the recuperated royal household through this act of revelation, but also allows them to recreate it in their very own kitchens through the practice of the Queen's recipes. Thus the recipes themselves become the means by which readers can share in a particular remembrance of the royal family.

*Queens Closet Opened* proves extremely popular with readers, and 15 editions are printed between 1655 and 1698.<sup>18</sup> The success of *Queens Closet Opened* establishes the existence of an audience for this particular type of cookery book, one which promises to reveal the household secrets of a "sovereign lady", and W.M.'s collection surely serves as the model for another such work, first published in 1664 though likely written no later than April 1660, entitled *The Court & Kitchin of Elizabeth, Commonly Called Joan Cromwell, THE Wife of the Late Usurper, Truly Described and Represented, And now*

---

<sup>17</sup> For a detailed reading of how *The Queens Closet Opened* domesticates the unpopular French Catholic Henrietta Maria into an English housewife, see Laura Lunger Knoppers, "Opening the Queen's Closet: Henrietta Maria, Elizabeth Cromwell, and the Politics of Cookery," *Renaissance Quarterly*, 60.2. (2007) 464-499. For further analysis of the book's royalist politics see Jayne Archer, "The Queens' Arcanum: Authority and Authorship in *The Queens Closet Opened* (1655)" *Renaissance Journal* 1.6. (2002): 14-25; Edith Snook "'Soveraigne Receipts' and the Politics of Beauty in *The Queens Closet Opened*" *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 15 (2007): 1-19.

<sup>18</sup> Editions are printed in 1655, 1656, 1658, 1659, 1661, 1662, 1663, 1671, 1674, 1679, 1683, 1684, 1695, 1696, and 1698. The general viability of cookery literature for publishers and booksellers is shown by the fact that between 1650 and 1750, no fewer than 106 "new" culinary texts and 160 subsequent editions of texts already in print were published in the English language, in England, Scotland, and Ireland (Pennell 239).

*Made Publick for general Satisfaction.*<sup>19</sup> *Court & Kitchin* satirizes the attempts of Oliver and Elizabeth Cromwell to imitate royalty, focused through a dissection of the vulgar and Puritanical Elizabeth's unsuccessful efforts to keep house at Whitehall Palace. The anonymous author constructs an audience of defeated royalists who find all their miseries, past, present, and future, deriving solely from the “single accursed plots and designs” of the Cromwells. Both *Queens Closet Opened* and *Court & Kitchin* adapt the recipe book genre for political purposes, and in doing so are only the most obvious examples of a common trend in the 1650s. Madeline Bassnett has demonstrated the politicization of the cookery book during the Commonwealth, when “royalists employed the popular genre of the printed recipe book to link good household management to the monarchy, thereby claiming that royalty and royalists could and should heal, order, and feed the nation” (n. pag). Though they share a basic royalist longing for the restoration of the monarchy, the two books frame their subjects very differently. While *Queens Closet Opened* enables the remembrance of Henrietta Maria as a kind of reverence, *Court & Kitchin* takes up a project of revenge, putting Elizabeth to work in Whitehall’s kitchen for the purpose of, as the title promises, “general Satisfaction.” The author of *Court & Kitchin* manipulates conventions established by *Queens Closet Opened* and other royalist cookbooks as one strategy in the creation of his satirical portrait of Elizabeth Cromwell.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> This date for latest possible composition is suggested by Knoppers on the basis of contemporary references made in the text. The conclusion of the book refers to Tatham’s play *The Rump* (performed in spring 1660) and notes that Richard Cromwell is in hiding because of his debts. Richard went into hiding in April 1660 and left England in May 1660.

<sup>20</sup> Bassnett traces connections to royalist figures or members of the royal family in eight of the ten cookbooks published from 1653-1658. These books are: Joseph Cooper, *The Art of Cookery Refin'd and Augmented. Containing an Abstract of some rare and rich unpublished Receipts of Cookery: Collected from the practise of that incomparable Master of these Arts, Mr. Jos. Cooper, chiefe Cook to the Late King* (London: J.G. for R. Lowndes, 1654); Elizabeth Grey, Countess of Kent, *A Choice Manval of Rare*

This suggests an intended audience that would be familiar enough with these generic conventions to understand what it signifies about Elizabeth when they are subverted or absent from “her” cookery book. Beyond those well-versed in recipe books, the author constructs his audience around shared ideas about the knowledge and behavior appropriate for a wife managing the household at the very top of the social order.

*Queens Closet Opened* and *Court & Kitchin* have the same purported provenance in a servant in the royal or protectoral household, but the distinction between how each book handles its source provides an illuminating entry point into their widely differing treatment of the former queen and “Protectresse Joan.” W.M. advertises his position as “late servant” to Henrietta Maria on the title page as an attempt to validate the authenticity of the work; readers can trust that these are indeed the recipes that were presented to the queen because they have been preserved by one close to her.<sup>21</sup> Additionally, W.M. represents his revelation of secrets as the further performance of loyal service. He claims to have only published his copy of the recipes to preempt the

---

*and Select Secrets In Physick and Chyrurgery; Collected and Practised by the Right Honorable, the Countesse of Kent, late deceased. As also most Exquisite ways of Preserving, Conserving, Candyng, &c* (London: Gertrude Dawson, 1653); *Elizabeth Grey, A True Gentlewoman's Delight. Wherein is contained all manner of Cookery: Together with Preserving, Conserving, Drying and Candyng, Very necessary for all Ladies and Gentlewomen* (London: Gertrude Dawson, 1653); W.M., *The Queens Closet*; W.M., *The Compleat Cook. Expertly prescribing the most ready wayes, Whether, Italian, Spanish, or French. For dressing of Flesh, and Fish, Ordering of Sauces, or making of Pastry* (London: Nathaniel Brook, 1655); Theodore Mayerne, *Archimagirus Anglo-Gallicus: Or, Excellent & Approved Receipts and Experiments in Cookery. Together with the best way of Preserving. As also, Rare Formes of Sugar-Works: According to the French Mode, and English Manner. Copied from a choice Manuscript of Sir Theodore Mayerne, Knight, Physician to the late K. Charles* (London: G. Bedell and T. Collins, 1658); Lord Ruthven, *The Ladies Cabinet Enlarged and Opened: Containing Many Rare Secrets, and Rich Ornements of several kindes, and different uses* (London: Printed by T.M. for M.M. G. Bedell and T. Collins, 1654); Alathea Talbot, Countess of Arundel, *Natura Exenterata: Or Nature Unbowelled By the most Exquisite Anatomizers of Her. Wherein are contained, Her choicest Secrets digested into Receipts, fitted for the Cure of all sorts of Infirmities, whether Internal or External, Acute or Chronical, that are Incident to the Body of Man* (London: H. Twiford, G. Bedell, N. Ekins, 1655).

<sup>21</sup> Jayne Archer has convincingly identified W.M. as Walter Montague, Henrietta Maria’s secretary and spy and “perhaps the closest and most loyal” of her former servants. See Archer, “The Queens’ Arcanum: Authority and Authorship in *The Queens Closet Opened* (1655)” *Renaissance Journal* 1.6 (2002): 14-25.

publication of two unauthorized copies he found in manuscript circulation on the continent. “Had not the lock first been pickt” he “should not have thought it lesse then Sacriledge” to open his mistress’s closet of secrets. That having been done, he hopes the publication “might continue my Soveraign Ladies remembrance in the breasts and loves of those persons of honour and quality that presented most of these rare receipts to her.” W.M.’s reference to the recipes as “Reliques” further suggests their ability to recall the exiled queen. As relics, the recipes can act “as a channel for the curative or beneficial powers required by the living,” temporarily making Henrietta Maria present in order to heal her troubled subjects (Hallam and Hockey 135). W.M. imagines Henrietta Maria’s personal gratitude for his collection, hoping she “may smile at the happy recovery of those papers, which perhaps these troubles and her travels might utterly have deprived of, had not my diligent care preserved them for her Majesties review.” Through these justifications, W.M. frames his publication as preserving the relationships between mistress and servant, sovereign and subject that governed both the early modern household and monarchical state.

In contrast, the source for Elizabeth Cromwell’s recipes as printed in *Court & Kitchin* is not revealed until the author’s parting remarks, when he justifies the disordered presentation of recipes of different sorts by saying “I had them in this form from a near servant of hers” (130). Far from being emblazoned on the title page as a selling point of the work, this admission appears as an afterthought and as a mere gesture towards the convention established in *Queens Closet Opened*. In this satirical work, the reader knows quite well that these aren’t *really* Elizabeth Cromwell’s personal recipes but nevertheless

the author manipulates the convention of servant-as-source to suit his purpose. If W.M.’s sharing of secrets represents the continuation of household loyalties, the revelation made to the author of *Court & Kitchin* provides evidence of their breakdown. Those “near” to Elizabeth Cromwell appear only too ready to betray a mistress who, according to the extensive prefatory narrative, never properly fulfilled the responsibilities of that role anyway.

Three of the recipes presented in *Court & Kitchin* are nearly identical to those in *Queen’s Closet Opened* and the remaining recipes do not differ materially from recipes in other cookery books printed at the time.<sup>22</sup> Though *Court & Kitchin* attempts to depict Elizabeth Cromwell’s villainy in the kitchen, it does not do so by fitting her out with a cauldron or pantry full of ingredients more suitable to the witches’ brew in Act 3 of *Macbeth*. No “eye of newt” or “toe of frog” here; just onions, barley broth, and small beer. In fact, *Queen’s Closet Opened* contains recipes calling for much more exotic, even macabre ingredients than does *Court & Kitchin*, including a cure for chronic bedwetting that requires powdered umbilical cord taken fresh from the infant (“take the Navil string of a child which is ready to fall from him, dry it and beat it to a powder”) (91). Other printed recipe books of the time ask practitioners to collect insects, slugs, snakes, dung, blood and bones (animal or human), breast milk, and human urine, none of which make an appearance in Elizabeth Cromwell’s “kitchin.” The absence of these ingredients from *Court & Kitchin* does not favor Elizabeth. Instead, it marks her as unsophisticated since

---

<sup>22</sup> Laura Lunger Knoppers presents a side by side comparison of these three recipes in her chapter “‘Protectresse & a Drudge’: the court and cookery of Elizabeth Cromwell” in *Politicizing Domesticity*. The recipes are (with their titles as given in *Court & Kitchin*) “A Turkish Dish of Meat,” “To stew a Fillet of Beef in the Italian Fashion,” and “To stew a Rump, or the fat end of a Brisket of Beef in the French fashion.”

such rare ingredients were only used in household medicine and as such represented the housewife's most advanced and prestigious knowledge. There are no medicinal recipes in *Court & Kitchin*, placing the healing arts outside of Elizabeth's abilities. Other notable recipe types missing from *Court & Kitchin* are those for confectionary making and distilling. These skills remained the purview of women of genteel and noble social standing, and so their omission from Elizabeth's recipe collection further underscores her representation as lower-class upstart. The absence of medicinal recipes and select types of culinary recipes marked as elite bolster *Court & Kitchin*'s overall depiction of Elizabeth Cromwell as out of place in Whitehall: though she may occupy a palace, she does not have the skills appropriate to that space.

The recipes that are included in *Court & Kitchin* consistently lack an additional feature common to cookery books, and that is attribution. As they do today, in the early modern period recipes circulated between mothers, daughters, sisters, friends, and neighbors of all social ranks and it was common practice for women to include the name of a source with a recipe. As Sara Pennell has argued, “the names of donors with which recipes are often annotated supply a suggestive shorthand map not only of the geographical, but also of the social connections (and arguably aspirations) of the compiler(s)” (243). This feature originates in handwritten recipe books, but it remains common as such books pass into print. So, for instance, *Queens Closet Opened* not only features numerous recipes attributed to prominent aristocratic women, learned doctors, and even previous monarchs, but it advertises this aspect of the text in the work's full title. These are recipes “as they were presented to the QUEEN” and in print they not only

offer readers a peek into Henrietta Maria's social circle but, to some extent, allow readers to imagine themselves among its members. Madeline Bassnett clarifies the significance of this gesture based in the receipt book's derivation from medieval books of secrets: "Although printed recipe books can scarcely be considered secret, ownership of such knowledge nonetheless implies entrance to an exclusive club." In *Queens Closet Opened*, this "suggestion recalls the elite structures that royalists hoped to re-establish" (par. 6). The second edition of the work further acknowledges the lure of these attributions for readers, as it adds a two-page listing of "*the Prescribers and Approvers of most of these rare Receipts following*" to the book's front matter. These names situate Henrietta Maria within a recognizable network of English social elite and depict her as graciously receiving and generously sharing culinary and medical knowledge. The absence of attributions in any of the recipes printed in *Court & Kitchin*, therefore, emphasizes Elizabeth Cromwell's isolation from any significant network. Her recipes lack the "authorization" of educated professionals or women of higher social standing, and instead betray their vulgar origins, such as a recipe for whole roasted pig said to have been "practiced by her at Huntingdon Brewhouse" (the Cromwells' supposed former profession as brewers features regularly in 1650s satire) (129). Instead of high-born ladies, Elizabeth surrounds herself with "Apple, or Oyster-women, or Stocking -Heelers and the like," convening in her chambers a "Covy of Milk Maids...another of Spinsters and Sowers" composed of the daughters of Nonconformist ministers (32-3). As *Court & Kitchin* reveals Elizabeth churning her own butter to share with these women, noting that "my Lady Protectors Butter" became "famous" amongst them, it offers a peek into

Elizabeth's humble network of "prescribers and approvers," but one that readers are meant to mock rather than admire. While *Queens Closet Opened* draws on readers aspirational desires to get them to peruse or even prepare one of the recipes attributed to Henrietta Maria and her circle, *Court & Kitchin* invites no such practice. Even though there is nothing remarkable or suspicious about their ingredients, these are recipes intended to repel.

As these two works, *Queens Closet Opened* & *Court & Kitchin*, invite readers into the social circles of Henrietta Maria and Elizabeth Cromwell, they also invite them to imagine these two women at work in their kitchens, either as "private recreation" in the case of Henrietta Maria or as drudgery for poor Elizabeth. In concluding my comparative discussion of these two works, it is important to emphasize that in spite of the differences in the depictions of their domestic labor, the actual space in which that labor occurs, and which readers are invited to reconstruct, is the same space. Both Henrietta Maria and Elizabeth Cromwell lived at Whitehall Palace. Elizabeth's renovation of that space in response to the haunting presence of "that other woman" (as she refers to the exiled queen) is mockingly recounted in the extended preface to *Court & Kitchin* and will be discussed in greater detail below. What I'd like to highlight here is the way in which the two cookbooks participate in recreating two distinct versions of Whitehall through the representations of opposing practices of housewifery. It is not surprising that scholars have not dwelt on the shared setting of the two cookbooks because they do come across as completely different spaces, shaped in readers' imaginations by the actions supposed to have occurred within them. The palace constructed by *Queens Closet Opened* is warm

and welcoming, host to a vibrant group of family and friends, linked through the sharing of food and drink and a shared reverence for cultural institutions. The palace constructed by *Court & Kitchin* is empty and inhospitable, home to a small band of usurpers linked through their shared ambition and disregard for traditional structures. This divergent use of Whitehall palace, as a space simultaneously private and public, provides a parallel for the way in which the cookery book, as a form of print culture that purports to reveal household practice, can be appropriated for such opposing, though equally politically charged, projects of public commemoration as *Queens Closet Opened* and *Court & Kitchin*.

### **“An Old Saw...*Olim haec meminisse juvabit*”: *Court & Kitchin* as Commonplace Book**

While both *Queens Closet Opened* and *Court & Kitchin* appropriate the cookery book genre for politicized commemorative projects, *Queens Closet Opened* sticks much more closely to the form and content of other printed cookbooks than does *Court & Kitchin*. Recipes do comprise the majority of *Court & Kitchin*, but before readers get to a single one, they must navigate an eleven-page prefatory address, a six-page “Introduction,” and a forty-five page narrative revealing the secret history of “The Court and Kitchin of Mrs. Elizabeth alias Joane Cromwell.” These extensive opening materials lead Laura Lunger Knoppers to remark that “the text itself strains the genre of the cookery book” (119).<sup>23</sup> I argue that the multiple addresses and narratives that open *Court & Kitchin* construct an audience for the highly political, satirical cookery book and

---

<sup>23</sup> Knoppers argues that the length and detail of these opening materials work against the book’s own central claim that Elizabeth Cromwell’s failure to keep a royal household is blatantly apparent.

instruct that audience, perhaps unfamiliar with reading even conventional recipes, on how to approach the text. This is done through the author's engagement with another mnemonic genre, the commonplace book. The sixty-two pages of prose that precede Elizabeth's recipes are peppered with Latin and Greek quotations (occasionally translated), and allusions and anecdotes from ancient Roman and more recent English political history. These items, which are integral to the discourse of the opening section of the book, would be recognizable to readers as the sorts of textual material one would keep in a commonplace book.

Developing from the medieval *florilegia*, the early modern commonplace book was a collection of quotations and exemplary excerpts selected from authoritative texts and assembled under conventional headings. More than a resting place for choice quotations, a commonplace book enabled its keeper to put quotations into action. The act of framing material within the commonplace book was meant to enact a simultaneous shaping of compilers' minds and memories, so that they might be properly receptive to future texts they might read. In this way, Hester Lees Jeffries writes, "commonplace books attempted to construct and inculcate social, cultural, and even doctrinal norms, as well as habits of mind, and in doing so fostered particular ways of reading, whereby texts might be mined for instructive fragments, rather than pondered as coherent, organic wholes" (19). This facet of how commonplace books operated upon their compilers proves crucial to the use of commonplaces in *Court & Kitchin*, a text which struggles to instruct readers in how to comprehend its own divided nature, as both recipe book and political satire. The practice of mining texts for instructive fragments suggests readers

with an eye for how old, authoritative language might be applied in the present moment. The existence of conventional headings and a storehouse of tried and true quotations and paraphrases would provide the compilers of commonplaces with a shared framework for interpreting new information and experiences in relation to what is already known. As Anne Moss writes, “The common-place book worked as a memory store of quotations, which could be activated to verbalize present experience in the language of familiar moral paradigms and with reference to a cultural history shared by writer and reader.” Commonplaces give those whose memories are shaped by the tradition a means for reading the world.

Throughout the introduction, commonplaces are used to show readers how to interpret the figures and actions of Oliver and Elizabeth Cromwell. Taken out of their original contexts and placed in new ones, commonplace quotations are inherently fragmented. They require classification, organization, interpretation, and are given new significance when placed amongst other such textual treasures. The author of *Court & Kitchin* reassembles commonplaces in ways that infuse them with new relevance while simultaneously relying on their retention of their initial or traditional meanings, and readers’ recollections of those meanings, in order to understand how they might illuminate the present moment.

The blending of commonplace book and recipe book found in *Court & Kitchin* is not as strange as it might initially appear. The practice of keeping commonplaces in a personal notebook spreads out of humanistic reading and writing practices of the Renaissance, fostered by its inclusion in grammar school pedagogy. This might lead one

to assume that the commonplace book was a genre composed exclusively by men, but women also participated in the general practice of collecting and organizing textual bits deemed particularly useful or worth remembering. In addition, the more specifically domestic practice of keeping recipes was influenced by the commonplace book tradition. Catherine Field traces the relationship between the two types of book: “The collecting of commonplaces from a variety of source popular with Renaissance readers—the Bible, sermons, poetry compilations, spiritual devotions, classical philosophy, natural history, and rhetoric—informed the practice of gathering receipts, which were themselves even occasionally included in commonplace books, a move which suggest, perhaps, that on one level, the recipe was thought of as just another type of commonplace fragment in the period” (51). Eventually recipe books emerge as a distinctive genre, especially in print, but *Court & Kitchin* reunites recipes with other kinds of commonplace fragments.<sup>24</sup> The frequency with which the author “Englishes” quotations from Latin, either by direct translation or paraphrase, also invites a wider audience into the text. The combination of recipes, Virgilian quotation, and Biblical allusions that one finds in *Court & Kitchin* duplicates the sort of mixing one might find in a personal notebook of the sort Field describes above. The difference, however, is that the recipes printed in *Court & Kitchin* are not meant to aid the cook attempting to remember how to preserve quinces or bake a Venison pie “*a la mode Cromwellian*” (which requires, as an essential component, that the deer be stolen) (125). Instead, the recipes, like the commonplace fragments from

---

<sup>24</sup> Kate Chedgzoy has also noted that for early modern elite women, the keeping of a commonplace book might blur with the keeping of a recipe book; for them, the practical knowledge of cooking “and the embodied memories that underpinned it would be supported by such *aides memoires* as personal notebooks containing recipes. This category of memorandum book overlaps with other manuscript collections in which women inscribed knowledge they wanted to recall and use” (22).

literary and historical sources, are presented to readers as aids for remembering the Cromwells.

When the author finally concludes the narrative of Elizabeth's housewifery and transitions to the actual recipes, he comments "Here follows the most usual Meat and Diet observed at her Table, most of them ordinary and vulgar, except some few Rarities, but such as arrided her Palate and Expence, of which it will be no unpleasing Labour to the Reader, to peruse the Cookery, and manner of Dressing, as also her preserves, &c."

(46). It is important to note that the "labor" here associated with this text is critical reading, not cooking. In this way, the recipes are made to serve the same function as the commonplaces summoned by the author to frame his readers' reception of his text. The concept of digestion as a common metaphor used by exponents of the commonplace book to describe how compilers should internalize their collected materials gains special relevance in this context. Walter Eamon, writing about books of secrets, claims that "the recipe distills the arduous trial-and-error experience of practitioners and collapses it into a formula for making" (9). Readers of *Court & Kitchin* find in the recipes, as in the commonplaces, formulas for making, or remaking, the Cromwells in the collective royalist memory.

All of the commonplaces in *Court & Kitchin* rely on a simultaneous evocation of past and present, but one that deals specifically with the subject of memory makes particularly effective use of this capability in order to imagine an audience for the work and proclaim its purpose. The author writes that "Her Highness" Elizabeth must excuse the "frank and libertine manner" of treatment she receives from him and other satirists

“for ‘tis all we are like to have for many millions; besides an old Saw or Proverb to the bargain,----*Olim haec meminisse juvabit*; a little transitory mirth, for twenty years duration of sorrow.” This “old Saw” derives from Aeneas’s speech to his comrades beginning at line 198 of Book 1 of *The Aeneid*. Referring to the quotation in this way acknowledges its status and function as a commonplace. Though the line has an afterlife independent from its original context, *Court & Kitchin*’s audience’s familiarity with not only the line but its context allows these few words to do considerable rhetorical work. A reading of the circumstances of Aeneas’s speech sheds light on how the author of *Court & Kitchin* positions himself and his text in relation to his audience and on what he hopes his work will accomplish.

The audience for Aeneas’s speech is comprised of fellow refugees, survivors of the fall of Troy who have shared in the suffering of war and the hardships of the journey from their lost home into an uncertain future. They have just escaped shipwreck in a storm stirred up by the vengeful Juno and found safe-haven on the Libyan coast, where they prepare to eat their first meal on dry land. Virgil’s description of the meal emphasizes generosity and hospitality even in such dire circumstances. The men will dine on seven stags, hunted by Aeneas, which he divides equally amongst the group--one stag for each of the ships, we are told--and will share the wine their ally Acestes, king of Sicily, had given them during their short time in his kingdom. Prior to the preparation of the meat, Aeneas speaks. He addresses the men as “*socii--neque enim ignari sumus ante malorum,*” companions who are not strangers to misfortune or pain, and urges them to find comfort in the thought that Fate has promised an end to their hardship.

*O passi graviora, dabit deus his quoque finem.  
Vos et Scyllaeam rabiem penitusque sonantis  
acceſtis scopulus, vos et Cyclopea saxa  
experti: revocate animos, maestumque timorem  
mittite: forsitan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit.  
Per varios vasus, per to discrimina rerum  
tendimus in Latium; sedes ubi fata quietas  
ostendunt; illic fas regna resurgere Troiae.  
Durate, et vosmet rebus servate secundis.* (199-207)

You who have endured worse, some god will also grant an end to these things. You who have approached the cliffs resounding deeply with the fury of Scylla and experienced the boulders of the Cyclops: Recall your spirits and dismiss your sad fear; perhaps at some time it will please us to remember even these things. Through various misfortunes, through the dangers of so many things, we hastened to Latium, where the fates promise us a peaceful home; there it is divine will for the kingdom of Troy to rise again. Harden yourselves, and preserve yourselves for more favorable things to come.

Aeneas asks his men to imagine themselves in the future, remembering events that are only just in the process of occurring in the present moment of the narrative. He recalls some of what they have endured, though the majority remains untold until his audience with Dido, and acknowledges that additional hardships remain. Aeneas reminds his men of the promise that Troy will rise again, and implicit in the speech is his own promise of that future from which they will be able to recall a past that has not yet taken place.

For readers of *Court & Kitchin* who know *The Aeneid*, all of this material can be conveyed through the quotation of one line, “*olim haec meminisse iuvabit*,” but how does this epic context illuminate the purpose of a satirical cookbook? In this quotation, the author of *Court & Kitchin* casts himself as a kind of Aeneas addressing an audience of hardened comrades, those who are not strangers to misfortune. This characterization of the audience emerges elsewhere in the introduction when the author refers to “the desperate depressed estate of many thousand loyal Subjects, who are irrecoverably lost

and past all means, but a miracle, to their just or any competent Restitution.” These subjects find “all their present and many more grievous past miseries are derived upon them and their Posterity” solely by the “single accursed plots and designs” of Oliver and Elizabeth Cromwell. In placing the blame for the regicide and its aftermath fully on Cromwell, *Court & Kitchin* joins other royalist works printed after 1660 that “give Cromwell a political power and prominence not found in the complex and shifting realities of the previous decade” (Knoppers *Constructing Cromwell* 178). The multigenerational experience of suffering and the need for miraculous intervention are again presented later in the introduction with respect to financial loss: “I am sure … there are some who now feel it to the third generation, and may without miracle to perpetuity” (4). Like Aeneas’s audience, the imagined audience of *Court & Kitchin* has survived war, seen a kingdom fall, and endured a complete overturning of the social order. Aeneas’s conjuration of a land “*quietas*,” “calm, at peace” would certainly resonate with such an audience. In 1658 it was unclear what Fate might hold for fallen royalists; could they, as Aeneas urges his men to do, look forward to the resurgence of a kingdom (*regna resurgere Troiae*)? When the author of *Court & Kitchin* recalls Aeneas’s promise “*forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit*” he too promises a future time when his readers might be able to look back differently upon their suffering, past and present. Additionally, and simultaneously, he offers the reading of his satirical cookbook as the means through which that time might be, at least temporarily, achieved. The author of *Court & Kitchin* acknowledges that though events might *seem* beyond the resources of memory to reconcile and understand, in fact they are not so far gone; he deploys a

commonplace meant to reassure his readers and provide them with a means of reading past and current events that will enable them to move forward into the future with, if not certainty, at least resolve. Through this commonplace, the book endows the satirical representation of Elizabeth Cromwell's housekeeping with a transformative power to alleviate grief and make the past just a little easier to digest, "a little transitory mirth for twenty years duration of sorrow."

Writing as a representative of the "many thousand loyal Subjects" who have yet to see justice done against the Cromwells, the author of *Court & Kitchin* positions himself within the tradition of "satire from below," described by Nigel Smith as "most transgressive" in its "deeply irreverent jesting voice." Smith continues "Satire was a form of cursing, a verbal utterance which was assumed to have magical properties. The laughter that satire released was a way for political and religious communities or community values to be sustained" (297). The magic performed by *Court & Kitchin* turns Fortune's wheel in favor of its dispossessed audience while transforming the agent of violent destruction from Oliver Cromwell into his wife Elizabeth. Throughout the text she appears as a parallel figure to her husband, as powerful and powerfully ill-suited to manage a royal household as he was to manage the nation. The focus on Elizabeth's "cookery" for an audience struggling to cope with their experiences as survivors of Oliver's butchery enables a wishful refiguring of the past into ameliorative and comic forms. As mocking Elizabeth allows the reader to find pleasure in remembering the recent past, it draws him into a community of defeated royalists, a political community here constructed around a shared set of domestic values depicted as fundamentally alien

to the Cromwellian household. While the political circumstances at the time of *Court & Kitchin*'s writing allow it to be read as “satire from below,” its appropriation of that tradition is complicated by the book’s pervasive sense that those very circumstances represent a travesty that has already taken place. Mikhail Bakhtin describes medieval folk festivals that allowed for a temporary “reversal of hierarchic levels” wherein, for example, “the jester was proclaimed king” at a “feast of fools” (81). One outcome of such festivities was the emphasis on temporality, change, and instability in opposition to “the protective, timeless stability, the unchanging established order and ideology” (81). *Court & Kitchin* proclaims that the people of England have had to endure a jester for a king, in the person of the Lord Protector, for some time and sets out to reveal just what was served in the palace where every meal recreated the “feast of fools.” The satire, then, is intended to undermine the current regime while ultimately serving to bolster allegiance to an idea of monarchical stability, a traditional order, which could yet return

**“What a Voracious Monster would she appear to be?” Elizabeth Cromwell**

### **Consumes the Past**

*Court & Kitchin*’s introductory narratives portray the Cromwells as radical enemies of this royalist conception of traditional order. The accusations made against the Cromwells here tap into deep anxieties that persisted from the beginning of the wars into the Protectorate. Husband and wife are shown to be usurpers and pillagers, operating in tandem in the political and domestic spheres and repeatedly gaining personal advantage from the general destruction and tumult of war. In this way, the portrait recalls plundering figures from pamphlets published in the early years of the war, such as *The Grand*

*Plunderer* (1643) and *The English-Irish Soldier* (1642). Described as “a huge, horrid monster, deprived of the eye of Equity” the grand plunderer “makes no more conscience to swallow up speedily a mans estate at a bit, then our Dutch doe to devoure nimblly pills of butter, and never purge for it.” (1) Further, “he rejoyces at others sorrowe, and rises by their fall: He can hardly subsist but by the spoyle and ruine of his neighbour, to whom such is his implacable malice and cruelty, that for his owne ends his endeavour is to make him a sacrifice.” (1) The English-Irish Soldier, depicted in woodcut and accompanying verse as armored head-to-toe in his stolen comestibles (with a whole duck providing the “feather” in his cooking pot helmet and pieces of toast buckling his shoes), joins the army out of hunger and thus “had rather Eate than fight.” Diane Purkiss describes these fearfully imagined figures of wartime plunder:

Abstract figures of death-dealing and violent soldiers described in many early pamphlets were tinged with class anxiety, and hence with the rhetoric of carnival, the world upside down, the fable of the belly. This was particularly true where the soldiers were recruited from the dregs of society, or were supposed to have been: it was said that local communities had rid themselves of undesirables by making them soldiers. What was horrifying about these figures was the unleashing of their unjust appetites: the figure of the Plundering Soldier as in any case almost all belly. (41)

It is hard to imagine any figure more “undesirable” than Elizabeth Cromwell in the estimation of *Court & Kitchin*. The author labors to remind readers of her lowly, vulgar origins; though perhaps not “the dregs of society,” she is labeled “an hundred times fitter for a Barn then a Palace.” The representation of the Cromwells on the rise in *Court & Kitchin* recounts a nightmare scenario in which a pair of these lowly plunderers ascend up the ranks of the Army and even further, to the head of the state, by consuming their neighbors.

Initially, Elizabeth's motivation to collect what she can from her husband's victories is shown to be a "prophetic prospect" of the instability of the times. Anticipating how "the Hurly burlies of war," into which Oliver "had whirled, and with so much impatient precipitancy engaged himself," could quickly reverse her family's fortunes and reduce them to a lower state, Elizabeth "concluded to be more *discreetly Armed*" (3). She will employ housewifery to protect her family against the uncertainty of the times, a choice which, in itself, would be regarded as the right performance of her domestic duty. Gervase Markham, in his 1615 cookery book and household guide *The English Housewife*, instructs readers, "It is a rule...if we preserve any part, we build strong forts against the adversities of fortune" (7). Throughout *The English Housewife* Markham is concerned with preparing housewives to manage with "adversities of fortune", and emphasizes the value of a knowledgeable, thrifty, and inventive housewife for maintaining a fortified and self-sufficient home. Elizabeth, however, perverts this advice, building her "fort" by sacking others and looting the wreckage left behind by "the Tempest of Rebellion" (3). *Court & Kitchin* claims that she "consecrated her House to be the Temple of *Rapine*," seizing "the best moveables to adorn and enrich this sacred place" (4). Like the "Grand Plunderer" she will "subsist by the spoyle and ruine of [her] neighbor" (1). For example, her coach, one of the few conspicuous signs of her elevated estate that she chooses to adopt, comes to her from a previous owner, as part of the spoils of war. It was "bought at the second hand, out of a great number, which then lay by the Walls, while their honourable owners went on foot, and ambled in the dirt to *Goldsmiths* and *Haberdashers-halls*" (14). Goldsmiths' and Haberdashers' housed, respectively, the

Committee for Compounding with Delinquents and its allied body the Committee for Sequestration and Advance of Money, government bodies with which many readers of *Court & Kitchin* may have had personal experience.<sup>25</sup> Maybe her coach belonged to one of them. This aside identifying the history of Elizabeth's coach demonstrates how her rise depends upon the confiscation of property from those who have fallen.

As Elizabeth obtains her coach, so the Cromwells accumulate considerable wealth: “by the manifold Surrender and Stormings of Houses and Castles, *Cromwell* had amassed good store of rarities, besides Meddals, and gold and silver Vessels, (the spoyls of our Captivity)” (17). With that “our,” the author of *Court & Kitchin* claims a common experience with his audience and reasserts their claim to these items in spite of the Cromwells’ theft. The author recounts the final siege of Basing House, in October 1645, to strengthen his accusations. Basing House, owned by John Paulet, the Fifth Marquis of Winchester, was assaulted by parliamentary forces three times during the first civil war. During the final siege, in October 1645, soldiers under the command of Cromwell stormed the garrison, killed many of those who remained inside, plundered the house and then demolished it.<sup>26</sup> Soldiers kept some of what they seized from the house and sold some of the foodstuffs, furniture, and salvaged building materials from the house to local people. The author of *Court & Kitchin* adds to this picture of redistribution of goods: “I have heard it reported for a Truth, that most of the precious moveables, and other things

---

<sup>25</sup> Margaret Cavendish recounts her unsuccessful visit to Goldsmiths’ Hall in *A True Relation*.

<sup>26</sup> Two accounts were published soon after the fall of Basing House, *Lieutenant General Cromwells Letter to the Honorable William Lenthal Esq; Speaker of the House of Commons of the Storming and Taking of Basing-House* and a supplementary account by Hugh Peters also addressed to Lenthal which set out to “give a full relation of some things concerning Basing not mentioned in the Lieutenant General’s letter” (1). This latter report provides a detailed inventory of food, furniture, jewels, and other goods seized from the house, as well as noting the number (and some names) of people slain in each room.

of value, at the storming of *Basing-house* by *Cromwell*, fell into his hands either immediately or directly" (118). From here they passed to Elizabeth, "the Lady Receiver," who was "about that time seen to be very pleasant and praejant at the enjoyment of those pretty things (as she express'd her self) being the best for substance and ornament, that belong to the noble Marquiss of *Winchester* and his Family, which this she-Usurper now lifted and Catalogued for her own" (19). In this account, these items still "belong" to the Marquis of Winchester, though Elizabeth attempts to list and enjoy them as "her own."

*Court & Kitchin* emphasizes how the Cromwells take advantage of the destructive chaos of war to steal with impunity. All that they take, they wait to display in their house until it is "safe," "till all propriety should be hudled up in the general ruine, out of whose mixt and confused rubbish in his new polish'd Government, they might exert their Brightnesse underivable and clear from all former title and claim" (18). The objects that they steal have a history of ownership, but they count on the tumult of the war making it difficult to discern. Perhaps the former owners are dead or otherwise in no position to enforce their claim, or the extent of the rubble is simply so vast that no one object can be traced to its source. Elizabeth stocks her bottomless storeroom with these displaced items.

*Court & Kitchin* voices a reminder that her efforts to save have left more than Basing House desolate: "And if the whole inventory of her rapinous hoard were now producible, what a Voracious Monster would she appear to be? not a Corner in the Kingdome which is not sensible of her Ravage, and which had not a share in the Lombard of her uncountable and numberless Chattels" (19). The term "Lombard" can refer to a kind of pawnshop, and the commercial overtones of this meaning are relevant to the depiction of

her housewifery at Whitehall turning the place into “*Bartholomew Faire*,” discussed in more detail below. Alternatively, “Lombard” can refer to a kind of culinary preparation, and thus Elizabeth stands accused of consuming the entire nation in one vast dish, recalling the figure of the “Grand Plunderer” who can swallow up a man’s estate in a single bite. Through this representation, we can also see the Cromwells as Margaret Cavendish’s dreaded “Whirlwind” of war made into human form. Bringing into relief what is really lost in the Cromwells’ plundering, the author asks, “How many rare pieces of antique Gold and Silver, are again damned to the earth from whence they were brought? and are by her mischievous Covetousnesse irrecoverably lost, which have been the glories and monumental pride of many Families and the only remains and evidences of their noble Hospitality, now buried by this Wretch in hugger mugger” (19). What Elizabeth hides, when she hoards her spoils in secret, are remnants of a prior social order: materials of memory in the form of household goods which served as monuments or reminders of an aristocratic hospitality, remembered as warmer and more generous than her own. As author of *Court & Kitchin* names the sources of Elizabeth’s household stuff, he therefore counteracts what he identifies as a Cromwellian project to remake the social order and conceal evidence that things were not always as they are at the present moment.

Of course the seizure of property that accompanies the Cromwells’ usurpation of power and their desire to the erase “all former title and claim” from what they assume as their own reaches its end in Cromwell’s most notorious theft, that of sovereign authority over England. The frontispiece engraving to John Gauden’s 1660 *Cromwell’s Bloody Slaughter-house* depicts the robbery in action. An armored Cromwell seizes the crown

from a table at the moment the execution of Charles I occurs in miniature in the background; Cromwell's words “Let's kill and take possession” link the two acts. Taking possession of “the crown,” if not actually then symbolically in the role of Lord Protector, allows the Cromwells to acquire the grandest household of all, Whitehall Palace. While *Court & Kitchin*'s narrative of Elizabeth's early housewifery records how the Cromwells cruelly consumed numerous estates and incorporated them into their own, the section that turns to “her Domestique Affairs at Whitehall” revels in disclosing all of the ways in which that palace proved too big a bite for them to manage.

### **Keeping (Haunted) House at Whitehall**

*Court & Kitchin* recalls that in 1653 “Cromwell first possessed and seated himself” at Whitehall, “as in his own right, and in Chief, and brought his Worshipfull Family thither” (24). In December of that year, “parliament voted that the former royal palaces of St. James, Somerset House, Greenwich House, York, Windsor Castle, and Hampton Court be repurchased for the use of the Lord Protector, and *The Faithful Scout* announced that ‘White-Hall is preparing for his Highnesse to reside in, and the Old Council Chamber is fitting for His Honorable Council to meet in.’” This relocation to a royal palace and the establishment of a protectoral court “almost immediately evoked suspicion of a monarchical Cromwell” (Knoppers, *Constructing Cromwell* 110). Earlier in the prefatory narrative, the author presents the publication of Elizabeth's housewifery as fitting punishment for her usurpation through a reference to the story of Lambert Simnel, a boy set up as challenger to the throne of Henry VII. The author writes, “*Lambert Simnel* very contentedly turned a broach in the Kings Kitchin, after the

Gaudies of his Kingly Imposture, in the beginning of the Reign of *Henry VII*, and therefore for variety sake let this once mighty Lady [Elizabeth] do *Drudgery* to the Publique." Elizabeth's equivalent of little Lambert's "Kingly Imposture" is to masquerade as mistress of a royal household. She fails spectacularly in the estimation of *Court & Kitchin*, and while this is shown to result in part from her lack of hospitality and aristocratic sensibility, her failure should also be understood as Whitehall's victory. *Court & Kitchin* emphasizes that it is not just the demands of her advanced social position that prove beyond Elizabeth's abilities, but that the space of the palace itself defeats her. The Cromwells' mode of operation on their ascent, as we have seen, is to take advantage of war's capacity to destroy evidence of ownership, to reduce the past to rubble. In referring to Elizabeth's "Seizing of this Royal Mansion," *Court & Kitchin* situates the occupation of Whitehall as the Cromwells' culminating effort to take possession of all the "remains and evidences" of a royalist order. But they never stand a chance. *Court & Kitchin* reassures readers that though the Cromwells might inhabit Whitehall, it never belongs to them. No matter what they try to do to make the space their own, they are completely overwhelmed by its ability to preserve its past. The Cromwells' new home turns out to be both haunted and haunting.

In his discussion of the Cromwells' occupation of Whitehall, the author appeals to his audience as a community bound by a shared understanding of the symbolic significance of the palace. This use of Whitehall palace in *Court & Kitchin* can be illuminated by Pierre Nora's definition of the *lieu de mémoire*: "a *lieu de mémoire* is any significant entity, whether material or nonmaterial in nature, which by dint of human will

or the work of time has become a symbolic element of the memorial heritage of any community” (xvii). *Court & Kitchin*, and *Queens Closet Opened* before it, participates in the process of making Whitehall a part of the memorial heritage of the royalist community in defeat and exile. Through repeated imaginative reconstruction in these kinds of works, the palace opens up to become a preserve of collective memory and a locus of social identity. As readers find amusement in the representation of Elizabeth’s inability to cope in her new home, they practice what Nora calls “commemorative vigilance,” protecting a site around which their community coheres.

There are two distinct threads running through the representation of Elizabeth’s life at Whitehall. Her response to the space can be read simultaneously as the practical application of the housewife’s memory resources and as an attempt to defend herself from traumatic memories. Within this first framework, she appears to renovate the palace in order to make it more manageable. Natasha Korda shows how the idealization of the housewife as “Mistress of Memorie” requires that, “To be a good housekeeper she must recollect or internalize via memory the objects she is charged with keeping, and the places in which they are kept, so that she always knows where they are and has them ready to hand” (50). Kate Chedgzoy builds on this idea by examining how metaphors for memory informed women’s domestic work. She suggests that through the figure of the “Mistresse of Memorie,” “the housewife’s disciplined ordering of the household becomes both a homely version of a memory palace, and a system for organizing her own memory” (21). The memory palace is a version of the classical mnemonic device in which one constructs an architectural space in the memory. The images by which

something is to be remembered are then placed within the space which has been constructed; the more detailed the space, including design elements and decorations, the more material one can store. When one wishes to recall what has been stored, these sites are visited in turn “and the various deposits demanded of their custodians” (Yates 4). The size and grandeur of Whitehall challenges Elizabeth’s system for organizing her memory. Elizabeth learned the skills and knowledge of housewifery in a very different space, and when she tries to repeat what she has internalized in this new space it proves insufficient. The literal palace overwhelms its corresponding mental space. In this new household, there are simply too many objects in her charge and too many places where they might be kept.

*Court & Kitchin* holds up Elizabeth’s attempts to manage the spaces under her care as cause for scorn. Her renovations intended to make it easier for her to keep an eye on her servants raise accusations of distrust: “she her self employed a Surveyor to make her some convenient accommodations, and little Labyrinths, and trap Stairs, by which she might at all times unseen, pass to and fro, and come unawares upon her Servants, and keep them vigilant in their places, and honest in the discharge thereof” (25). For a woman in her position, Elizabeth wants to know too much, be too involved in the work of running her household. Though unable to make the “great Reformation” she had intended for “the Kitchin and Pantry,” yet Elizabeth is still criticized for being “so severe and strict...in this thrifty way of House-keeping that she descended to the smallest and meanest manners” (35). She continues to keep house in a manner suited to a much humbler habitation. In addition to actually constructing new rooms to help her cope in the

alien formerly royal spaces, Elizabeth repurposes sites for domestic and rustic labor. She “very providentially kept two or three cowes in St. James’s Park, and erected a new Office of a Dairy in Whitehall, with Dairy Maids to tend that business solely” (32). As part of this business, she “fel to the old Trade of cherning Butter, and making Buttermilk,” and “my Lady Protectors Butter” was well-received by the “zealous Ladies of the Court, most whereof, being Apple-, or Oyster-women, or Stocking-Heelers and the like, did much wonder at and magnifie the invention and rarity” (32-33). In addition to this “Covy of Milk Maids” and their cows in the park, Elizabeth kept “another of Spinsters, and Sowers, to the number of six, who sat the most part of the day, after she was ready, in her privy Chamber sowing and stitching” (33). Not only the work being done, but the women doing the work appear as attempts to resignify royal space into the kind of lower-class space in which Elizabeth knows how to behave.

The names of rooms within Whitehall presents another challenge for Elizabeth, as they serve as reminders of the palace’s former inhabitants and thus of Elizabeth’s non-belonging.

Upon her first coming, when her Harbingers had appointed her Lodgings, the same with the Queens, which yet retained their Royal Names and Distinctions, she would by no means hear of them but changed them into other Appellations, that there might remain no manner of disgust and discontent to her ambitious and usurping Greatnesse; and therefore they were adapted now into the like significations, by the name of the Protectors and Protectresses Lodgings, as more proper and fitter terms to their propriety, and indisputed possession. (27)

Trying to take “indisputed possession” of their lodgings by changing the names that attach them to the former king and queen recalls the Cromwells’ practice of waiting to display plundered goods until they appear “underivable and clear from all former title and

claim” (18). “Royal Names and Distinctions” are not so easily overwritten, however, and the palace in *Court & Kitchin* is like a palimpsest, a multilayered record that retains traces of its past in spite of Elizabeth’s attempts at revision. While the renovations discussed in the previous paragraphs appear intended to aid Elizabeth’s memory, easing her housework or making the rooms more recognizable from her past experiences, changing the names of her lodgings indicates a distinct desire to forget.

In *Court & Kitchin*, the palace actively resists being forgotten, becoming nearly uninhabitable for the Cromwells in the process. Whitehall’s protective spirits set to work from the start, with “The *Penates* and *Genii* of the place abhominating this prophane and sacrilegious Intrusion, neither giving him one hours quiet or rest in it, from his troubled, mistrustfull, ill boding thoughts, nor her any Content and Satisfaction” (24). Both Oliver and Elizabeth appear deeply troubled by the psychological effects of their new home. The longer explanation that follows from here focuses especially on Elizabeth’s experience of strange domestic spaces:

Her Highnesseship, not being yet accustomed to that roomy and august Dwelling, and perhaps afraid of the vastnesse and silentnesse therof, which presented to her thoughts the Desolation her husband had caused, and the dreadful apparitions of those Princes, whose incensed Ghosts wandred up and down, and did attend some avenging opportunity; and thus was the more believable, because she (not to name her Husbands mis-giving Suspicions and Frights) could never endure any Whispering, or to be alone by herself in any of the Chambers. (26-27)

These big, empty, quiet rooms in which Elizabeth finds herself are evocative, but she would rather not confront what it is that they evoke. In light of this passage, her projects of butter-churning and cheese-making can be re-read as attempts to occupy her thoughts with work. The summoning of a chattering “covy of Milkmaids” serves to fill the

unbearable silence. And the partitioning of rooms and the creation of labyrinths and new staircases perhaps confuses the ghosts wandering the palace, rendering the space unfamiliar to them so that they cannot find her. Writing about stories of battlefield ghosts from the civil wars, Diane Purkiss explains, “Ghosts signify the dead who have been denied, ignored, slighted. The ghost comes to avenge a wrong, to point out a miscarriage of justice, to make demands for itself” (32). The ghosts of Whitehall reveal the link between battlefield and household, reminding Oliver and Elizabeth of the bloodshed that brought them to the palace. As “dreadful apparitions” of vengeful princes and more abstractly as thoughts of “Desolation,” they prevent the Cromwells from enjoying the domestic comforts of their new home and render it harrowing instead.

The depiction of Oliver Cromwell as haunted appears to fulfill a common fantasy across popular print toward the end of the 1650s. After his death, numerous short publications appear presenting dialogues between the ghosts of Cromwell and Charles I wherein Cromwell confesses to have been deeply troubled by his past actions. A *Dialogue Betwixt the Ghosts of Charls I, Late King of England: and Oliver, the Late Usurping Protector* from June 1659 begins with Charles’s demand: “*Tell me who thou art that thus presumes to disturb the Ashes of one that been at rest these ten years,*” to which Cromwell replies, “It is he that sent thee to that Rest, who now would fain be at rest himself but cannot.” In the years since the regicide, it appears, Charles’s spirit has found peace, while Cromwell’s has been disturbed in life and death.<sup>27</sup> In his paranoia, he

---

<sup>27</sup> In multiple examples of the ghostly dialogue genre, the initial afterlife encounter between Charles and Oliver follows this pattern, playing upon the word “rest.” For example, *A New Conference Between the Ghosts of King Charles and Oliver Cromwell* (June 1659) begins:

King: *How now! Who’s this that disturbeth my dust, at Rest now some years?*

tells Charles, his palace became his prison. Even without the threat of earthly foes, “my thoughts had been enough, for it I lookt one way me thought I [saw] you without a Head bleeding afresh, as if there had been a Deluge, to drown me and all my Crew in blood” (8). This ghostly dialogue, printed very close to when *Court & Kitchin* was likely being written, fills in the picture of what that text calls his “suspicious Misgivings and Frights” in the passage above. Uniquely, *Court & Kitchin* claims to provide insight into the distress suffered by Elizabeth Cromwell as well as Oliver as a result of the mental burden of “the Desolation her husband had caused.”

### **“To Bake a Pig”: Justice is Served**

*Court & Kitchin*’s representation of the haunting of Elizabeth Cromwell sets out to satisfy its imagined readers’ desires to see her and her husband answer for their crimes. The spirits wandering the halls of the palace join the textually-constructed audience of *Court & Kitchin* in demanding the “satisfaction” promised by the work’s full title. Early in the book we are reminded that the “monstrous enormities and unparalleled insolence of these upstarts” merits “peculiar Justice.” And yet, at the time of writing, “they wanton in the abundance of their spoyle and rapine, afflicted with nothing else but the torments of ambitious designs,” the nature of the latter revealed as the suspicions, frights, and apparitions discussed in the preceding section. *Court & Kitchin* promises to administer “peculiar Justice” through printed satire and with “the most biting sharpest ink” to “cure” the nation of a lingering affliction, what it calls “*Protectorian Evil*.” This diagnosis plays on the alternative name given to the skin condition known as scrofula, called the King’s

---

*Oliver*: I am one that gave thee no Rest when we lived together upon the Earth.

*King*: What? Is it Oliver Cromwel, that grand Enemy of mine?

*Ol.*: The same.

Evil because it was believed to be curable by the royal touch. All of the Stuart kings participated in this ritual, but nevertheless *Queens Closet Opened* offers a home remedy for the disease, which manifested in swellings and open sores on the neck caused by an infection of the lymph nodes. Though *Court & Kitchin* includes no such recipe, nor any medicinal recipes, the application of the whole book is meant to cure the suffering body of loyal, royalist subjects in the absence of the monarch's healing hands.

Complementing the offer of a homespun remedy to his ailing audience, the author of this politically-charged recipe book ultimately stages the execution of justice in a collectively imagined royalist kitchen. This is the public space within which the Cromwells can receive the spectacular punishment they deserve. The suitability of a cookbook for the author's retaliatory purpose is explained in *Court & Kitchin*'s opening preface: "It is well for her if his [Oliver's] *Butchery* (then which the Sun never saw a more flagitious, execrable fact, and so comprehensive that it reached *Caligula*'s wish) can be slighted into her *Cookery*; and that there were no other *Monument* of it then in *Paste*." Furthermore, she should be pleased if only it were "That the records of his Crimes were only damn'd to an *Oven*." The most prominent figure regularly depicted as a victim of Cromwell's butchery was Charles I, and royalist elegiac and satirical responses to the regicide routinely emphasized the centrality of violence to Cromwell's political power. Certainly Charles's death is part of the reckoning Cromwell faces from *Court & Kitchin*, but he is made to answer additionally for the deaths of all "those loyal persons martyred by him." This number would include any man or woman whose death can be attributed directly or indirectly to Cromwell during the course of the civil wars. Military

historian Charles Carlton notes that the second and third civil wars “were fought with a much greater degree of ferocity. Unlike those of the first civil war, the pamphlets which describe the battles of the second and third invariably included the word ‘bloody’ in their title” (Carlton 310-11). Cromwell often appears in these gore-soaked accounts as merciless, barbarous, and bloodthirsty. To “slight” Oliver’s “Butchery” into his wife’s “Cookery” is to transform memories of the horrors of war into something that seems more comprehensible. While Margaret Cavendish vows to build monuments out of “Truth” since commemoration of her family’s losses in marble have proven vulnerable and insufficiently long-lasting, the author of *Court & Kitchin* offers monuments made of pastry for those who might wish they could trade marble effigies and tomb markers for a more temporary substance. In relation to this statement from the preface, the recipes printed in *Court & Kitchin* provide readers a way to remember the blood shed by Elizabeth’s hand in the kitchen as a substitute for that shed by Oliver in battle. The book argues that the Cromwells are lucky to receive the “domesticated” treatment it gives them. Had Cromwell usurped the throne in what the author refers to “the southerne parts of the world,” the people would not be content to consume one of his wife’s dishes, neither in print nor at table; they would need to eat the Cromwells themselves: “their nimble and vindictive rage, upon the *Turn*, would have *limb’d* and *minc’d* her Family to *Atomes*, and have been their own *Cooks* and *Carvers*.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> The wish for Cromwell to have met a more violent end appears in several of the ghostly dialogue pamphlets as well, expressed by the ghost of Charles I who assumes that such a tyrant as Cromwell could only have been murdered or executed. In *A Dialogue Betwixt the Ghosts of Charls the I, Late King of England: and Olivier, the Late Usurping Protector*, a credulous Charles asks, “Did the people call thee to an account, and put thee to death by the hand of Justice, or did some free born subject of England stab thee

The wished for transformation of “Butchery” into “Cookery” illuminates how memories of civil war violence are inscribed on the page of *Court & Kitchin* through a process of domestication. Michael McKeon has defined “domestication” in its figurative usage as “‘to naturalize’ or ‘to familiarize’ the great, the distant, the worldly, the strange, or the foreign by ‘bringing it home’—through the medium of the little, the proximate, the local, the familiar, or the native” (326). I would argue that more than “bringing home” the violence of the civil wars, the domestication performed by *Court & Kitchin* serves to underscore just how “close to home” it always was. Accounts of the civil wars, both personal and public, testify to their impact on family life and everyday household order. Already in *Court & Kitchin* we have seen Elizabeth Cromwell gorge herself on aristocratic estates and furnish her table with plundered goods; the “Grand Plunderer” in housewife’s garb is an apt caricature of the wars’ tremendous capacity for domestic disruption. If Elizabeth Cromwell and her husband made the royalist household a site of battle, as they are shown to have done in this work, what could be more fitting than to take on the “she-Usurper” in her own stolen kitchen? In her work on domesticity and collective identity, Wendy Wall has shown how “domesticity emerges as *fantasy*” in early modern England, using “fantasy” in order “to suggest domesticity’s ability to provide the ‘psychic glue’ binding people into a community” (6). In the fantasy that binds the audience of *Court & Kitchin*, the revelation of Elizabeth’s recipes and with them her supposed crimes against noble housewifery stands in for a much graver accounting, the casualties of Oliver Cromwell’s political and military ascent.

---

*or take away thy life some other way; for surely such a Rebel, Traitor, and Tyrant could never dye in peace, without an open punishment for such offences as thou hast committed*” (7).

Even the recipes that seem unremarkable (most of them) have work to do in service of domesticating the Cromwells. It is important to remember that the early modern kitchen, and its textual representation in cookbooks and advice literature, gave housewives a power over life and death. Housewives frequently had blood on their hands, turning the heart of the home into “a slaughterhouse reeking of blood and strewn liberally with animals waiting to be killed, plucked, and dressed.” As Wendy Wall sums it up, “carnage was a household commonplace of the time” (192). In *Court & Kitchin*, recipes such as the one for “A Cordial strengthening Broth” reveal how cookery afforded the opportunity to express aggressively violent impulses. The instructions begin: “Take a red Cock, strip off the feathers with the skin, take a rolling-pin and bruise his bones to shivers” (113). As this broth constituted “the ordinary morning draughts...of the Protectress and her Master,” the pulverizing of fowl must have been a frequent practice in the kitchens at Whitehall.

While the phrase “bruise his bones to shivers” is delightfully shiver-inducing itself, this is, ultimately, a pretty basic recipe for chicken broth. Taken out of context and reframed, however, perhaps by something like a politicized satirical household guide, regular domestic tasks “might be estranged temporarily... so that their affinities with conventionally defined violence were made apparent” (Wall 198). The author of *Court & Kitchin* relies on this estrangement most alarmingly in recipe titled “To Bake a Pig.” More than any other in the collection, this recipe is explicit in its translocation of the battlefield to the kitchen. The recipe reads:

This is an experiment practiced by her at *Huntingdon* Brewhouse, and is a singular and the only way of dressing a Pig. Take a good quantity of clay, such as

they stop barrels bungs with, and having moulded it, stick your Pig, and bleed him well, and when he is warm, arm him like a Curassier, or one of *Cromwels Iron-sides*, hair, skin, and all (his intrals drawn and belly sowed up again) with this prepared clay, thick everywhere, then throw him below the stoak-hole under the Furnace, and there let him soak, turn him now and then, when the clay is hardned, for twelve hours, he is then sufficiently baked; then take him and break off the clay, which easily parts, and you will have a fine crispy coat and all the juice of the Pig in your dish; remember but to put a few leaves of sage, and a little salt in the belly of it, and you need no other sauce. The like you may do with any fowle whatsoever, for the clay will fetch off and consume the feathers. (129)

This recipe would be as unremarkable as the variation that follows it were it not for the extraordinary authorial comment clarifying how to coat the pig with clay. Comments added to other recipes disparage the quality of Elizabeth's cookery and her generally vulgar practices, and the sourcing of this recipe to Elizabeth's time in the "brewhouse" participates in that kind of class satire.<sup>29</sup> However, this is the only recipe with authorial comment that imagines a fantastical transformation. The kitchen is always a site for transformation of a more mundane sort, the raw into the cooked, but this recipe employs that literal power figuratively to provide readers a means of retaliation and consolation. There is nothing particularly "witchy" in the ingredients listed here, but a recipe that exchanges a soldier's body for a pig's would likely evoke Circean magic for *Court & Kitchin*'s readers steeped in classical literature. The reading and imaginary preparation of this recipe invites the audience to practice that magic and summon their courage for a culinary return to battle against Cromwell's forces. This is a recipe for coping with unresolved anger, grief, or traumatic memory. Though the author of *Court & Kitchin*

---

<sup>29</sup> Satirical representations of Oliver Cromwell regularly make reference to a former profession as brewer, sometimes supplementing the class-based critique with a play on figurative uses of "brewing," as in this example from John Crouch's *A Tragi-Comedy called New Market Fayre* (June 1649): "Now is the malice of that bloody Brewer Cromwell yet half satisfyed with the last *Gyle of Blood Royall*, drawn off from the Father, but is now a Brewing more mischief towards his Royall Sonne King CHARLES the Second, who (in spight of all the Brewers and Bakers, Coblers, Pedlers, and Tinkers in the Parlament and Army) is rightfull King of *Great Brittayn, France, and Ireland.*" (qtd. in Knoppers *Constructing Cromwell* 27).

relegates cannibalistic revenge to “the southerne parts of the world,” this recipe is animated by the pleasure of killing and eating one’s enemy in porcine effigy. The casual nature of the instruction to “arm him like a Curassier, or one of *Cromwels Iron-sides*,” as if there were nothing strange about this comparison, makes it all the more chilling. Martial violence flits in and out of the recipe collection as if it were the stuff of everyday cookery.

Written in 1659 but published in 1664, *Court & Kitchin* accumulates additional, unforeseeable resonances for its eventual post-Restoration print audience. Readers in 1664 would have memories of witnessing or reading about displays of “nimble and vindictive rage” performed against Cromwell and his family following the restoration of Charles II, some of which duplicate in their own way facets of the fate foretold from “southerne parts of the world”. Attacks on Cromwell that took place as part of celebrations of the return of the Stuart monarchy in May 1660 included the burning of effigies, with or without a preceding trial. *Mercurius Publicus* reports a mock trial and punishment that took place at Sherborne as part of a ceremony for proclaiming the restoration of the king. Effigies of John Bradshaw and Oliver Cromwell, “artificially prepared and brought thither by a guard of Soldiers” were charged with high treason and the murder of the king and commanded “to hold up their bloody hands, which for the purpose were besmeared with blood” (330). They were sentenced “to be dragged to the place of Execution, to be there hanged upon two gibbets of forty foot high, on both sides the States Arms” (330). During the dragging, the effigies “had many a blow with fists, swords, halberts, and pikes, which were aimed at the execrable malefactors,” and in fact

the violence inflicted upon them nearly erases the need for the final planned punishment on the bonfire: “as they hung upon the Gibbets, they were so hacked and hewed, so gored and shot threw, that in a short time but little remained, besides *Cromwels Buff Coat* and *Bloody Scarf*, that was worth the burning” (330). This treatment recalls *Court & Kitchin*’s idea that cannibals elsewhere in the world would have “limb’d and minc’d [the Cromwells] to Atomes” before cooking and consuming them. The people of Sherborne, too, must cook Cromwell, as the report in *Mercurius Publicus* continues, “would not the people be satisfied till they had made a fire between the Gibbets and burnt all they could get of their Garbage or Garments” (330). So many bonfires are lit in Sherborne that night, according to the account, that they “no doubt made the inhabitants of the World in the Moon, if there be any there, think there was an apparition of some Blazing-star” (330). Elizabeth Cromwell could be included in these symbolic punishments, as seen, for example, in Thomas Rugge’s diary account of the celebrations accompanying Charles’s entry into London. The festivities concluded “with bonfiers; in Westminster a very great fierie made, and on the top of the fier they put old Oliver Cromwell and his wife in sables, theire pictures lifely made like them in life, which was burnt in the fire, and State arms” (qtd. in LLK *Constructing Cromwell* 173). Such rituals of material vengeance manufacture the Cromwells for the purpose of consumption through public spectacle.

Though beginning in attacks on Oliver Cromwell’s representation, these public punishments culminate in an attack on his actual body as a powerful object of memory. On January 30, 1661, the 12th anniversary of the regicide, the bodies of Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton, and John Bradshaw were disinterred from their graves in Westminster

Abbey, dragged to Tyburn on hurdles, and hanged in their shrouds before an enormous crowd. They remained until sunset, when the bodies were taken down, decapitated, and buried under Tyburn. The heads were impaled on spikes atop Westminster Hall beside those of recently executed regicides. A witness to the event, Charles's Secretary of State Edward Nicholas describes how the punishment of "three of those horrid Murderers, viz Cromwell, Ireton & Bradshaw" provided "a signal spectacle of Justice" that "drew many thousands of people out of y<sup>e</sup> city to behold it" (Sec. Nicholas to the Earl of Orrery). Samuel Sainthill, a Spanish merchant, remembers the mutilation of the bodies in his account: "Cromwell had eight cuts, Ireton four, being seare cloths, and their heads we set up on the South-end of Westminster Hall." Furthermore, he adds that "of [Bradshaw's] toes, I had five or six in my hand, which the prentices had cut off" (qtd. in Knoppers *Constructing Cromwell* 185). This account wavers from the serious, judicial ritual to verge on the perverse and darkly comic; detached from the body, Bradshaw's toes take on new meaning as profane relics. They could even, were they to pass from Samuel Sainthill's hands to those of a properly knowledgeable housewife, be repurposed as ingredients for a medicinal brew. "A little transitory mirth," in the words of *Court & Kitchin*, "for twenty years duration of sorrow." A similar black humor informs popular works that exhume Cromwell in print following the exhumation of his body. A number of these works draw on the vocabulary of cookery and domesticity to represent Cromwell's fate. The ballad *The last Farewell of three bould Traytors* (1661) imagines the trio of headless corpses providing a feast for the Devil:

*Cromwel, Bradshaw, and Ireton, farewell,  
with a fa, &c*

A mess under *Tiburn* for the Devil of hell  
with a fa, &c  
From *Tyburn* they e're bid adieu,  
And there is an end of a stincking crew,  
I wish all may to their king prove true,  
with a fa la la la la lero.

Elsewhere in print, Cromwell is imagined not as a dish on the devil's table, but as the one who tends to it and invites his fellow traitors to pull up a chair. *The Case is Altered* (1660) concludes with Oliver's ghost crafting an epitaph for his newly reburied corpse:

*Now I old Oliver have got such fame,  
That Rolls of Infamy records my name,  
I do desire both with heart and tongue  
Beseeching that you would not stay too long,  
And do desire you all your friends to tell,  
Old Olivers become house-keeper in Hell.* (16)

As *Court & Kitchin* puts Elizabeth to work in a collectively-imagined royalist kitchen to "do Drudgery to the Publique" in punishment for her crimes, so does *The Case is Altered* proclaim her husband's newly acquired domestic role in hell. Unlike Whitehall, this is a house he deserves to keep.

Sharon Achinstein argues that the exhumation and posthumous "execution" of Cromwell, Ireton, and Bradshaw "registers the violence of the backlash" that accompanied the Restoration and that "this was not merely political revenge; it was an assault on cultural memory" (45). In a later chapter I will discuss in more detail the nature of this assault from the perspective of those who found themselves on the wrong side of the Restoration, but for now I want to acknowledge how the same act could be an affirmation of cultural memory for those who had always maintained a collective view of Cromwell as a murdering usurper, deserving of a more ignominious, violent end than his

natural death afforded. *Court & Kitchin* preserves that memory in the time of its writing and adds to the printed record of it after the Restoration, the “*Rolls of Infamy*” Cromwell’s ghost crows about in the passage above from *The Case is Altered*. There are no “infamous rolls” in *Court & Kitchin*, but an abundance of infamous roasts, puddings, sauces, and pies that inscribe Elizabeth alongside her husband as firmly responsible for all of the devastation of the 1640s and 1650s. In its own way, this book shares in Margaret Cavendish’s attempt to sustain a royalist community through the upheaval and uncertainty of the wars and their aftermath. The extensive prefatory narrative in *Court & Kitchin* builds an audience around readers’ shared memories of figures, events, spaces, and texts, so that they understand how to read the Cromwells through the recipes that follow. By reconstructing the household, and particularly the kitchen, as the site for the Cromwells’ villainy and just punishment, this commonplace-cookery book provide the means for those readers to look back at painful years and laugh, to remember “even these things” with pleasure.

## **Chapter Three: “What is necessary to be remembered”: Lucy Hutchinson and the Politics of Restoration Memory**

In the writing of what would come to be known as the *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, Lucy Hutchinson presents herself as engaged in a contest over the past, disputing the course of events—what actually happened—as well as making a claim for how what happened ought to be interpreted.<sup>30</sup> Critically aware of having lived through a period of tremendous upheaval, when the world “turned upside down” and then reversed itself again, Hutchinson writes with a determined sense that some things which are necessary to be remembered have either been distorted or forgotten in the aftermath. This chapter explores how Hutchinson chooses what is necessary for her and her readers to remember and how she defines their remembering as an oppositional tactic.

In his article “Memento Mori: Death, Widowhood, and Remembering in Early Modern England” J.S.W. Helt argues that early modern widows served as sites of memory in two distinct and significant ways. Widows are remembered, named in their husbands’ last words or in wills as guardians or inheritors of property and wealth. Alternatively, widows remember, actively participating in the construction, preservation, and transmission of their husbands’ social identities and their own. Lucy Hutchinson became a widow in 1664, when her husband John, a political prisoner of the Restoration government, died in his cell at Sandown Castle. As the writer of her husband’s life story, known today as *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, Lucy Hutchinson is clearly a

---

<sup>30</sup> When I am referring to the author and narrator of the *Memoirs* I call her by her full name or surname. When I am referring to the character within the narrative, in other words to Hutchinson’s recollection of herself, I call her “Mrs. Hutchinson,” using the name she most often uses for herself in the *Memoirs*.

widow who remembers. But, within the *Memoirs*, she frames her act of commemoration as a response to being remembered herself, by her dying husband. Although she is absent at her husband's death, Hutchinson receives, and is therefore able to report to her readers, her husband's final words to her: “‘Let her,’ said he, ‘as she is above other women, show herself, in this occasion, a good Christian, and above the pitch of ordinary women’” (330). “This occasion” being his own death, John is leaving his wife instructions for how to mourn. Hutchinson interprets her husband's dying words as an authorization of her entrance into the public sphere of commemoration, a space typically gendered as male. She transgresses, but does so out of compliance with her husband's deathbed wish. In this way, Hutchinson treats written memorialization as the performance of a domestic responsibility.

While other women certainly did memorialize their husbands in writing (in elegies, in epitaphs, and in longer biographical works), this activity was not traditionally considered to be widow's work. Hutchinson treats her writing as if it were. She redefines the boundaries of widow's work to accommodate the duty she feels she owes her husband. Lucinda Becker has shown how death could provide an opportunity for early modern women. She contends that death brought with it the possibility for public expression through writing not only for women who were actually facing death themselves but for those confronting the death of a loved one (Becker 181). Lucy Hutchinson writes the script for her husband's death scene in such a way that she cannot refuse the opportunity presented by his passing. Her interpretation of his final words for her allows for the blending of private grief and public mourning. Armed with her

husband's deathbed permission, she uses the role of obedient wife to become a fighter in the realm of memory. Like Margaret Cavendish, though writing out of sense of allegiance to a completely different political community, Hutchinson demands the authority to inscribe her family's story into the record of the time that is otherwise being written by her opponents.

Hutchinson resists of a correlation between consolation and forgetting that she finds operating in the most intimate, familial spaces as well as on the national stage. Hutchinson's opposition to official Restoration projects of remembering and forgetting takes the shape of an alternative narrative of the past, built on analysis and interpretation of the politics of the civil war and the years that followed. In a recent article considering a distinct early modern category of women's war writing, Joanne H. Wright proposed, "To take women's war writing seriously is to discover that women's perspectives on war may sound different and may come from a place outside the bounds of what we normally consider the sites for knowledge production, spaces that are personal, private, or domestic" (20). The "different" sound of Hutchinson's perspective, and its expression in a text commemorating her dead husband, has led her to be read purely as the "dutiful wife," a type Wright urges scholars to complicate in our engagement with women's writing from the second half of the seventeenth century. Hutchinson does cast herself in the role of loyal wife, motivated by duty and love to memorialize John, but as critics look back on the memory work she does in this text there is too often a tendency to place limits on this role that Hutchinson herself would not recognize, limits dividing the domestic and the political. Paul Salzman and Sharon Seelig have highlighted the

complexity of Hutchinson's presence in her own text—while she initially seems to play a secondary, dependent part, she in fact occupies a central role as creator of and character in the narrative of her husband's life.<sup>31</sup> Lucy Hutchinson never stops being “Mrs. Hutchinson” or “the Colonel's Wife,” even though she occasionally switches from third to first person to communicate with her audience more directly, but the remembering she does from this position is no less politically charged for the fact that it is shaped by her relationship with her husband.

The political significance of even Hutchinson's internal struggle to manage her grief is brought into sharp focus when the silence that would accompany a failure is linked to the silence prescribed by the Act of Oblivion. When Hutchinson disapproves of the drawing of “oblivion's curtain” in the preface to her text penned in the early 1660s, in which she celebrates and commemorates the life and death of an Independent, republican, regicide as a “resplendent body of light...to discover the deformities of this wicked age,” the term certainly has an explicit political charge (16). Hutchinson's usage supports Sharon Achinstein's assertion that “seemingly apolitical words, when taken into consideration along with the occasion and setting in which they were spoken, did carry explicit political content” (30). In her reference to “oblivion” Hutchinson introduces her memorial text as a gesture in opposition to the work of collective remembering and forgetting attempted in the foundational legislation of the Restoration, the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion. Hutchinson can be understood as a kind of Antigone who, in Judith Butler's formulation, tries “to grieve, to grieve openly, publicly, under conditions

---

<sup>31</sup> Paul Salzman, *Early Modern Women's Writing*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006; Sharon Cadman Seelig, *Autobiography and Gender in Early Modern Literature: Reading Women's Lives, 1600-1680*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006, 74, 82.

in which grief is explicitly prohibited by an edict, an edict that assumes the criminality of grieving.” (79) As she, like Antigone, “refuses to obey any law that refuses public recognition of her loss” Hutchinson resists social pressure to grieve privately and instead uses her grief to energize a political purpose.

### **“Oblivion’s Curtain”**

“‘Let her,’ said he, ‘as she is above other women, show herself, in this occasion, a good Christian, and above the pitch of ordinary women’” (330). John Hutchinson’s deathbed instructions to his wife are brief and he doesn’t elaborate; the meaning of his reported final wish depends on an assumed understanding of how “ordinary women” express grief. In Hutchinson’s address “To My Children,” which precedes the text of the *Memoirs*, she delineates the “ordinary” female grieving process from her own. In doing so, she associates feminine grief with excessive emotion, reinforcing a commonplace of the early modern discourse of death. In the opening sentences of her preface, Hutchinson chastises “they who dote on mortal excellencies,” who, “when, by the inevitable fate of all things frail, their adored idols are taken from them, may let loose the winds of passion to bring in a flood of sorrow whose ebbing tides carry away the dear memory of what they have lost” (16). In Hutchinson’s analysis, this tempestuous expression of emotion stems from an overvaluation of that which is transitory. Women who were enthralled by the “mortal excellencies” of husbands they regarded as “idols” are “desolate” when those husbands die because they cannot imagine anything beyond material, earthly existence (16). The “winds” and “flood” of the passage mark this as destructive grief, grief that obliterates its object before it dissipates. Hutchinson’s language here recalls the figure of

the “Whirlwind” that Cavendish uses to convey the war’s effect in her autobiography and, like Cavendish, she strives for commemorative practice that can endure the storm.

This representation of female grief conforms to what Patricia Phillippy has found in early modern texts which characterize female grief as predominately responding to the physical body of the deceased. According to Phillippy this characterization is informed by feminine work of tending to the dying and preparing the dead for burial, along with the more general idea of women’s association with the flesh (11). Hutchinson’s absence from her husband’s deathbed denies her this usual physical intimacy with the dying body. Rather than presenting this absence as a disadvantage for commemorating his death, Hutchinson will use it to disassociate her expression of grief from that of other widows.

The dramatic, messy mourning Hutchinson criticizes, understood as typical female behavior, justified arguments for the exclusion of women, as wives and widows, from active participation in their husbands’ death and burial (Phillippy 221). At the scene of death, it was claimed, the sight of such emotion could tempt a dying husband to despair and resist giving himself over to death. At the funeral and burial sites, it could be read by fellow mourners as a sign of uncertainty over the fate of a husband’s soul. Both before death and after, a grieving woman was being watched. As Helt explains, “Grief, because it was a public performance necessary to represent her husband’s death as a ‘good’ one in the collective memory, required the widow’s mourning to be a mean between overly effusive and overly constrained” (50). As one who identifies herself as “under a command not to grieve at the common rate of desolate women,” Hutchinson feels entrusted with striking that mean (16).

While Hutchinson's rejection of "ordinary" female grief draws on the belief that such behavior could injure the reputation of the deceased, she also believes that it enables, and even encourages, forgetting the deceased. The "remedy" most commonly applied to comfort this sort of mourner, according to Hutchinson, involves removing from her sight any objects which may remind her of her dead husband and thus bring on a fresh bout of grief. As a result, when the flood of tears recedes it takes with it the memory of the lost loved one, and eventually "oblivion's curtain is by degrees drawn over the dead face, and things less lovely are liked, while they are not viewed together with that which was most excellent" (16). Here Hutchinson associates forgetting with a gradual fading of fidelity, culminating in a betrayal—"things less lovely" can be understood as potential new husbands. To grieve "above" this rate, Hutchinson must remember her husband, even if it pains her. As she writes, the image, values, and actions of "that which was most excellent" will be constantly before her, and thus her writing will not only be an expression of her devotion to John, but the means to remain devoted to him. In this sense, the *Memoirs* form a continuation of a living relationship. In her brief summary of the consequences of "oblivion's curtain" being drawn, Hutchinson characterizes the complacency that comes with forgetting as a kind of injustice to the deceased, a renunciation of the lessons that the remembrance of their virtues, values, and actions may impart to the living.

Hutchinson's choice of the word "oblivion" to identify the force she opposes in the writing of her husband's life brings together the cultural processes of forgetting imposed upon conventional female mourners and those imposed upon all British subjects

by the foundational legislative act of the Restoration, the Act of Free and General Pardon, Indemnity, and Oblivion. This document, along with its precursors in Charles II's letters to the Houses of Parliament and the Declaration of Breda, speaks of the king's urgent desire to forget, and his recognition that many of his subjects share this desire. As Hutchinson identifies the process of forgetting as an intended, though in her opinion ultimately ineffective "remedy," so the Act of Oblivion and associated documents prescribe a selective forgetting of the past as a cure for the wounds inflicted by civil conflict. In her analysis of Hutchinson's *Elegies* Susan Wiseman has pointed out how Hutchinson manipulates the keywords of the Restoration, "building an oppositional poetic vocabulary from the lexicon of the Restoration" (227). When Hutchinson disparagingly refers to the drawing of "oblivion's curtain" she continues this "linguistic remaking," appropriating the foundational language ordering the Restoration world. She challenges the positive valuation of oblivion and its association with consolation and healing, made dominant in the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion.

### **Collective Memory in the Declaration of Breda and the Act of Oblivion**

The language of the Act of Oblivion displays what Katherine Hodgkin and Susannah Radstone have identified in their analyses of other conflicts over memory as "a wish to transform something into 'memory' by converting it into narrative, at a point where the story has not attained closure and the suffering is not yet a memory" (102). To transform the events of the civil wars into a memory of crimes committed against Charles I and his son has the symbolic effect of consigning them to the past, signaling that the time in which such a thing could have occurred has passed and its potential has been

spent. Acceptance of the pardon offered by this Act implies acceptance of the narrative of events. Combined with the rigid stance taken towards any future resistance or rebellion expressed in the King's speech at the passing of the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, this gesture of renaming is intended to extinguish the hopes of any who had clung to the initial ideals of the revolution throughout the years of the republic.<sup>32</sup> In the writing of the *Memoirs*, Hutchinson is not merely contesting the representation of her husband in the Act (which is, in any case, relatively minor) but its overall project of erecting a barrier between the recent past and the present, in the form of an official narrative of events.

Before turning to the Act of Oblivion, it is important to consider a slightly earlier political document that set the agenda for the later piece of legislation. The first significant textual attempt at reconciliation is made by the Declaration of Breda, dated April 4, 1660. Throughout the opening of the text, Charles II emphasizes what he shares with those he has always considered his subjects. The document frames Charles's return as an intervention in the health of his kingdom, the deterioration of which he has been observing silently from his position in exile:

If the general Distraction and Confusion which is spread over the whole Kingdom doth not awaken all Men to a Desire and Longing, that these Wounds which have so many Years together been kept bleeding, may be bound up; all We can say will be to no Purpose: However, after this long Silence, We have thought it Our Duty to declare how much We desire to contribute thereunto.”<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Charles's address to the joint houses of parliament on August 29, 1660 at the passing of the Act of Oblivion included the following threat: “But for the Time to come, the same Discretion and Conscience, which disposed Me to the Clemency I have expressed, which is most agreeable to My Nature, will oblige Me to all Rigour and Severity, how contrary soever it be to My Nature, towards those who shall not now acquiesce , but continue to manifest their Sedition and Dislike of the Govt., either in Action or Words.” from “House of Lords Journal Volume 11: 29 August 1660.” Journal of the House of Lords: volume 11: 1660-1666 (1767-1830): 146-148. British History Online. Web. 26 July 2011. <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=14039>>

<sup>33</sup> “House of Commons Journal Volume 8: 1 May 1660.” Journal of the House of Commons: volume 8: 1660-1667 (1802): 4-8. British History Online. Web. 25 July 2011. <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=14039>>

Charles acknowledges that he cannot heal the kingdom without the will of the people, but at the same time, in a move that recalls the belief in the curative power of the king's touch, the observation that the wounds have been kept bleeding all during the time the people have been without a king (in a period of "Distraction and Confusion") suggests that neither can the kingdom heal itself without him. The Declaration therefore translates a desire for wholeness, for wounds to "be bound up," into a desire for the restoration of the monarchy. The document shares this metaphorical vocabulary with the royalist recipe collections published in the 1650s that claimed royalty could and should heal the nation. Charles's offer to "contribute" to this process consists of a general pardon, so that those who may have feared retribution for their actions can welcome the restoration and accompanying peace rather than working against it. Through the magic of the pardon, all of those who come forward and publically ask for the king's mercy, indicating that they have forgotten their former enmity against the institution he embodies, will in turn have their former crimes forgotten and will "return to the Loyalty and Obedience of good Subjects." The "Wounds" will leave no scars. In this document, which sets the stage for the restoration and the Act of Oblivion, rebels are transformed into "good Subjects" through an agreement to forget their prior beliefs and actions.

Paradoxically, this agreement requires a person to come forward and have their crimes remembered so that they can be forgotten. The Declaration offers "a free and general Pardon" to "all Our Subjects...who, within Forty Days after the Publishing hereof, shall lay Hold upon this Our Grace and Favour, and shall by any Public Act

---

[history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=26177](http://history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=26177)> All of the quotation from the Declaration in the following paragraphs are taken from this source.

declare their doing so.” The Declaration also tasks parliament with identifying those whose crimes are too heinous to be included in the pardon. In order to make such a determination and to draft a document that fulfills the promises of the Declaration of Breda, the members must undertake extensive memory work, figuring out exactly who did what and when they did it. The journals of the respective houses of parliament from the months between the issuing of the Declaration and the passage of the Act of Oblivion are full of evidence of the grand remembering that had to precede the grand forgetting. This process relied on both personal testimony and public records from the war years and the Commonwealth period. For example, on May 12<sup>th</sup> 1660, a member of the Commons read “Some Votes in the Journal of the Twelfth of December 1650, concerning the trial of the late King,” along with “A Journal, intituled, A Journal of the Proceedings of the High court of Justice, erected by Act of the Commons of England, intituled, An Act of the Commons assembled in Parliament, for erecting of a High court of Justice, for the Trying and Judging of Charles Stewart, King of England.” These accounts were supplemented by the reports of “Divers Members of this House, now present, who were named Commissioners in the said Act” who “did severally express how far they were concerned in the said Proceedings.”<sup>34</sup> At least for a little while, then, the attempt to impose oblivion has the opposite effect of expanding memory and provoking debate over the recent past.

---

<sup>34</sup> "House of Commons Journal Volume 8: 12 May 1660." Journal of the House of Commons: volume 8: 1660-1667 (1802): 24-25. British History Online. Web. 25 July 2011. <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=26187>>

Lucy Hutchinson relates the events of May 12 in the *Memoirs*, as her husband was one of those members present on the day. She reports that while the House was debating how to handle those involved in the king’s trial, “at the first, divers persons concerned in that business sat there, and when the business came into question, every one of them spoke of it according to their present sense” (279). The qualifier “according to their present sense” is ambiguous—did the men speak of it according to their present ability

By the time the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion is given royal assent on August 29, 1660 the business of determining what can be legally forgotten, what must be remembered, and how it ought to be remembered has already been done; this document turns those decisions into an official narrative with the weight of the law. The final version of the Act makes enforced forgetting and the assertion of a dominant memory into complementary processes. In one sense, the rejection of actions and actors of the previous twenty years still constitutes a recollection of both. In another sense, for those whose understanding of the past differs significantly from that put forward by the Act, the acceptance of a revised version of events requires participation in a collective forgetting that creates tension with personal memory. The Act validates the legitimacy of the new order (which is to some extent offered as a return to an older order) by granting it the power to answer questions of what has occurred and what it means for the present and future. Through this document the restored Stuart monarchy claims authority to rename past events and limit the story that they can tell.

This text casts Charles II in the same role he plays in the Declaration of Breda, a reconciler eager to bring his people together in political unity through an act of forgiveness. The factors that have been weighed by Charles's "Gratiouse and Serious consideration" include "the long and great Troubles Discords and Warrs that have for many Yeares past beene in this Kingdome," and the "great paines and penaltyes" into which his subjects have fallen as a result. These have driven him to "a hearty and pious Desire to put an end to all Suites and Controversies that by occasion of the late

---

to remember it, or according to their sense of how they ought to speak of it, so as not to get them in trouble, at the present time? At any rate, Hutchinson's description draws attention to the subjectivity of memory.

Distractions have arisen and may arise betweene all His Subjects.”<sup>35</sup> There are two purposes given for the Act and its particular method of putting an end to lingering conflicts caused by the disturbance of previous years. Each one directly responds to the power of memory to prolong such conflicts to the detriment of future stability, but they approach the task of forgetting on different levels. The first “intent” to which the Act is established is “that noe Crime whatsoever committed against His Majesty or His Royall Father shall hereafter rise in Judgement or be brought in Question against any of them to the least endamagement of them either in their Lives Libertyes Estates or to the prejudice of their Reputations by any Reproach or Terme of Distinction.” The second purpose expressed is “to bury all Seeds of future Discords and remembrance of the former as well in His [Charles’s] owne Breast as in the Breasts of His Subjects one towards another.” Taken together, these two objectives epitomize an attempt to bridge the social and individual. The first proposes an act of forgetting in the public and legal spheres: the law will not remember any crime committed against Charles Stuart, the father or the son, should such an action be brought before it; nor will such actions be remembered in social discourse “by any Reproach or Terme of Distinction.” The second objective moves inward to the realm of personal memory and what resides in the “breasts” of Charles II and his subjects. Here the “remembrance” of former discord is associated with “Seeds” of future troubles, a causal relationship the Act sets out to sever. Typically we might think of burying seeds so that they can grow; in figurative terms, memory would provide the

---

<sup>35</sup> John Raithby (editor). "Charles II, 1660: An Act of Free and Generall Pardon Indempnity and Oblivion.." Statutes of the Realm: volume 5: 1628-80 (1819): 226-234. British History Online. Web. 25 July 2011. <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=47259>> All quotations from the Act of Oblivion in the following paragraphs are taken from this source.

source from which future identifications and relationships might develop and flourish. In the opening of the Act, however, to bury is to put into oblivion, to suppress and silence the past and a possible version of the future along with it. In these two objectives, the Act offers both public and private forgetting as the means to reconciliation. Sharon Achinstein identifies “the destruction of civil war residue” as a prominent “mode” of the Stuart search for political legitimacy (23). The Act destroys, but with the expressed intent of reconciliation. The destruction of civil war residue recalls the image from the opening of Hutchinson’s *Memoirs* of the removal of the physical objects that remind a widow of the husband she had lost. In both instances, erasure is intended to prevent additional pain.

Understanding how the Act of Oblivion works as a memory text requires attention to the acts of naming and renaming and their corresponding silences throughout the document. The Act displays an awareness of language’s power to evoke memory, and attempts to restrict how that power might be used. In the opening section of the Act, identified as “The Causes and Ends of this Pardon and Indemnity,” its authors refer with care to the circumstances which the Act is intended to ameliorate. The pardon covers the years 1637-1660, a tumultuous time, and the terms used to describe this period reveal sympathies, alliances, antagonisms, and, ultimately, intentions, as the Act’s authors know. First, a list: “the great Troubles Discords and Warrs” that have been in the kingdom for many years past. This list begins in the abstract but becomes more concrete by its final item; the period began with troubles and discord that led to, but were not fully resolved by, open civil war. A few lines later, these same circumstances are referred to as the “late Distractions” that have surfaced “betweene all His Subjects.” All of these

general terms downplay agency and the particular events of those years are held at a neutral distance—*all* of the subjects have “fallen” into pains and penalties as a result of the “Troubles Discords and Warrs” and *all* of the subjects have been divided from one another by dissension. At the same time, referring to attempts at complete political and ecclesiological reform as “Troubles” and “Discords” goes some distance to downplay the significance of these initial aims of the revolution.

A less innocuous, more pointed blurring occurs in the language of the general pardon itself. Balancing naming and refusing to name, the Act attempts to establish an official language of memory. This reduces a political and religious revolution to a series of criminal offenses, able to be encompassed in a single provision as “all and all manner of Treasons, Misprisions of Treason, Murthers Felonies Offences Crimes Contempts and Misdemeanors Counceld Commanded Acted or done since the first day of January in the yeare of our Lord One thousand six hundred thirty seaven by any person or persons before the [twenty fourth] day of June in the yeare of our Lord One thousand six hundred and sixty.” Before these actions can be “Pardonet Released Indempnified Discharged and put in utter Oblivion,” before they can be legally forgotten, they must be remembered anew and renamed as crimes. By the terms of the Act, that which may have been understood as a calling from God, “to the carrying on of the interest of truth, righteousness and holiness, and to the defense of [the] country,” as John Hutchinson understood his commission as governor of Nottingham castle, becomes just one of “all manner of treasons” (137). This naming clarifies how such things are to be understood from then on, obscuring whatever significance they may have had, or may still have, for

those who committed them. In his work on collective memory Paul Connerton identifies the practice of recollection at the core of all dramatic shifts in regime. He finds that “to pass judgment on the practices of the old regime is the constitutive act of the new order” (7). In the general pardon, Charles II judges the practices of the revolutionary regime from the position of one who suffered from them. Even as it makes a show of reconciliation, then, the Act asserts the authority of the restored monarchy, its right to give an ultimate decision on the past.

In addition to judging certain acts as crimes, the Act judges certain individuals as criminals. The general pardon granted by the Act extends to everyone as if they had been named individually, as “the same Pardon Indemnity and Oblivion should have beene if all Offences Contempts Forfeitures Causes Matters Suites Quarrels Judgements Executions Penaltyes and all other things not hereafter in this present Act Excepted and Foreprized had beene perticularly singularly especially and plainly named rehearsed and specified.” Only those who are excluded from the pardon find their names inscribed in the document. This is obviously a practical move, as it would be impossible to individually name everyone who acted against the monarchy during the roughly twenty year period covered by the Act. More symbolically, the refusal to name supports the general spirit of casting past crimes into oblivion. Those included in the pardon, and unnamed in the Act, keep their lives, their freedom, their possessions, but at the same time, they find their past actions written over by a new regime.

The people excluded from the pardon, those who are named in the Act, share this experience of having the meaning of their past actions determined by their past foes. John

Hutchinson belongs to this group, along with the other regicides and leaders of the parliamentary army and commonwealth government, even those who have died by the time the Act is passed.<sup>36</sup> These men are not permitted to pass into oblivion, but must be remembered for their “execrable Treason.”

The Act also includes a section that specifically prohibits the use of divisive language “to the intent and purpose that all names and termes of distinction may [likewise be] putt into utter Oblivion.” This part of the Act establishes a fine for anyone who, “within the space of three yeares next ensuing” “shall presume malitiously to call or alledge of, or object against any other person or persons any name or names, or other words of reproach any way tending to revive the memory of the late Differences or the occasions thereof.” Nigel Smith points out that such an attempt to regulate language “did not work, not least because it was rarely enforced” but nevertheless its inclusion in this foundational legislation reflects unease over the finality of the recent restoration (1).<sup>37</sup> Words can revive memory and by extension memory can resurrect prior causes and conflicts. The Act does not ban terms connected to the “late Differences” for all time, but only for three years. This would suggest that the power of such terms to summon divisive memories is temporally limited; after three years the memories associated with such words will have lost their power to sting, or the Restoration regime will have established itself enough to handle the revival of any past uprising. In this section of the Act, as in the

---

<sup>36</sup> John Hutchinson is named in Article XL of the Act: “Certain persons made incapable of any offices,” which reads: “Provided always that John Hutchinson Esquire...shall be and [is] hereby made for ever incapable to execute any Place or Office of Trust Civill or Military within this Kingdome.”

<sup>37</sup> Smith opens his book with a reflection on the fears reflected in this provision of the Act of Oblivion, and then turns back to the previous twenty years to show the significant impact of the printed word on public affairs during this period. See *Literature & Revolution in England, 1640-1660*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

opening language of Charles II and his subjects burying remembrance within their breasts, we see how its project of reconciliation depends upon the illusion that individual and official state memory will align. This document of remembering and forgetting imagines individual minds discarding and reinterpreting their stored contents in accord with a unified narrative of the past being constructed and solidified in social exchanges and social spaces all around them.

### **“Treacherous Memory”**

By writing a narrative of her husband’s life Hutchinson directly opposes the force of oblivion, but it is not a painless process. Throughout the *Memoirs*, she comes up against the difficulties and dangers of memory work—the possibility that her memory may betray her, the burden of establishing a claim to truth and credibility among competing narratives. Additionally, the project she sets for herself entails calling up powerful emotions, powerful enough perhaps to throw her off track and into a consuming grief. Her experience remembering her husband attests to Elizabeth Hallam and Jenny Hockey’s description of memory as “crucially double edged, facilitating both the sensation of recover of whoever has been lost to the past but, simultaneously restimulating the painful feelings evoked by the loss” (102). Furthermore, “memories do not simply call pain to mind along with lost presence; rather, they stimulate grief in the present for that which remains ‘lost’ to the past” (102). Hutchinson presents herself negotiating a balance between drawing on feelings to help her remember and being taken over by feelings generated through the act of remembrance.<sup>38</sup> The difficulty of finding

---

<sup>38</sup> Hutchinson’s *Memoirs* include both past emotions remembered at the time of writing, and emotions generated in the act of remembering and writing. In their chapter “Layers of memories: Twenty years after

this balance continues to trouble Hutchinson after the writing of the *Memoirs*, as explored in the next chapter. Since I am focusing here on the link between emotion and memory in the *Memoirs* I would like briefly to address the relationship between this text and Hutchinson's *Elegies*.<sup>39</sup> Scholars often pair these works since they are produced during the same years, following the Restoration and John Hutchinson's death, and respond to the losses of that time in prose and poetry respectively. The *Memoirs* is read as the more public, political text, and the *Elegies* as more personal and private. There is a tendency to interpret the *Elegies* as Hutchinson's expression of all of the grief, pain, fear, and uncertainty which she must suppress in writing the *Memoirs*. For example, Kate Chedgzoy explains the relationship this way: "The political and public orientation of the *Life* means that such issues are to some extent sublimated in its composition, but the *Elegies* wrestle constantly with the pains of loss, the longing for consolation, and the sheer difficulty of finding a mode of consolation adequate to assuaging such grief" (162). But the "costs of fidelity to John's difficult deathbed injunction" are apparent in the *Memoirs* too, if not as plainly. This typical treatment of the pair of texts comes close to repeating Christopher Hill's justification for excluding Hutchinson's life of her husband

---

in Argentina" Elizabeth Jelin and Susana G. Kaufman characterize these processes as two layers of the "labours of memory" they found in interviews they conducted with people who lived through a period of extreme political violence. These are displayed "as narratives of facts and remembrances; as feelings that are remembered now, and as feelings generated in the act of remembrance during the interview...; as ways in which memory is conveyed intergenerationally: who tells, who listens, who keeps silent; as thoughts and reflections about what one has experienced, considering the moment in the life course when this happened, and one's current thoughts about that past; as reflections about one's place in the world, about one's own social responsibility" (105).

<sup>39</sup> For in-depth readings and discussion of the *Elegies* see: Sharon Achinstein *Literature and Dissent*, 69-73; Kate Chedgzoy. *Women's Writing in the British Atlantic World: Memory, Place and History, 1550-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 153-164; David Norbrook. "Lucy Hutchinson's 'Elegies' and the Situation of the Republican Woman Writer." *English Literary Renaissance*. 27 (1997), 468-521; Susan Wiseman. *Conspiracy and Virtue: Women, Writing and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. 209-233.

from his work *The Experience of Defeat*. Hill writes that Hutchinson should have been a candidate for inclusion, but “she is far too concerned to cover up the Colonel’s weaknesses to allow her own views to come through” (21). I disagree with the view that the *Elegies* provide access to a more “authentic” response to Hutchinson’s experience of defeat, merely because she writes them in the first person. Both the *Elegies* and the *Memoirs* are highly constructed, mediated pieces of memory work and thus we should not take their differences to suggest the truth of one and the fiction of the other. The pain and difficulty of memorialization haunts the beginning and ending of the *Memoirs*, and breaks through the narrative when Hutchinson draws on recalled emotion in order to connect with particular memories.

In writing the *Memoirs*, Hutchinson’s challenge is to constantly confront the memories of her husband which evoke grief, pain, fear, and loss without allowing these emotions to capsize her project. Her stated attempt at writing in order “to moderate [her] woe” captures this delicate balance. The connection she draws between memory and emotion reminds readers of one way in which Hutchinson’s memory, her primary source of information, may be “treacherous,” as she characterizes it in the preface (18). Hutchinson comes face to face with this treachery in a digression on how the nickname “roundhead” came to be applied to members of the parliamentary faction. The digression follows from Hutchinson’s recollection of an incident that occurred shortly before the raising of the royal standard in Nottingham in August 1642, in which her husband gets hailed by this nickname. Hutchinson paints a picture of domestic harmony interrupted, when John is called away from his dinner to stop the king’s soldiers from raiding the

county's ammunition store. As John passes by a group of soldiers, one of them remarks that "he hoped the day would shortly come when all such roundheads would be fair marks for them" (86). While Hutchinson allows herself a momentary departure from her narrative in order to provide context for the term for an imagined uninformed reader, this digression leads her through a chain of memories that threaten to throw her off her narrative purpose altogether, never to return.

To begin, Hutchinson traces the term "roundhead" back to the time "when Puritanism grew into a faction," one whose members distinguished themselves through "affected habits" of dress, speech, and hairstyle (86). Since John always had a "very fine and thickset head of hair, kept...clean and handsome without any affectation," rather than worn in the "roundhead" style, not only was that name "ill applied" to him but he found himself scorned by some of the godly party "because his hair was not in their cut nor his words in their phrase" (87). Nevertheless, as she next recalls, John never abandoned this party as long as they served God, in spite of "their weaknesses, censure, ingratitude, or discouraging behavior, with which he was abundantly exercised all his life" (87). The recollection of John's poorly rewarded support finally draws Hutchinson to a new topic, the betrayal of the entire godly cause, when its supposed leaders "apostatized" from their honorable principles and practices leaving only "the carcase of religion" behind in the place of living grace. At this point Hutchinson cuts herself short: "Instead of digressing, I shall ramble into an inextricable wilderness, if I pursue this sad remembrance: to return therefore to his actions at the time" (87). In the new paragraph that immediately follows, she returns, as if with no interruption, to the raid on the ammunition stores.

What happens during this digression to necessitate such an interruption? The recollection of a time when John was named as a representative of “all such roundheads” by a soldier eager for a fight begins harmlessly enough as Hutchinson explains the cultural practice that gave rise to the divisive term. Quickly however this matter-of-fact explanation breaks down into a critique and then a sequence of recalled betrayals committed by the revolutionary party against John and against its foundational, godly cause. Hutchinson’s memory has brought her to the brink of that division between destructive and productive grief that Cavendish confronts as well in her autobiography; if she indulges in the “sad remembrance” of John’s mistreatment and the death of true religion in the revolutionary party, she falls into despair and becomes unable to finish her story. To “ramble into an inextricable wilderness” is to give up on a public project of truth-telling that depends upon coherence and completeness, the witnessing of John’s whole life from beginning to end. Hutchinson resists yielding to the flow of memory at this point, but the pull it exercises on her reveals, if only briefly, a struggle occurring behind each page of the text as Hutchinson seeks in commemoration both consolation for herself and justice for her husband.

### **“A Naked, Undressed Narrative”: Competing Histories**

Hutchinson stages the conflict between competing narratives of the past put forward by her book and by her and her husband’s personal and political enemies. This strategy demonstrates her awareness of a contest over meaning and represents her attempt to get readers to invest in her version of events. In each instance, her personal memory provides the standard by which the truth of these narratives can be evaluated. Hutchinson

takes on both high and low sources of information, written histories and lingering rumors, in her attempt to set the record straight, recognizing that both have produced what is, to her mind, a distorted view of the recent past.

This contest becomes visible over the origins of the revolution. As was the case in Cavendish's autobiography, the treatment of the wars' origins matters because it guides readers' perceptions of the wars' unfolding and resolution and of the actors involved. Hutchinson knows this as well as Cavendish, which may be why she takes the time, early on in the *Memoirs*, to depart from the details of her early married life to provide a broader view of political developments leading up to the time when "the kingdom began to blaze out with the long-conceived flame of civil war" (57). This marks the first time Hutchinson ventures beyond the "particular actions" of John's life, and thus it gives a sense of the context Hutchinson believes is necessary to properly make sense of that life. Such a large task as tracing the causes of the civil war does not exceed the capability of Hutchinson's own memory, as she states "though I cannot do exactly, yet I can truly relate what I was then able to take notice of" (57). Here truth, in the form of a particularly observant eye-witness account, takes precedence over completeness and yet Hutchinson acknowledges that some of her audience may want a more detailed picture than she can summon up. Hutchinson refers these readers to the abundance of books written on the subject at the time, placing this printed material in a complementary relationship to her manuscript text. In her assessment, these books do not offer a truer record than what Hutchinson herself can tell; their details can only confirm and elaborate upon her truth. Even those accounts written by "our enemies" when read against the grain, though they

are “all fraught with abominable lies, yet if all ours were suppressed, even their own writings, impartially considered, would be a sufficient chronicle of their injustice and oppression” (57). In this somewhat rare use of the first-person plural, Hutchinson assumes an audience with a shared allegiance to the Puritan, republican cause, an audience who has its own recollection of suffering those injustices and oppressions to which she refers here and in the following 18 pages (mainly Charles’s absolutism and persecution of the godly). Although Hutchinson’s account is no less politically motivated than those of her “enemies,” she makes a claim to the inherent and universal truth of her side. She uses this claim to justify her presentation of what she admits is a calculated narrative—in her view, her only purpose is the revelation of truth, and so she is bound to include “only what is necessary to be remembered for the better carrying on of my purpose” (57).

Hutchinson’s stated principle of including “only what is necessary to be remembered” speaks to the fact that the narrative she presents to her readers derives from a series of careful choices about what story to tell. Most often, as in the above example, Hutchinson offers her story in opposition to others that have been constructed by her enemies, whether she names these enemies individually or identifies them by the more inclusive and abstract term “they.” However, in one of the most revealing and understated examples of contested memory in the *Memoirs*, Hutchinson competes with a narrative written not by one of her and John’s enemies, but by herself. This is the letter dated June 5, 1660 that she claims to have written in her husband’s name and sent to the

Speaker of the House of Commons without John's knowledge.<sup>40</sup> At the time the Commons had issued a call for all of those who had been involved in the late king's trial to come before them and plead their case. As Hutchinson recalls, John was "ambitious of being a public sacrifice" and therefore eager to turn himself in, but she "obstinately" refused to let this happen (280, 281). In what she identifies as the lone act of wifely disobedience committed in her whole life, Hutchinson "devises" a plan to save her husband and forges a letter to the Speaker:

to try the House...and to urge what might be in [John's] favor, and let him know that by reason of some inconvenience it might be to him, he desired not to come under custody, and yet should be ready to appear at their call; and if they intended any mercy to him, he begged they would begin it in permitting him his liberty upon his parole till they should finally determine of him. (281)

This is the only description Hutchinson provides of the contents of the letter. Hutchinson cannot ignore the letter completely because it belongs to public record, but she handles it with care. Her summary of the document is not completely inaccurate—in the final lines of the actual letter John does ask to be permitted to remain at liberty until the House

---

<sup>40</sup>Hutchinson says that she wrote the letter. Perhaps she did not, or did in the role of amanuensis, and she is covering for her husband, but there is no way to know with certainty. Several scholars have stressed on what they see as Hutchinson's overwhelming guilt over the writing of this letter in her husband's name. Foremost among these is David Norbrook, who argues that Hutchinson wrote the *Memoirs* "to expiate her sense of guilt that informed her own identity as a writer: forging her husband's hand was a rebellion both of conjugal disobedience and of writing," "Margaret Cavendish and Lucy Hutchinson: Identity, Ideology, and Politics." *In-between: Essays and Studies in Literary Criticism.* 9:1-2 (2000), 192. In his work attributing the Genesis epic *Order and Disorder* to Lucy Hutchinson, he indirectly links the "intellectual error" committed when Hutchinson "forged a letter of recantation in her husband's name" to Eve's fall, which the narrator of *Order and Disorder* casts "more in intellectual than in sexual terms" (259). "Lucy Hutchinson and *Order and Disorder*: The Manuscript Evidence." *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700*. Ed. Peter Beal and Margaret J.M. Ezell. London: The British Library, 2000. 257-91. For additional arguments that accept Hutchinson's claim to have forged the letter see: N.H. Keeble "'The Colonel's Shadow': Lucy Hutchinson, Women's Writing and the Civil War." *Literature and the English Civil War*. ed. Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday. Cambridge: Cambridge UP: 1990, 255; Norbrook, "Memoirs and Oblivion: Lucy Hutchinson and the Restoration," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 75 (2012), 233-82. Derek Hirst's suggestion that Hutchinson's claim of forgery is a fabrication has recently been advanced by Giuseppina Iacono Lobo. See "Lucy Hutchinson's Revisions of Conscience," *English Literary Renaissance*, 42 (2012), 317-41.

passes their judgment on him—but Hutchinson’s almost total misrepresentation of the tone and contents of the rest of the letter provides a stunning example of selective recollection for her audience. Hutchinson effectively erases the elements of the letter that would be problematic for her memorialization of John as a loyal supporter of the Puritan cause, but nevertheless in her portrayals of John’s character at crucial moments in the *Memoirs* we can see her responding directly to the damage the letter might have done to his reputation and memory.

In the actual letter, the writer (John, or Lucy posing as John) addresses his audience from a “deepe & sorrowfull sense, which so heavily presses my soule for the unfortunate guilt that lies upon it” and a “persistent sorrow” that is “above utterance.”<sup>41</sup> This guilt and sorrow derives from John’s involvement in the trial and sentencing of Charles I, alluded to as “so horrid a crime as merit no indulgence,” but more generally his support of the parliamentary side and later his role in the commonwealth government. John makes a pathetic plea for mercy on the grounds that he was “horridly misled” in his opposition to the king, calling on the personal memory of his letter’s readers to absolve him:

They who yet remember the seeming sanctity and subtile arts of those men, who seduced not only me, but thousands more in those unhappy days, cannot if they have any Christian compassion, but joyne with me in bewailing my wretched misfortune, to have fallen into their pernicious snares, when neither my owne mallice, avarice, or ambition, but an ill guided judgement led me.

This image of John as a repentant man manipulated by powerful “deceivers” could not be more incompatible with the John who emerges from the pages of the *Memoirs*, though

---

<sup>41</sup> Col. John Hutchinson to the Speaker of the House of Commons 5 June 1660. *State Paper Domestic, Charles II*. All quotations from the letter in the following paragraphs are taken from this source.

Hutchinson identifies herself as the creator of both representations. The main opposition to this representation of John comes in Hutchinson's recounting of the trial of Charles I and then in John's reflections on it after his pardon, but she plants the seeds earlier in the text when she describes John's resistance to factionalism in the parliament. Because of his abhorrence of the "malicious zeal" of the Presbyterian faction he is counted by them as "one of the Independent faction" (207). Hutchinson calls this a mistake that could only be made by those who "very little knew him" for "he had a strength of judgment able to consider things himself and propound them to his conscience, which was so upright that the veneration of no man's person alive, nor the love of the dearest friend in the world, could not make him do the least thing without a full persuasion of conscience that it was his duty so to act" (207). This portrait of resolve opposes the pitiful letter writer, a man who would be "seduced" by "seeming sanctity and subtile arts." I highlight the gaps between the representation of John's character that appears in the letter and that which appears in the *Memoirs* is not to argue for the truthfulness of one over the other, but instead to emphasize how Hutchinson constructs the latter version of her husband in response to the former. In recounting John's participation in the trial of Charles I, for example, she goes out of her way to discredit "some of them" who "after, for excuse, belied themselves, and said they were under the awe of the army and overpersuaded by Cromwell, and the like" when in fact they were "left to their free liberty of acting, neither persuaded nor compelled" (234). It is not just "some of them" who afterwards relied on this excuse in the search for pardon, but Hutchinson herself who used it on her husband's

behalf. Since she conceals that aspect of the letter from her readers, she can maintain her indignation without any apparent contradiction.

To strengthen opposition to any story that evil counselors overwhelmed John to sign the death warrant, Hutchinson shows her readers a process of prayer and deliberation that led him to that choice. The letter writer speaks of a deeply troubled soul, an “insupportable affliction” that will follow him to his grave. The John of the *Memoirs* never appears so afflicted but instead finds “a confirmation in his conscience that it was his duty to act as he did” (235). Likewise, when the matter of the trial resurfaces after the Restoration, and many of those who had previously said it would have been treason not to sign the death warrant “were all now apostasized, and as much preached against it and called it rebellion and murder, and sat on the tribunal to judge it,” John prays for God to show him “if ignorance or misunderstanding had led him into error” (286). At this point, when John had supposedly just written a letter to the Commons expressing his guilt and repentance, Hutchinson tells us that “the more he examined the cause from the first, the more he became confirmed in it” (286). Far from provoking him to abandon the godly cause, as the letter would have it, John’s contemplation leads him to a reassertion of his beliefs “concerning the free grace and love of God in Jesus Christ, and the spiritual worship under the Gospel, and the Gospel liberty which ought not to be subjected to the wills and ordinances of men in the service of God” (286). Both the letter and the *Memoirs* speak of John having his eyes opened; in the letter they are opened to his deception, in the *Memoirs* to his righteousness.

Without the letter as a reference, Hutchinson's readers may not recognize the intertextuality of her portraits of John's character. Her modern readers might be excused for missing it because the letter is only reprinted in two of the four modern editions of the *Memoirs* both of which are out of print.<sup>42</sup> It is important to note that Hutchinson herself denies her readers this recognition by dramatically abridging the contents of the letter in her description of it. Typically when Hutchinson writes against an existing narrative of her husband, she shows her readers the distorted representation she contests. She likes to point the finger at those who, in her view, misrepresented John in his life and death. In the case of the letter, that person seems to have been herself.<sup>43</sup> Though John was pardoned largely as a result of the letter, with his only punishment being prohibition from holding public office, Hutchinson reports that others who did turn themselves in and renounce their former positions were not rewarded for cooperating, but instead had their estates confiscated and their liberty, or in some cases their lives, taken from them. She records with regret how "the other poor gentlemen were trepanned that were brought in by proclamation" and "the whole cause itself, from the beginning to the ending, was betrayed and condemned" (286). Such was one purpose of the proclamations in the first place—for those in power to make meaning out of the past by hearing the testimony of those involved in the king's trial and publicly interpreting it through the frame

---

<sup>42</sup> These are the 1885 edition by C.H. Firth and the 1973 edition by James Sutherland. While the dedicated Hutchinson scholar could certainly dig up one of these editions or, with the right permissions, access the letter in the State Papers, Domestic Series, it is largely out of reach of most readers, including students. A new edition currently in progress and led by Martyn Bennett and David Norbrook will include the letter. Titled *Memoirs of the Life of John Hutchinson; Defence of John Hutchinson*, this edition will be the third volume in the first collected edition of *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson*, published by Oxford University Press.

established by the restoration of the monarchy. Whatever the execution of Charles I meant to those who participated in it in 1649, when they came before the parliament in 1660 it had to be resignified as a crime against the state and against God. When Hutchinson submits the letter in the place of her husband, she acknowledges the practical efficacy of assenting to this official narrative. As we will see, Hutchinson repeatedly attributes the version of John that appears in the letter (tormented, repentant, ashamed, broken, and apostate from the cause) to the envious imaginations of his enemies. In the opening of the *Memoirs* she voices a fear “to injure that memory which I would honor, and to disgrace his name with a poor monument” (16-17). In this fear, she perhaps admits an awareness of the injury she has already done to his memory in the writing of the letter, a textual monument through which she becomes temporarily complicit in constructing the very narrative of the past against which she fights.

### **“Not to be remembered as a criminal”: John Hutchinson’s Imprisonment**

The circumstances of John’s arrest and imprisonment provide another site for the contest over memory. Hutchinson portrays the arrest as a betrayal of the terms of John’s inclusion in the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion, by which he was legally entitled to expect that “noe Crime whatsoever committed against His Majesty or His Royall Father” before June 24, 1660, “shall hereafter rise in Judgement or be brought in Question” against him “to the least endamagement” of either his life, liberty, or estate, or “to the prejudice” of his reputation.<sup>44</sup> John’s arrest occurs on October 11, 1663 and, although he is never formally charged or brought to trial, he is committed to the Tower of London on

---

<sup>44</sup> John Raithby (editor). "Charles II, 1660: An Act of Free and Generall Pardon Indempnity and Oblivion.." Statutes of the Realm: volume 5: 1628-80 (1819): 226-234. British History Online. Web. 25 July 2011. <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=47259>>

November 3 on suspicion of involvement in stirring up insurrection against Charles II.<sup>45</sup>

Hutchinson expresses her view of her husband's role in these plots in straightforward terms: "The Colonel had no hand in it," as he felt "obliged at the time to be quiet" (301). As she denies her husband's collusion in any plots against the king after 1660, Hutchinson criticizes this accusation as a pretense devised to punish John for his earlier crimes against the crown.

Hutchinson herself emerges as a character more frequently in the final portion of the *Memoirs* chronicling her husband's imprisonment and death than she does in the earlier part of the text. "Mrs. Hutchinson" enters the story to express her emotional response to John's treatment, to ask him questions, and to speak on his behalf with Secretary Bennet, Lieutenant Robinson, and other authorities. The increased presence of Hutchinson as an actor in the events being recalled, rather than solely as narrator of them, emphasizes her position as eye-witness to and sharer in her husband's suffering. Throughout the *Memoirs* one senses Hutchinson's presence in the scenes she describes, but she does not often come into the foreground. In this portion of the text, her larger role reminds her readers that she was there, as a way to assert her reliability as a reporter and interpreter of events.

As a character in the narrative, Mrs. Hutchinson wields John's inclusion in the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion throughout this portion of the text, first as a protection from future persecution and then as a proof of injustice. This change signals her

---

<sup>45</sup> John Hutchinson is not the only Nottinghamshire puritan to be arrested and detained without trial in the early 1660s. For a blog post sharing a few other examples, see Mark Burden, "Lucy Hutchinson, 1662, and Detention without Trial," *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson*, 6 May 2012. Web. Accessed 25 March 2014. <<http://lucyhutchinsonworks.wordpress.com/2012/05/06/lucy-hutchinson-1662-and-detention-without-trial-by-mark-burden/>>

disillusionment with the promises of the Restoration. In the first instance, before John's arrest, a royalist relative of Hutchinson's warns her that she and John should leave England for their safety. When Hutchinson protests that "the Act of Oblivion being passed, she knew not why he should fear, who was resolved to do nothing that might forfeit the grace he had found," the relative replies that "it was determined that, if there were the least pretence in the world, the Colonel should be imprisoned and never be let loose again" (290). Hutchinson does not seem to place much value in this threat at the time, but the threat returns not much later in the text, immediately after John's imprisonment in the Tower. At this point, Hutchinson recalls, she tried to be hopeful about John's situation and take comfort in his continued good spirits but her "divining heart" undermines these attempts when "she remembered what had been told her of the cruel resolutions taken against him, and saw now the execution of them" (304). This moment in the text involves three levels of remembrance: Hutchinson the author remembers her moment of recollection, the character Mrs. Hutchinson remembers the rumors of resolutions against her husband, and the reader remembers hearing these resolutions reported only a few pages prior. Later Hutchinson brings up the Act in her conversation with Secretary Bennet over the terms of her husband's imprisonment. Bennet remarks that "her husband was a very unfortunate person in regard of his former crimes," using this as justification for keeping John confined under strict terms. Hutchinson replies that "she rather hoped he had been happy in being comprised in the Act of Oblivion, which allowed him not to be remembered as a criminal" (309). Although in this instance her main opposition in making meaning of John's arrest comes

from the state, Hutchinson also takes on members of John's own party who accused him of betraying information which lead to their arrests. Hutchinson attributes these rumors to "the base jealousies of our own party always over him," who, since John was "not hanged at first, imagined and spoke among themselves all the scandals that could be devised of" (298).

### **The Politics of a Good Death**

Part of Hutchinson's challenge in commemorating her husband is to interpret the circumstances and actions around his death. She was not there when he died, not because of the cultural belief that a wife's presence might interfere with her husband's readiness to die but because at the time she was home, gathering supplies to comfort John during his imprisonment and managing the household they maintained in spite of it. Because of this absence, Hutchinson was unable to perform the traditional, culturally sanctioned duties of a wife to her husband's dying body. However, when she preserves the memory of John's death and interprets its significance for her readers, she brings John into her care. John's death occurred far from home, in an utterly inhospitable place. The *Memoirs* provide Hutchinson the opportunity to domesticate it. Through her writing, she can ensure that Johns' death is remembered as a good one.

The deathbed often provides a site of narrative focus in the textual presentation of a life, and the importance of this site to Hutchinson's account is amplified by her conscious participation in a context over memory that, as Sharon Achinstein notes, was most urgently waged over the bodies of the dead (24). Hutchinson writes from within a Protestant revision of the *ars moriendi* tradition in which the manner of and

circumstances of a person's death could be analyzed and interpreted as signs of that person's eternal fate. The evaluation of the "goodness" or "badness" of a death, of course, depended upon the position of the interpreter. In the case of a "good" death, though, the details could provide an example to survivors, help them cope with their loss, and reinforce their faith.<sup>46</sup> In the case of John Hutchinson's death, his wife uses them to transform the process of dying from tragic defeat into triumphant victory. In many ways, the material circumstances in which John dies stand in stark opposition to those which were traditionally thought to enable a good death. Hutchinson makes sure her readers know that this was by design: John's enemies wanted him to suffer. Ideally, a man would die at home, comfortable in his own bed, with family, friends, and spiritual advisors around him to aid him in his passing. John Hutchinson does not die at home in his bed. His deathbed was in a dank, gloomy prison chamber, a place Hutchinson describes as "so unwholesome and damp that even in the summer time the Colonel's hat-case and trunk, and everything of leather, would be every day all covered over with mould; wipe them as clean as you could one morning, by the next they would be mouldy again" (320). Hearing the report of these conditions, the physician who is summoned to attend John on his deathbed suspects "his journey would be to no purpose, for that chamber had killed [him]" (329). In the final days of life, a dying man's chamber could be a crowded, busy place. For John, this possibility was limited by the conditions of his imprisonment. When he died, the only people by his side who knew him were his brother and his daughter.

---

<sup>46</sup> See Ralph Houlbrook, *Death, Religion and the Family in England 1480-1750*, (Oxford 1998), 183. Houlbrook draws on a multitude of period resources to construct an overview of beliefs and practices associated with death in England in the early modern period. Chapter 7, "Good Deaths and Bad," explores changes in the way people interpreted the significance of deathbed behaviors and conditions in the period.

While John was not entirely alone, it is safe to say that had he died at home, his deathbed would have been more highly attended. Hutchinson blames John's enemies for these conditions, which seem to have been crafted purposefully to ensure a degraded, wretched death.

Through her memorial, Hutchinson denies John's enemies of this death. As she reports John's final hours, she demonstrates how all of the material conditions which could have demoralized him actually enabled him to triumph over death and thus over his enemies. As in the treatment of John's imprisonment, however, Hutchinson frequently breaks into the narrative flow to meditate on the significance of each detail, attempting to curtail any alternative readings of the situation. J.S.W. Helt identifies three essential spiritual requirements that define a good death: "to die in faith, to die readily in submission to God's will, and to render up the soul into God's hands" (42). According to Hutchinson's memorial, John surpassed all three of these criteria in his death.

Hutchinson constructs an active and central role for John in his deathbed drama. The story of John's death begins on September 3<sup>rd</sup> when he goes for a walk along the seashore and returns to his chamber feeling "aguish, with a kind of shivering and pain in his bones" (327). After this "he slept no more till his last sleep came upon him, but continued in a feverish distemper, with violent sweatings" (328). Though the sudden nature of John's fatal illness, with only a few days passing between the development of his symptoms and his death, could be understood as leaving him little time to settle his worldly affairs or prepare his spirit, Hutchinson's account assures readers that he had been readying himself for some time. Her account demonstrates John's equal attention to

material and spiritual concerns. At the time of his death, John had been a prisoner for nearly a year, circumstances which afforded him both the impetus and the time to contemplate the possibility of death. He apparently wrote a will while in the Tower, which he confirms from his deathbed to be his official last will and testament. He displays his spiritual readiness in his chiding response to the doctor who asks him if he has made peace with God: “I hope you do not think me so ill a Christian to have been thus long in prison and have that to do now!”(329). Hutchinson sets up her readers to anticipate such a response by showing them how John began his turn away from the world and its attachments from the time of his arrest. While the restrictions of his jailers forced him to sever ties with his business affairs and limited his personal contact to members of his immediate family, John voluntarily withdrew himself in other ways, especially after his removal from the Tower to Sandown Castle. Most significantly in terms of foreshadowing his spiritual preparedness, Hutchinson reports: “His business and continual study was the Scripture, which the more he conversed in, the more it delighted him; insomuch that his wife, having brought down some books to entertain him in his solitude, he thanked her and told her that if he should continue as long as he lived in prison, he would read nothing there but his Bible” (321). In this description of John’s activities, Hutchinson shows how he turns his imprisonment into an opportunity for devoted Bible study, one that allows him to reconcile himself to his fate long before it is realized. Here through Hutchinson’s remembrance, John echoes Bunyan’s assessment from his *Prison Meditations* that “gaols are Christ his schools / In them we learn to die” (24).

Throughout his deathbed scene, John maintains perfect self-control and awareness of his surroundings. He speaks “very composedly and cheerfully” as long as he can, and remains “very sensible and very cheerful” in spite of his likely discomfort from lack of sleep and fever. Hutchinson’s narrative of the “good” death depends on her husband’s retention of his mental faculties and the ability to speak long enough to play his expected part, advising faith in God and duty to family to instruct and comfort his deathbed audience. As Ralph Houlbrooke notes, “conditions which left the dying person speechless before he or she had time to deliver last messages or affirmations of faith were often distressing both to the dying and to family and friends” (199). John has time to deliver both. He begins by affirming the source of his hope as “none but Christ, none but Christ, in whom I have unspeakable joy, more than I can express” (329). The ineffability of his joy combines with the “soreness of [his] mouth” to keep John from any more declarations of faith, but he still gives his final farewells and instructions for those of his family who are with him and those who are absent. In John’s death he gives more comfort to those around him than he receives, even consoling his weeping daughter “‘Fie, Bab,’ said he, ‘do you mourn for me as for one without hope? Do not so: there is hope’” (330). John eventually loses his ability to speak, but even then he remains conscious and able to communicate with his deathbed audience, evidenced by the small sigh he releases when someone comments on how surprised Mrs. Hutchinson will be that her husband died while she was away. Hutchinson includes the performance of these valued deathbed practices to indicate John’s acceptance of coming death; he does what one is supposed to do while dying well.

The script for any “good” death includes final words that bear personal significance to their immediate hearers, as well as more general meaning to an audience of like-minded Christians. In John’s last words, he appears to reflect on the circumstances of his death and find them satisfactory, as he pronounces: “‘Tis as I would have it. ‘Tis where I would have it.” John has already submitted to his fate, declaring “The will of the Lord be done” (329) but here he suggests that, though God is the ultimate agent, it is his will to die in this manner, in this place as well. Accounts of dying revolutionaries sometimes included their interpretation of their passing as the harbinger of God’s vengeance against their foes and their calls for their allies to rally around their bodies as symbols of a grander cause.<sup>47</sup> In this regard, the account of John’s death differs from those of other supporters of the revolutionary cause who had been imprisoned and died after the Restoration. In the deathbed scene, no one claims a larger significance for John’s passing and neither he nor anyone attending him at the time blames his extended persecution for his death. However, previously in the *Memoirs* John and his wife do discuss the likelihood that he will die a prisoner and what might come out of such a death. Though John does not think he will die in prison, he promises Mrs. Hutchinson “if I do, my blood will be so innocent I shall advance the cause more by my death, hastening the vengeance of God upon my unjust enemies, than I could do by all the actions of my life” (322). Hutchinson’s inclusion of John’s final words, without additional comment, could speak to her sense that, taken in the context of his whole life narrative, they speak

---

<sup>47</sup> For example, the Calvinist preacher Henry Jessey who died in 1663 of scurvy contracted while in prison, “is said to have called on God to begin the destruction of his enemies in a Fifth Monarchist revolt. Authorities noted that Jessey’s ‘dying words were that the Lord would destroy the powers in being, and he encouraged the people to help the great work’” (Achinstein 25).

for themselves. He “would have” his death in this manner, in this place because he sees the purpose working behind these qualities. By representing the exemplary quality of John’s death, Hutchinson invites her readers into John’s chamber at Sandown to witness for themselves how “innocent” John’s “blood” was, so that his death might serve the godly cause in the way that he hopes.

The final testament to the “goodness” of John’s death comes in the serenity of his actual passing. Hutchinson writes simply that he “departed, his countenance settling so amiably and cheerful in death that he looked after he was dead as he used to do when he was best pleased in life” (331). The *Memoirs* attest that John is “cheerful” and “best pleased” in life when he feels he is serving God’s will, even if it requires sacrifice.

Hutchinson coaches her readers in the proper response to the deathbed scene by describing the reactions of John’s audience to his various behaviors. These witnesses provide an initial interpretation authorized and spread through Hutchinson’s account. His coherence and calm inspires “amazement in their sorrow” and “the admiration of both the doctors and of all that saw him” (330). The two doctors, strangers to John, were yet “so moved” by John’s show of faith in death that they wept “as if had been their brother” (331). Likewise, in case any reader is unable to discern the significance of John’s deathbed comportment, Hutchinson includes the testimony of one of John’s doctors along with her own reflections on the forces at work behind John’s serene passing. Having witnessed the deaths of many “eminent persons”, the doctor avows that “he never in his life saw any one receive death with more Christian courage, and constancy of mind, and steadfastness of faith, than the Colonel had expressed from the first to last; so that

considering the height of his fever and his want of rest, there was an evidence of a divine assistance that overruled all the powers and operations of nature” (331). To complement the doctor’s assessment, Hutchinson presents her own lengthier meditation on John’s death as a triumph:

I have often admired, when I have considered the aboundings of God’s favour in the want of all things, that he who had had a comfortable house of his own, attendants, and all things that any gentleman of his quality could require from his infancy till his imprisonment, should come to die in a vile chamber, untrimmed and unhung, in a poor wretched bed without his wife, children, servants and relations about him, and all his former employments taken from him—these thoughts extended were enough to melt any tender bowels. But then, to consider on the other side that the Lord provided his dearest brother and daughter to assist him to the last, and had sent him money to defray all charges which he wanted before, and likewise ordered it so that some which should have been paid half a year before he was detained, and sent in now to bring him home; and above all that the Lord not only bore up his spirit to part with all things without regret but filled him full of joy and thankfulness and curbed the power of his disease and chained up Satan that he could not torture him in mind or body, it was an admirable and unspeakable flood of mercy which may help to comfort us in the loss of him. (334-35).

Hutchinson speaks as one who has contemplated her husband’s death, and gained the perspective to guide her readers through their own meditations on the subject. She constructs a series of lists for her readers’ considerations: all of the things John had and lost, the dismal material conditions in which he died, and the mercies he received nevertheless. The progression allows Hutchinson to lead her readers through a process of recognition much like those she creates in dialogues between herself and John throughout the narrative of his imprisonment. In these exchanges, which become formulaic through their repetition, “Mrs. Hutchinson” makes some expression of fear, sadness, or misery, and John responds by showing her why they ought to be thankful and trust in their faith. Hutchinson does not suggest that John did not die “in a vile chamber” “in a wretched

bed” without his wife and family by his side, but argues that a focus only on these details creates a distorted memory of him which can only foster destructive grief—something like the tear-floods imagined in the opening of the *Memoirs*. From another angle, to focus on these details allows John’s enemies to determine the meaning of his death.

As Hutchinson instructs her readers in how to interpret John’s death, she provides them with a pattern for coping with their own grief. Writing the *Memoirs* is a crucial part of Hutchinson’s grieving process; it helps her accept John’s death and come to terms with her new circumstances. Since writing helped her, she imagines that reading the *Memoirs* will aid others as they work through their emotional responses. In her preface, addressed to her children, Hutchinson writes as if John’s death had just occurred, as if the tears were fresh. She explains why her readers should cease their weeping, addressing them in the first person as joined with her in a community of mourners and of the faithful:

Our conjunction, if we had any with him, was indissoluble; if we were knit together by one spirit into one body of Christ, we are so still; if we were mutually united in one love of God, good men, and goodness, we are so still. What is it then we wail in his remove? The distance? Faithless fools! ‘tis sorrow only makes it. Let us but ascend to God in holy joy for the great grace given his poor servant, and he is there with us. (18)

In Hutchinson’s view, the rift of separation occasioned by death is only an illusion. She provides her readers with the tools they need to see through this illusion and comprehend their lasting spiritual bond with John. As she guides readers through the details of John’s life, they will inspire in the reader the “holy joy” necessary to “ascend to God.” And, Hutchinson promises, John will be waiting. “If our tears did not put out our eyes,” she advises, “we should see him even in heaven, holding forth his lamp of virtuous examples and precepts, to light us through the dark world” (18). Hutchinson conceives of herself as

bound to “open the shut eyes,” those which have been blinded by unnecessary grief, by writing the plain truth of her husband’s life and death.

Hutchinson writes a positive, politically inflected narrative of Johns’ death as a work of resistance, a way to wrest control of his memory from his enemies. She shows her readers exactly what she is up against in this struggle. John’s enemies appear as eager for information that they can manipulate to their own ends: one of the doctors who attends John expected that “in regard of the Colonel’s former engagements” he “should be examined of all circumstances” surrounding his death, and “as he guessed it afterward fell out, for the gentlemen of the country, being of the royal party, were busy in their inquiries” (331). Here Hutchinson specifically attributes interest in the details of John’s passing to long-standing political antagonism of the sort which was supposed to be abolished at the Restoration. Though the “faithful” doctor fails to provide John’s enemies with any material suitable for their purpose, this does not put an end to attempts by the “royal party” to shape the significance of John’s death. According to Hutchison, “then they raised a false report and spread it from the Court that, impatient of his prison, he had poisoned himself” (334). This rumor represents a dispute over what actually happened, not just over how what happened should be interpreted. Hutchinson’s insistent suspicions that her husband had been administered poison by his keepers in the Tower raises the possibility that they had been poisoning him in order to stage a suicide; on the other hand, it is possible that after their attempts to poison John proved successful, they concocted a story of suicide to cover up their role in his death. At any rate, the accusation that John

committed suicide, motivated by impatience with his imprisonment, is calculated to do the greatest damage to his memory.<sup>48</sup>

For Puritans and other nonconformists persecuted by the Restoration government the collective experience of suffering had a powerful unifying force. The ability to remain strong in the face of persecution depended on the Christian virtue of patience, defined as “a dynamic virtue which endures adversity positively and cheerfully, confident Providence and not fortune rules the sublunary world” (Keeble 199). Such confidence ensured that suffering was not meaningless, but would in fact be recognized, an assurance powerfully expressed in the words of Independent leader John Owen: “*Every Circumstance in suffering shall add to the Glory of the Sufferer*; and those who suffer here for Christ without witness, as many have done to Death in Prisons and Dungeons, have yet an *all-seeing witness* to give the Testimony in due Season. *The righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance*; and nothing that is done or suffered for God shall be lost forever” (16).<sup>49</sup> The accusation of impatience leveled against John implies he was overcome by fear that the “due Season” to which Owen directs his followers would never come; God would never acknowledge him. The news of John’s suicide, then, would signal not only a personal lack of faith in God’s mercy, but an abandonment of those who remained faithful to the saints’ cause and a rejection of the possibility that their suffering might hold any meaning.

---

<sup>48</sup> Hutchinson leaves the final verdict up to a more all-seeing rememberer than herself, concluding that if John’s jailers in the Tower did not poison him “it is certain their unjust and barbarous usage of him did occasion his death, whose murder the Lord will not forget when he makes inquisition for the blood of his saints” (336).

<sup>49</sup> Sharon Achinstein suggests that Lucy Hutchinson was probably a member of Owen’s Independent congregation in London at the Restoration. See *Literature and Dissent in Milton’s England*, 69.

The rumor of suicide could also be manipulated into a confession of guilt for past and present crimes committed against the crown. This rumor provides the context in which Hutchinson decides to memorialize her husband as dying a saint's death. As we have seen, Hutchinson's account of her husband's imprisonment and final days explicitly counters this charge of impatience, of despair, by documenting evidence of his cheerful submission to and unshakeable faith in God's will. Here Hutchinson uses her version of John's death to subvert a statement of authority, specifying that this rumor spread from the Court, from the top down. Once again the contest here comes back to the story that John's dying can be used to tell, how it can be given meaning and put to use for a particular political purpose. If he died a martyr, his death and its narration represent acts of resistance that can be used to rally the community of the faithful by restoring to them one of their heroes. If he commits suicide, his death performs an act of surrender to the authority of the Restoration, a way of signaling to that same community that their revolution has truly been defeated.

How a person dies matters, but so do the location and ritual of burial and commemoration. Though John died far away from home, in a hostile place, his family honored his request to be buried at home in Owthorpe. Though John does not specifically say why he wanted to be buried at home, Hutchinson suggests "I am apt to believe one thing was because he would not have any of those superstitions exercised about him, being dead, for the opposing of which he lost his liberty and life" (334). Sharon Achinstein reads John's instructions for burial as an act of resistance to the new prayer book, noting that "in refusing 'those superstitions,' in refusing the prayer book service,

this political radical who had signed the death warrant of Charles I was continuing the work of resistance that had taken him to gaol where he died” (31). Being buried at home allows John and his family some degree of control over his funeral and burial, both powerful social performances. Before these performances can take place, however, they appropriate the journey from Deal to Owtborpe (“about eight score miles,” according to Hutchinson) as an opportunity for publically making meaning out of John’s death. It is no wonder that the authorities at Deal were loath to hand the body over to John’s sons and threw up groundless legal obstacles to thwart their attempt to claim it.<sup>50</sup> The actual sight of John and Lucy’s eldest sons bearing their father home in a train made up of “a hearse, tricked with escutcheons and six horses in mourning, with a mourning coach and six horses to wait on it” serves as a very public mobile memorial, making available a man who had not been seen for nearly a year previously. As Hallam and Hockey write, “The physical remains of the dead can be regarded as the epitome of a memory ‘object’ as they stand, not only as a material reminder of the embodied, living person, but as a medium through which the dead might communicate directly with the living” (134). John’s unusually extended funeral procession creates a space in which he can be mourned, and his death can be interpreted as a martyr’s death. Hutchinson captures the effect of this sight when she recalls how John was brought home “very seriously bewailed all the way he came along by all those who had been better acquainted with his worth than the

---

<sup>50</sup> Although they come to Deal with an order from the Secretary to collect the body, they are initially refused because the warrant was written for the body to be delivered to Mrs. Hutchinson, and she was not with them. They are held up at Deal while they wait for a new warrant to be sent, authorizing them to take the body. In the mean time, they are worried that they will be further held up by Freeman who wanted to conduct an inquest to establish that John had died of natural causes and not of anything that the king’s soldiers did to him. This is prevented, but once the new warrant does arrive and the sons try to leave with the body Freeman stops them and tries to demand a fee from him. He is unsuccessful, but he does delay their journey home (332).

strangers among whom he died” (333). The procession puts John’s death on display for the eyes of his friends; it authorizes their expressions of grief. Hutchinson reads resistance into how these mourners bore themselves. We see the formation of a community around John’s death, one that had not been visible before. However, the combined sight of the body and the mourners who accompany it in each place along the way also communicates a calculated message for a different audience, that of John’s enemies. Thus Hutchinson can report that John was “brought home with honour to his grave through the dominions of his murderers, who were ashamed of his glories, which all their tyrannies could not extinguish with his life” (333).

What was Hutchinson really resisting in her efforts to control the narrative of her husband’s death? Was the Restoration government as invested in using the dead to solidify their claim to power as Hutchinson makes them seem? A return to the exhumation, “execution”, and reburial of Cromwell, Ireton, and Bradshaw, and the accompanying disinterment and translation of the bodies of their family members, as discussed in the previous chapter through a royalist framework, provides a sense of how the Restoration government used the bodies of the dead to establish control over individual memorial practices and collective memory. Hutchinson’s commemoration opposes this process. Although deceased, Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton, Thomas Pride, and John Bradshaw are excluded from the pardon granted by the Act of Oblivion, grouped together in their own particular provision. This exclusion opened the door for the parliament to pass the following act, on December 10, 1660: “Ordered, by the Lords and commons assembled in Parliament, That the Carcases of Oliver Cromwell, Henry Ireton,

John Bradshaw, Thomas Pride, whether buried in Westminster Abbey or elsewhere, be with all Expedition taken up, and drawn upon a Hurdle to Tyburne, and there hanged up in their Coffins for some Time, and after that buried under the said Gallows.”<sup>51</sup> Although the body of Thomas Pride somehow escaped this postmortem punishment, the bodies of Cromwell, Ireton, and Bradshaw did not.<sup>52</sup> In its treatment of the bodies of these men, the Restoration government undertakes the destruction of existing memorial sites in order to control the preservation and transmission of the past. The purpose of this action is to regulate practices of mourning and commemoration that would assign conflicting meanings to their deaths to limit what might be communicated by the “physical remains of the dead” to the living. It takes them out of the realm of public meaning-making and authoritatively ascribes an official meaning to their lives and deaths. These men had died of natural causes, but that did not suit the official state narrative, which required the punishment of a few symbolically significant individuals to fulfill the desire for vengeance in a focused manner and therefore allow pardon to be granted to the majority. The “carcasses” of Cromwell, Ireton, and Bradshaw had to hang in a public spectacle at Tyburn—both a manner and site of death which communicates a certain signification to the bodies on display there: traitors. But I would suggest that their removal to Tyburn is

---

<sup>51</sup> “House of Lords Journal Volume 11: 10 December 1660.” *Journal of the House of Lords: volume 11: 1660-1666 (1767-1830)*: 204-205. British History Online. Web. 23 June 2011.

<<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=14082>>

<sup>52</sup> Three letters from Secretary Nicholas give one view of the proceedings. The first letter, dated January 31, matter-of-factly reports “Cromwell and others took their leave at Tyburn yesterday.” The next two are more descriptive, relating how “the arch-traitor Cromwell, and two of his choicest instruments, Bradshaw and Ireton, finished the tragedy of their lives in a comic scene at Tyburn; a wonderful example of justice” and how the punishment of “three of those horrid Murderers, viz Cromwell, Ireton & Bradshaw” provided “a signal spectacle of Justice” that “drew many thousands of people out of y<sup>e</sup> city to behold it.” See Sec. Nicholas to Sir Hen. Bennet 31 January 1661, *State Papers Domestic, Charles II* vol. 29, 71a; Sec. Nicholas to Sir Hen. De Vic 1 February 1661, *State Papers Domestic: Charles II* vol. 30, 3a; Sec. Nicholas to the Earl of Orrery 2 February 1661, *State Papers Ireland: Charles II* 306, 546.

not more significant in the construction of the official narrative than is their removal *from* Westminster. Westminster Abbey communicates its own significance to the bodies interred there. Already in the seventeenth century it was the resting place of kings, poets, and politicians, and as such it was a place for the preservation and transmission of the national past. Removing their monuments from Westminster denies these men one site of remembrance, one site where they could be acknowledged by those who had been sympathetic to their cause, and also one site that could serve as the source of future resentment and conflict. In this last way, the exhumation and reburial of these three men clearly belongs to the program of healing issued in the Act of Oblivion—in Westminster they remain as a public reminder of past conflict, and as public monuments they are available to be taken up and inscribed with meaning by the people. The subsequent disinterment of several family members of those named in the Act and in the order of Parliament signals the completeness of the state's attempt to manage the signification of the past.<sup>53</sup> This action dramatizes the power of the Restoration government to determine how history is written and how people are remembered. Their power consists not only in words, but in public actions in public spaces.

---

<sup>53</sup> By a royal warrant issued September 9, 1661, the bodies of Cromwell's mother, who had died on November 18, 1654, and his sister Jane, who died in 1656, were removed from the Abbey. His granddaughter Anne Fleetwood, the child of Cromwell's daughter Bridget and Charles Fleetwood, was also exhumed. Cromwell's daughter Elizabeth, who was also buried in Henry VII's chapel with her father, remains there, but according to the Westminster Abbey website this is only because she was buried in a different part of the chapel and was overlooked. The remains of Mary Bradshaw, John Bradshaw's wife, were translated from the Abbey by the same warrant. All ended up buried in the churchyard of St. Margaret's Westminster. They were buried along with the remains of other regicides who had been interred in the Abbey since 1641, men whose crimes were not severe enough for them to suffer the fate of Cromwell, et al, but who were still deemed undeserving of a resting place in the Abbey. A tablet at the entrance to St. Margaret's Westminster, put in place in 1866, names those who were re-buried there.

## Conclusion

While scholars have noted Hutchinson's purpose to rescue the memory of her husband, there has been no sustained attention to the ways in which she understands this task or how she makes her work of preservation and emendation visible to her readers and invites them to participate in it for themselves. N.H. Keeble has argued that "Restoration" is "better understood as process than as an event, and as a process which never achieves the closure its public propaganda so vehemently claimed" (*The Restoration* 3). Part of this process involved handling the recent past by at least attempting to exert control over how it could be interpreted and what kind of purposes it could be made to serve. Lucy Hutchinson intervenes in this particular aspect of the Restoration when she writes the *Memoirs*, and her text remains as an indicator of just how distressed and distressing the process was, even years after the official "event" took place. Keeble's additional claim that "save in the narrowest political sense, there was not one Restoration but many" suggests this series of Restorations unfolding throughout a duration of time, but also a multiplicity of Restorations occurring at any one time (3). The process of Restoration was experienced differently and thus meant something different to people in different position or belonging to different groups. There could be no single, unified narrative to reflect the experience of all the officially restored subjects of the officially restored king but there could be narratives built around shared experiences and that both tapped into and contributed to the collective memory of a particular group. Though the *Memoirs* have an undeniably personal component, Hutchinson's perspective is not exclusive to herself. In telling John's life story and representing the conflict

motivating her writing, Hutchinson forges connections with others whose lived experience of the Restoration was characterized by upheaval and suffering.

In the *Memoirs*, Hutchinson equates silence with the erosion of memory and onset of oblivion. Though it may be painful both for her and her readers to remember relentlessly, Hutchinson sets out to show why it is necessary to do so. As she remembers what happened to her family, she recalls the injustice and danger of those years following the Restoration, and thus confirms the significance of her memory work. Because John was allowed to rot in prison, and because his death is being used to demoralize the cause he died for, and because he is not the only one to suffer such a fate, Hutchinson has to preserve and promote her memory of him. To do so is to oppose the imposition of closure on the narrative of the revolution and to refuse to relinquish control of the past as a weapon in an ongoing religious and political struggle.

## **Chapter Four: Seeing through “Sacred Spectacles”: Memory and Composition in**

### **Lucy Hutchinson’s *Order and Disorder***

The politics of Lucy Hutchinson’s entrance into the Restoration contest over whose memories should survive via the *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* serve as the subject of my previous chapter. Though the specific struggles in the *Memoirs* between remembering and forgetting, and authorized and unauthorized memories are complicated, that work’s status as a work of memory is apparent. But what happens when we think about Hutchinson’s Genesis epic *Order and Disorder* as a work of memory?

Approaching *Order and Disorder* as a work of memory focuses attention on the method of its composition, which Hutchinson reveals in the subtitle given to the 1679 published edition, *Being Meditations Upon the Creation and the Fall; As It Is Recorded in the Beginning of Genesis*, and in the opening words of her preface when she refers to the work as “these meditations.” Textual meditation is memory work, involving the internalization of language for the purpose of sustained contemplation. It is, in the words of Mary Carruthers “the stage at which reading is memorized and changed into personal experience” (53). This chapter is concerned with how this transformation of scriptural language into personal experience, which occurs during meditation, also enables Lucy Hutchinson’s transformation from the sad shadow who haunts the final pages of the *Memoirs* into the fully-realized authority whose “certain truths” “wind up” the conclusion of *Order and Disorder* (675).

The chapter is divided into two main parts, which each part broken down further into sections. The first part of the chapter focuses on Hutchinson’s relationship to

Scripture as it is mediated by the devotional beliefs and textual practices of her time and as it changes over the course of her writing life. In the surviving fragment of her autobiography and in the *Memoirs*, Hutchinson depicts her engagement with the Bible at different stages of her life. Though the autobiographical fragment highlights Hutchinson's zeal for sharing the lessons she draws from her reading, the *Memoirs* subordinate her devotional experiences in favor of her husband's and consistently celebrate his authority as interpreter and annotator of sacred text. In this work, Hutchinson establishes a distinctly gendered division of spiritual labor that determines how the Colonel and Mrs. Hutchinson relate to one another and to the Scripture. In the composition of *Order and Disorder*, and in her husband's absence, Hutchinson must negotiate a new authorial identity for herself. The final sections of part I consider the language Hutchinson uses in the preface to *Order and Disorder* to describe how she undergoes transformation from her husband's scribe to composer of her own religious verse through the practice of meditation. Hutchinson's Scriptural meditations engender creative agency, appropriating the language of textual authority from her husband proves difficult.

The second main part of the chapter turns to the close of Canto 5, the end of *Order and Disorder* in its 1679 edition, to demonstrate how Hutchinson dramatizes these struggles with appropriation that underlie the composition of the poem. The conversation Hutchinson imagines between Adam and Eve epitomizes the collision of scriptural language and personal memories. In the speaking figures of Eve and Adam, Hutchinson resurrects previous textual representations of herself and her husband as they appear

*Elegies* and the *Memoirs*. Eve laments loss in the voice of Mrs. Hutchinson, Adam provides consolation as John has before, and for two lines at the end of the conversation Hutchinson breaks the frame of the poem, questioning her ability to speak in an authoritative voice. In these two lines, Hutchinson exposes the limitations imposed by the dependency depicted as fundamental to her marriage in her earlier works. Fortunately, the poem does not end with these two lines. As the narrator begins a meditation on Adam and Eve's conversation, we see how Hutchinson has successfully incorporated her husband's language, along with the Scriptural language of the Fall narrative, into her own.

## Part I

### Reading and Writing (with/in) the Bible

The full title of Hutchinson's Genesis poem is *Order and Disorder: or, The World Made and Undone. Being Meditations upon the Creation and the Fall; As It is Recorded in the Beginning of Genesis*.<sup>54</sup> Its basis in the practice of meditation locates the poem in a context of early modern English women's intertextual religious writing in both prose and verse. Danielle Clarke claims that "The availability and authority of the Bible was, without doubt, the most influential of the factors which led women to write devotional

---

<sup>54</sup> It's existence as a long poetic treatment of Genesis written after the Restoration by a woman Puritan in religion and republican in politics has brought *Order and Disorder* in from the margins of early modern literary culture as a useful parallel to Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Given the super-canonical status of *Paradise Lost*, it is no surprise that work on *Order and Disorder*, especially since its attribution to Lucy Hutchinson, tended to place the two poems in conversation. David Norbrook opens his introduction to the first printed edition of the complete 20-canto *Order and Disorder* with the statement that, among many other claims to our interest, the poem "sheds new light on *Paradise Lost*." The series of questions posed a few pages further into the text demonstrate the same sense that any pairing of these texts is useful for what it can reveal about Milton, rather than the other way around. In a work invested in rethinking the methodology of influence, Shannon Miller claims Hutchinson's poem as a "probable Restoration re-writing of *Paradise Lost*. ...In what is overtly a rethinking of Milton's narrative of the Fall, the method of retelling the story of Genesis, and the modes of organizing the family and human society, Hutchinson's poem offers us an opportunity to examine what certain women writers did with Milton's poem" (*Engendering the Fall* 107).

poetry in the early modern period, not least because most of the women who did so had a strong Protestant commitment” (147). In this section, I will briefly review some of the beliefs and practices which made the authority of the Bible appear available for Hutchinson’s creative verse appropriation.

Reading and writing were central to the practice of Protestant religious devotion for both men and women in this period. As Michelle Dowd and Thomas Festa explain, “The sole authority to which human beings could refer for knowledge of God was scripture, the study of which, according to the reformers, ought to occupy a privileged place at the center of every Christian life as the exclusive means of access to divine truth” (9). Much of this study took place in the home, either individually or in collaboration with the family. Christopher Hill has traced the process he calls “the spiritualization of the household” in his work *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*. For Puritans, the most basic unit of social order was the family and each household functioned as a little church. Within the framework of the spiritualized household, the Bible was made accessible to more interpreters than ever before even if that access was somewhat shaped by ideas about the hierarchical ordering of the household. In this formation, the patriarch was ultimately responsible for spiritual well-being of his family, but each member had their part to play its maintenance. Hill explains, “The protestant doctrine of the priesthood of all believers opened doors to innovation, because it was ultimately an appeal to individual interpretation of the Bible, to the consciences of (some) individual and lay men and women” (*The English Bible* 416).

Though perhaps denied the official authority of the patriarch, women could still access divine truth through their active engagement with the Scripture. Certainly there were women in the seventeenth century who felt called to use their religious writing to challenge existing authority, question established beliefs, and liberate themselves from social conventions.<sup>55</sup> But those women who exercised a less radical devotion still felt empowered to turn their religious experiences into texts. One popular practice was the keeping of a spiritual diary, a record of one's daily prayer, meditation, reading of the Bible and religious texts, and other activities understood as performing piety. Women's spiritual diaries, such as the one kept by Margaret Hoby, demonstrate evidence of Scripture reading that is both extensive and interactive. Variations on the description "then I wrett notes in my testament" appear frequently in Hoby's entries. As a testament to "the notion that the daily activities of the subject are worth recording," the spiritual diary could authorize and provide a source for additional creative textual production (Seelig 24).<sup>56</sup> Women wrote hymns, prayers, paraphrases, psalm versifications and collages, translations, meditations, advice books, lyric and epic poetry making use of scriptural languages in ways that demonstrate compositional skill and careful agency. Far from depriving women of an authentic voice, intertextual religious writing enabled creative expression by allowing them to make scriptural language their own.<sup>57</sup> In her

---

<sup>55</sup> For an introduction to the works of these radical sectarian women, see Hilary Hinds, *God's Englishwomen: Seventeenth-Century Radical Sectarian Writing and Feminist Criticism*, New York: Manchester UP, 1996.

<sup>56</sup> For more on women's spiritual diaries, see the chapter on Margaret Hoby in Sharon Cadman Seelig's *Autobiography and Gender in Early Modern Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006, pp.15-33; Elspeth Graham, "Women's Writing and the Self", in *Women and Literature in Britain, 1500-1700*, ed. Helen Wilcox, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996, pp. 209-33.

<sup>57</sup> One goal of the recent collection *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500-1625*, edited by Micheline White, is "to insist on the importance of intertextual prose genres" in order to overturn the

devotional meditations, Lady Grace Mildmay urges readers to seek stability in God, “laying up / the word of God in our harts and meditating therein” (qtd. in Narveson 167). Similarly, Rachel Speght writes of the ideal woman: “Her heart should be a receptacle for God’s Word” (*A Muzzle for Melastomus* 47). As this chapter will show, Hutchinson describes her meditations as fulfilling just this end, with her composition originating in the prior inscription of God’s words on her heart.

In addition to the valuation of the personal encounter with God through Scripture, several specific textual practices in the period also contributed to the opening up of the text for readers’ appropriations. These are well-represented in the Geneva Bible, a version typically associated with more radical-leaning Protestants. The Geneva Bible, first published in Switzerland in 1560, was reprinted in London in 1599 and ran through multiple editions into the 1640s. The Hutchinsons owned a copy of the Geneva Bible and several of its features are essential to the kinds of reading and writing that they practiced in their Biblical study and that predicate Hutchinson’s composition of *Order and Disorder*. The “copious annotation” of this version, notes Gerald Hammond, “helped fulfill the demands of the early sixteenth-century Reformers, that Scripture alone should sit at the center of the national culture, to be accessible to everyone without the mediation of priest and bishop” (166). The annotations’ purpose in making meaning more accessible is apparent, but they could also make the text appear more accessible for further interpretation, annotation, and elaboration. Part of the concern of figures like King

---

view of female-authored religious writing as “marginal or depressingly acquiescent,” appearing in genres which “afforded women minimal forms of literary or political agency” (Introduction 2). See also Danielle Clarke’s chapter “Writing the Divine: Faith and Poetry” in her *The Politics of Early Modern Women’s Writing*, New York: Longman, 2001, pp.123-186.

James (and others) at the time over the Geneva Bible is that the presence of the (often politicized) annotations open up the text, suggesting that it is fundamentally interactive or collaborative. Acknowledging the authority granted to the annotations, David Norbrook argues that “Protestant Biblicalism ultimately undermined the distinction between primary text and secondary commentary” (“Preface” xxvi). Hammond notes that the Geneva Bible was the first English Bible to be divided into chapters and verses, another feature which would give readers more control over their own reading. These divisions would make for easier cross-referencing and would also break the text into defined units that could be extracted from the fuller text and made use of on their own. With verse divisions, readers can create more precise parallels or other kinds of relationships between parts of the larger texts; they can be more pointed in their critiques or nuanced in their celebrations. These features of the Geneva Bible change the imagined relationship between reader and Biblical text in a way that enables Hutchinson’s appropriation of Scriptural language in the composition of her Genesis poem.

### **The Family that Reads Together: Gendered Devotion in Hutchinson’s (Auto)Biographical Writing**

Hutchinson’s appropriation of Scriptural language and her choice to compose a poem based on Genesis meditations occur within and are authorized by these broader cultural values and textual practices. At several points both in the autobiographical fragment “The Life of Mrs. Lucy Hutchinson, Written by Herself” and in the *Memoirs* of John’s life, Hutchinson provides some insight into her personal encounters with Scripture

and devotional language.<sup>58</sup> Her written memories reflect the normative gendering of spiritual education at different stages of women's lives at the time; as she grows up she moves from the tutelage of her mother to the guidance of her husband. As evidence of the quality of her early education, Hutchinson reports: "By the time I was four years old I read English perfectly, and having a great memory, I was carried to sermons; and while I was very young could remember and repeat them exactly." She read voraciously "any book [she] could find" but "through the good instructions of my mother and the sermons she carried me to, I was convinced that the knowledge of God was the most excellent study, and accordingly applied myself to it" (14-15). Pious little Lucy apparently moves beyond study to adopt the practical example of her mother's instructions, as she reports "I used to exhort my mother's maids much, and to turn their idle discourses to good subjects" (15). These snippets from her autobiographical fragment situate Hutchinson's youthful devotions in a primarily feminine space; her mother fulfills her responsibility for spiritual management, raising a daughter who appears eager herself to take up this responsibility in the household.

In the account of her marriage given in the *Memoirs*, Hutchinson emphasizes her husband's role in shaping her devotional practice. Additionally, she depicts their studies as a cooperative effort but with a strictly gendered division of labor: when they read together, John interprets the Scripture and Mrs. Hutchinson records his interpretations. In the *Memoirs*, if she applies herself to gaining knowledge of God, her efforts are mediated through her husband. Hutchinson's decision to subordinate her devotion to her husband's

---

<sup>58</sup> The autobiographical fragment no longer exists in any manuscript version, but was published by Julius Hutchinson in his 1806 edition of the *Memoirs*. N.H. Keeble duplicates this yoking of the two texts and reproduces Julius Hutchinson's version of the fragment in his 1995 edition.

matters more here than whatever their roles might have been in actual practice. It matters that she privileges John's personal relationship to the Scripture and celebrates his interpretive agency in the *Memoirs* because in the composition of *Order and Disorder* she emphasizes the development of her own. What Hutchinson refers to -as her husband's "final perseverance" in Scriptural transcription is fully depicted in the closing pages of the *Memoirs*, recounting the final days of John's life as a prisoner of the Restoration government. Hutchinson's representation of John's patient endurance and submission to the providential design in this portion of the *Memoirs* is designed to oppose contemporary claims that his faith faded at the end of his life. For my purpose here, one extended passage from this section is important for two reasons. First, because it establishes a model of adopting the diligent study of Scripture to cope with hardship, a model Hutchinson herself follows in the meditations that become *Order and Disorder*. Second, the passage depicts the distinct roles played by the Colonel and Mrs. Hutchinson in relation to the Scripture and to one another. When Hutchinson turns her scriptural meditations into a poem, her authoritative voice develops from a struggle with these roles.

Hutchinson describes her husband's reading regimen in prison:

...when he was up he used to read much in his Bible. He had appointed his wife, when she went away, to send him the *Dutch Annotations on the Bible*, and she had sent it down with some other things; which he presently caused to be brought to him, though he was in his bed, and some places in the Epistle to the Romans read, which having heard, 'These annotations,' said he, 'are short.' And then looking over some notes upon that Epistle which his wife had left in a book which she had gathered from him, 'I have,' said he, 'discovered much more of the mystery of the truth in that Epistle, and when my wife returns I will make her set it down; for,' said he, 'I will no more observe their cross humours, but when her children are near, I will have her in my chamber with me, and they shall not pluck

her out of my arms. And then,' said he, 'in the winter nights, she shall collect several observations I have made of this Epistle since I came into prison.'; for he had read it all over once a week all the while he was in prison, and he used to say that every time he read it he made some new discovery of excellent mystery and doctrine in it. Though that Epistle and forty-eight selected psalms which he had applied to his present condition were his daily exercise, yet he diligently read all the other parts of Scripture and left many choice places marked, in the time of his imprisonment, in his Bible. It was his custom to read an epistle entirely at once, or as near together as he could, and he advised us also to do so; for he said the coherence and connexion of parts, one with another, in most of them gave great light to the understanding of the whole, and that the Apostle when he writ them intended they should be read entirely in the churches. This continual study of the Scriptures did infinitely ravish his soul and refine it and take it off from all lower exercise, and he continued it in his sickness even to the last, desiring his brother, when he was in bed and could not read himself, to read to him. He found himself every day grow weaker, yet was not exceeding sick, only he could not sleep at all day nor night.<sup>59</sup> (328)

There is something oddly sweet about John's insistence that his wife be allowed to join him in his cell upon her return. When he imagines how they will reunite in defiance of his keepers, he sees them spending the long winter nights in one another's arms, engaged in intense biblical study. This vision transforms the inhospitable prison cell into a domestic tableau wherein the Colonel and Mrs. Hutchinson practice the spiritual conversation that has been fundamental to their marriage.

Mrs. Hutchinson plays a role in the scene John imagines but the overarching purpose of this passage within the *Memoirs* is to celebrate John's triumph as facilitated through the Scripture. Thus Hutchinson shows John engaged in daily meditation and even tells which verses occupied his mind and most helped him understand "his present condition." The general identification of "forty-eight selected psalms" is clarified later in the manuscript in a section following the main narrative: Hutchinson gives "His selected

---

<sup>59</sup> The insufficient (in John's view) annotations come from Theodore Haak's *The Dutch Annotations upon the Whole Bible*, printed in 1657. Haak was commissioned by the Long Parliament to produce this translation.

psalms in the prison” as ““Psal. 5, 10, 18, 22, 25, 31, 35, 37, 42, 43, 46, 51, 56, 57, 59, 60, 63, 64, 69, 70, 71, 73, 75, 79, 80, 86, 88, 94, 103, 104, 109, 112, 115, 119 deleteth he, 123, 124, 125, 126, 140, 143.” (qtd. in Keeble 375 fn.)<sup>60</sup> Obviously the months of John’s imprisonment would have been trying for Hutchinson as well as she had to manage her family and household in her husband’s absence, maintain him in prison, and deal with continued antagonism from their enemies. But the manuscript remains silent on those psalms which spoke to Mrs. Hutchinson in her time of difficulty. Her husband’s preferences are left to stand for both.

The absence of Hutchinson’s selected psalms corresponds to the privileging of John’s insights over hers in the scene imagined in the passage above. Mrs. Hutchinson “gathers” and “collects” material for the annotations but is not shown to generate material herself. John makes the observations, the discoveries, out of his careful readings and meditations; she sets down the record of his illuminations. Norbrook cites this activity to make the point that deep biblical study was familiar to Hutchinson when she undertook work on *Order and Disorder*, stating: “She had helped her husband’s studies in his final imprisonment by bringing him commentaries on the Bible” (xvii). Most basically this observation fails to account for the difference between assisting someone else in their textual explication (especially when that assistance is reduced to transporting books) and delving into the text on one’s own. And though Norbrook recognizes the writing of directly religious poetry as a new phase in Hutchinson’s writing, he largely misses the

---

<sup>60</sup> In this long section of the manuscript, headed “Psalmes he had marked when he first began to be per[secuted],” Hutchinson copied out the verses her husband had marked in his Bible, organizing them under titles with contemporary relevance. This part of the manuscript has not been printed in any edition of the *Memoirs* to date but will be included in the forthcoming edition prepared by David Norbrook and Martyn Bennett for Oxford University Press.

significance of gender in her shift from witness to and participant in her husband's biblical study to initiator of her own course of study and composer of meditational verse.

### **From Scribe to Author: Putting on the “Sacred Spectacles”**

Lucy Hutchinson assumes a very different role in the composition of *Order and Disorder* than she had in the recording of her husband's annotations. Though Hutchinson is already a writer prior to *Order and Disorder*, and thus not generally unfamiliar with creative, textual production, the Genesis poem requires her to develop her writing identity in at least two major ways. First, she must present herself and her work with authority enough to enter the public arena through the medium of print. Some of Hutchinson's earlier work, including the Lucretius translation, had circulated in manuscript but *Order and Disorder* (Cantos 1-5) is her only work to be published in her lifetime.<sup>61</sup> Second, as *Order and Disorder* marks a turn to religious verse, Hutchinson must locate her authority to speak on a new topic, one she had only engaged previously from a prescribed position within the established Puritan framework of her marriage. Though the basic processes of biblical interpretation and related textual production would be familiar from the interactions she records in the *Memoirs*, here Hutchinson makes the discoveries and sets them down in her own voice, as she has carefully crafted them in verse. She moves from a scribal role to assume authorship of her own religious work, creating and transitioning to a new writing identity independent of her husband's authority. In the preface

---

<sup>61</sup> The *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson* and *On the Principles of the Christian Religion* are published in 1806 and 1817 respectively, prepared by the Reverend Julius Hutchinson, a descendant of Colonel Hutchinson's half-brother Charles. David Norbrook printed all of the *Elegies* along with his article “Lucy Hutchinson’s ‘Elegies’ and the Situation of the Republican Woman Writer” in *English Literary Renaissance* in 1997. And, of course, the entirety of *Order and Disorder* (all 20 cantos) was not printed until 2001.

Hutchinson self-consciously reflects on the writing of *Order and Disorder*, and it is important to pay attention to the terms she uses to describe this activity because of what they reveal about the relationship between memory and composition in her work.

In the preface Hutchinson accounts for her decision to write and articulates her method of composition, her relationship to the text, and her expectations for its readership. Hilary Hinds identifies discussions of how a writer came to write her account as a key site for investigating the formations of the relationship between author, self, and text (87). In the sectarian women's writing Hinds considers, the process is "typically not described as a *decision* or desire to write, but as a *call* or command to write, emanating from God and requiring obedient acceptance" (87). The image of the writer as an instrument frequently appears, an image which "provides both a means by which to efface the significance of the author-figure, and a way of relocating the responsibility for the writing with God, whose hand guides and shapes her literary activities"(89). Hutchinson's preface celebrates the source of the poem in meditations on God's truth (as expressed through the Scripture) and she urges her reader to redirect towards God any glory that might derive from the poem. Nevertheless, she is not so self-effacing that she displaces herself as the agent behind the composition of the poem. The choices that bring the poem into being are hers, and they are made clear throughout the preface. Hutchinson does *decide* to take up meditations on Genesis. She seeks after knowledge of God and compares "the revelation he gives of himself and his operations in his Word with what the wisest of mankind, who only walked in the dim light...could with all their industry trace out or invent." She judges the scriptural account of creation "transcendently

excelling all that was human” (3). As a result she resolves to limit future pursuits to what she can learn “out of [God’s] own word” (4). The preface is about Hutchinson’s’ self-initiated intellectual transformation; though scriptural language provides the basic material for her meditations, she does not let the reader forget that this language gets processed through her memory before finding expression again on the printed page.

In a similar vein, Hutchinson makes no reference to the urgings of friends and family members as a reason for publishing her work (a standard rhetorical move in women’s prefaces to their publications).<sup>62</sup> The decision to print, too, is hers. Hutchinson rationalizes publication with her own judgment that her meditations may be beneficially read by others, in spite of their origins as an attempt at personal vindication. This too is a trope. Kate Narveson identifies an author’s assumption that the thoughts that comforted her might comfort others as standard in devotional writing of the time, “as writers stated in prefatory letters that they published their meditations with the hope they would be helpful to readers in like circumstances” (176). Hutchinson writes, “If anyone of no higher a pitch than myself be as much affected and stirred up in the reading as I have been in the writing, to admire the glories and excellencies of our great Creator, to fall low before him, in the sense of our own vileness, and to adore his power, his wisdom, and his grace, in all his dealings with the children of men, it will be a success above my hopes; though my charity makes me wish that everyone that hath need of it the same mercy I have found” (4-5). Here Hutchinson does not so much see her meditations as doctrinal

---

<sup>62</sup> For a detailed discussion of how early modern Englishwomen adopted various prefatory strategies to authorize themselves their texts, see Julie Eckerle, “Prefacing Texts, Authorizing Authors, and Constructing Selves: The Preface as Autobiographical Space,” *Genre and Women’s Life Writing in Early Modern England*, Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007. 97-113.

instructions for her readers, but as records of thoughts and experiences, as traces preserved in print of her having been radically moved by the composition process. Her choice to record her meditations fits within the rationale proposed by Danielle Clarke: “The major injunction regarding spiritual development and self-examination was to dwell upon the word of God, to meditate upon it, and to have it always in mind....Clearly much of the poetry authored by women in this period was motivated by a desire to take the injunction to meditate continually upon the word a stage further by turning such thinking into an artefact with an independent existence” (125-6). Such an “artefact” could have devotional use beyond the poet herself. Hutchinson imagines readers who come to her work in the same state in which she began it, needing “the same mercy [she has] found.” As these readers move through the work, she hopes, her words might speak to their own experiences and they will be “affected and stirred up” to devotion just as she was. In the same phrases that outline what should happen “in the reading” of her poem, Hutchinson chronicles her transformation into a Christian poet. She too was a reader, before she was a writer. The affinity she acknowledges between herself and her readers suggests that the insight she has gained through her meditations, and that authorizes her writing of the poem, is available to all who follow her course of scriptural study.

The question, then, is how Hutchinson goes from being a reader to being a writer, how she gains the insight that authorizes her writing and publication. Hutchinson’s prefatory discussion of her meditations reveals an intense, transformative process that requires erasure and reinscription of her memory. This process changes her from reader of Scripture to composer of Scripture-based meditative verse. Hutchinson begins by

explaining the origins of the project: “These meditations were not at first designed for public view, but fixed upon to reclaim a busy roving thought from wandering in the pernicious and perplexed maze of human invention” (3). In spite of the early affirmation she records in her autobiographical fragment that “knowledge of God” was the best course of study, the “vain curiosity” of youth had drawn her to “consider and translate the account some old poets and philosophers give of the original of things.” This refers to her translation of Lucretius’s *De Rerum Natura*, the first English translation of that work. These meanderings “filled [her] brain with foolish fancies” which remain even after she has discontinued and recanted the work itself. Thus, to remedy the stubborn effects of her previous course of study, she “found it necessary to have recourse to the fountain of Truth, to wash out all the ugly wild impressions and fortify my mind with a strong antidote against all the poison of human wit and wisdom” (2). Hutchinson uses a traditional, commonplace figure for memory here: the rewritable tablet upon which words and ideas make impressions that can be erased and written over.<sup>63</sup> Hutchinson presents a two-step process requiring purification and fortification. She intends her Scriptural meditations to remove the erroneous information inscribed upon her memory but also to replace it with stronger stuff that will prevent her from being misled by what she reads in the future, as if the “Truth” she encounters here is inscribed more deeply or written in a more permanent medium. In this way, Hutchinson implies that the meditations

---

<sup>63</sup> For a discussion of traditional figures for memory in early modern women’s writing, see Kate Chedgzoy, “‘The rich Store-house of her memory’: The metaphors and practices of memory work,” Chapter 1 of her *Women’s Writing in the British Atlantic World: Memory, Place, and History, 1550-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007, pp. 16-47. For a general treatment of early modern memory models see Frances Yates, *The Art of Memory*, London: Routledge, 1966. The classical and medieval sources for these metaphors of memory are explored in Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008, pp. 18-55.

<sup>63</sup>

undertaken in the composition of *Order and Disorder* represent a new course in her religious study. While devotional reading has been part of her life previously, the “foolish fancies” persist nevertheless. For these meditations to have the desired effect, then, she must read differently. Hutchinson’s vow “Never to search after any knowledge of [God] and his productions, but what he himself hath given forth” announces a more disciplined investment in the study of Scripture and thus a more personal relationship with that text (3). Hutchinson figures this intellectual orientation in terms of redirecting her sight from deceptive objects: she has recognized “the light of Truth” and thus can warn those who “having shut their eyes against the sun, have, instead of looking up to it, hunted glow-worms in the ditch-bottoms” (4).

Having her eyes opened to “the light of Truth” gives Hutchinson the insight that authorizes her writing and the practice of meditation itself enacts her movement from reader to writer. In the preserved fragment of her autobiography Hutchinson reports her childhood ability to “remember and repeat exactly” sermons she had heard. There is a more complicated interaction between text and memory at work in the composition of *Order and Disorder*, revealed in the words Hutchinson uses to describe her process. Preemptively defending herself against charges that her poem lacks stylistic charm Hutchinson states: “I would rather breathe forth grace cordially than words artificially. I have not studied to utter anything that I have not really taken in” (5). Hutchinson’s preface creates the impression of immersion in Scriptural language to the extent that it becomes her own. The foundations of the poem are in Scriptural language, but the above quotation suggests that it would be a mistake to dismiss “the apparent overlay of female

voice and Biblical master-text” as derivative or inauthentic (White 6). What it means to have “really taken in” this language so that it can be expressed “cordially” is that Hutchinson accesses it not from the page but from her own memory, as it has been written in her heart. It becomes a language of personal experience, but not the only one. In her meditations, the Scriptural language encounters other languages Hutchinson has internalized and this is where the process of new text-making begins. In her work on medieval memory, Mary Carruthers identifies composition as one of the activities of meditation, involving the placing together of pieces that have been laid away in the memory. The pieces of whatever has been “taken in” are “ruminated” (Carruthers’s word) into a composition (234). What Hutchinson “utter[s] forth in her poem recalls, but does not repeat, the material with which she began; it is thoroughly intertextual. Most significantly for this chapter, it has been interwoven with the language of her previous written work and personal memories of conversations with her husband. Hutchinson speaks fluently in the language of the Scripture, but also in the language that Scripture inspires. Though moving from the initial memory-work of composition to the development and revision of her compositions into polished verse is a long process, Hutchinson’s course of meditations positions her towards that direction.

Hutchinson’s depiction of scriptural meditation as transformation appears also in the conceit of “sacred spectacles” that she develops in *On the Principles of the Christian Religion* (1673). *On the Principles* is addressed to Hutchinson’s daughter Barbara as a supplement to the spiritual education of her childhood, and thus it can be approached as

part of the mother's legacy genre popular in the period.<sup>64</sup> In the chronology included in his edition of *Order and Disorder*, David Norbrook suggests that Hutchinson was working on these religious texts in prose and verse at the same time. In *On the Principles*, Hutchinson advises her daughter that "though the whole Creation preach God to us" humankind is unable to apprehend the message without a bit of assistance.

The creation and our owne frames are like faire volumes to a dimme-sighted man, where the truths of God are written in legible characters; but wee cannot make any sence of them without the help of devine illuminations, which sacred spectacles once put on makes us read the discoveries of God with holy wonder and delight, and therefore he [God] hath added to his workes, his word given forth in the Scriptures of the New and Old Testament, and made that a perfect rule of faith and obedience for us. (11-12)

Simply understood, the metaphor suggests that Scripture acts as a lens through which one can perceive God's truth in the created world; the Word reveals the truth of the works. The conceit of "sacred spectacles" can be taken further to figure Hutchinson's appropriation from her husband of the roles of interpreter and authority. Prior to the Reformation's emphasis on individual reading of the Bible, only those in the church had access to the "sacred spectacles." Even in Hutchinson's own time, there were those who felt that scriptural interpretation should be reserved for authorized preachers or, at least, properly instructed patriarchs within the ideal, godly household. In this model, an authority dons the spectacles and tells what he sees; his understanding becomes *the* understanding. For the most part, the depiction of Hutchinson family reading practices in the *Memoirs* follows this model: John Hutchinson wears the spectacles. However, in the composition of *Order and Disorder*, Lucy Hutchinson puts them on and does not take

---

<sup>64</sup> For a discussion of *On the Principles of the Christian Religion* in the context of the mother's legacy book genre see Jennifer Heller, *The Mother's Legacy in Early Modern England*, Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011.

them off. To have internalized Scriptural language, to have “really taken [it] in” in Hutchinson’s words, means that one no longer needs to read directly from the Bible in order to access the spectacles. Instead, one can meditate upon the words as they are inscribed in her memory, and thus see through the spectacles at all times. A permanent transformation occurs.

Hutchinson has experienced this transformation. In *On the Principles* she urges it upon her daughter, and in *Order and Disorder* she demonstrates to a wider audience how it can be achieved. In both works, Hutchinson entrusts the individual believer with the responsibility to put on the spectacles and see for herself, emphasizing that spiritual insight is not reserved for an elite few: “God hath sett up a light in every man, which is a wittnesse of himselfe, imprinted on their own natures and the Scripture “hath the witnesse of the same Spirit that gave it forth in every sanctified reader” (*On the Principles* 11, 12). Likewise, Hutchinson explains the process by which she comes to write the poem as one that is open to all. In addition, she makes no apologies or special defenses on the basis of her gender. When she “acknowledges all the language I have, is much too narrow to express the least of those wonders my soul hath been ravished with in contemplation of God and his works” she attributes the insufficiency of her language to an inevitable human, rather than feminine, inability to accurately represent the divine. The overall effect is to suggest that there is no reason why God’s truth could not be discerned by her, or by anyone else who applies himself or herself to the contemplation and understanding of his Word. The difficulty lies not in perceiving the truth, but in putting it into words.

This metaphor of “sacred spectacles” remains important beyond the preface of *Order and Disorder*, as in Canto 5 Hutchinson figures Eve’s incomplete understanding of God’s presence in the postlapsarian world as a vision problem. As we will see, Eve’s grief blinds her to the truth but Hutchinson, via Adam, provides correction through the recollection and application of God’s words. He gives her spectacles. This exchange initially seems to repeat the model of unequal authority supported by the representation of the Hutchinson’s textual practices in the *Memoirs*. However, as we read on to see Hutchinson’s narrator offer the final illuminating word in her closing meditations on what Adam has said, we see that earlier model superseded by one in which Hutchinson herself assumes full textual authority. This dramatization reminds readers of the appropriative action which underlies the composition of the entire poem, as Lucy Hutchinson claims the spectacles for herself.

### **Struggles with Appropriation**

As one might expect, appropriating a role previously ascribed only to one’s saintly, deceased husband could be fraught with anxiety. The Bakhtinian concept of heteroglossia can help us understand how Hutchinson’s mediated use of Scripture in the composition of her poem ultimately engenders authorial agency, as well as some of the difficulties she encounters along the way. Bakhtin argues that at any moment of its existence, “language is heteroglot from top to bottom;” rather than one unified language, we find innumerable languages (of different socio-ideological groups, of different generations and epochs, and so forth) intersecting and interacting, conditioning meaning. The individual encounters the world through this social dialogue. The condition of

heteroglossia is such that, “of all the words uttered in everyday life, no less than half belong to someone else” (339). Thus every utterance begins with the appropriation of existing words, taking shape and meaning from the set of conditions that exist at that particular moment and place. Words are not neutral, impersonal, unmarked--as Bakhtin says, “It is not out of the dictionary that the speaker gets his words!” (294). Instead, words live “in other peoples mouth’s, in other people’s contexts, serving other people’s intentions: it is from there that someone must take the word and make it his own” (294). We might add, paraphrasing Bakhtin, that it is not purely out of the Bible that the meditative poet gets her words either. When Hutchinson “takes in” the words of Scripture, the action involves much more than rote memorization of fixed words on a page. Each word is internalized through interaction with a myriad of personal and cultural meanings, associations, and ideas, all of which must be dealt with during the creative process of meditation.

Within the Bakhtinian framework, we form our own discourse from those of others, but the discourses of others can perform in two distinct ways with regard to that formation. Here Bakhtin distinguishes between authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse. In her discussion of these concepts, Susan Felch reminds us that “because language is heteroglot and formed from the words of others, both authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse begin with words and ideas and that originate outside of ourselves; they come from tradition, from our immediate family, from the formal and informal languages in the larger culture that surround us” (159). Authoritative discourse, however, appears as distanced and fixed. Such discourse “is

given (it sounds) in lofty spheres, not those of familiar contact” (Bakhtin 342). We may recite it by heart, or reject it entirely, but authoritative discourse can never be fully assimilated as our own words. Although it may occasion and organize around itself additional discourses, “the authoritative discourse itself does not merge with these...it remains sharply demarcated, compact and inert: it demands, so to speak, not only quotation marks but a demarcation even more magisterial, a special script for instance” (343).

While we might imagine the Bible performing as authoritative discourse (and it certainly has done so in some contexts), the discussion of Puritan textual practices above should suggest that Hutchinson would not have experienced it in this way. Hardly reserved for “lofty spheres,” Biblical language animates the relationships that structure the household, providing the vehicle through which “familiar contact” occurs. Additionally, in works like the Geneva Bible, the Dutch annotations read by John Hutchinson, or the annotations he composes himself, the secondary commentary does merge with the primary text. Lucy Hutchinson’s poem attests to an interaction with an open, active, living discourse, one that performs, in Bakhtin’s term, as internally persuasive discourse. In contrast, to authoritative discourse, internally persuasive discourse is “affirmed through assimilation” and “tightly interwoven with ‘one’s own word’” (345). The “creativity and productiveness” of the internally persuasive word, exist precisely in the fact that such a word awakens new and independent words, that it organizes masses of our words from within, and does not remain in an isolated and static condition. It is not so much interpreted by us as it is further, that is freely, developed, applied to new material, new conditions; it enters into interanimating relationships with new contexts. More than that, it enters into an

intense interaction, a *struggle* with other internally persuasive discourses. (345-6, emphasis in original)

*Order and Disorder* shows how “tightly interwoven” the language of the Fall has become with Hutchinson’s “own word” and how her meditations on Genesis give rise to “new and independent words” which, as she depicts it, she could not have spoken before. To pick up one of Hutchinson’s own metaphors for her meditations, when the “fountain of Truth” rushes in, it doesn’t merely carry away the remnants of her Latin translations; it breaks over all of the other discourses built up in her memory from a lifetime of listening, reading, and writing. In the wash, some of these get broken down, others get built up but ultimately when the water recedes the landscape has been changed; new formations emerge. The emergence of this illuminated, authoritative voice that not only interprets but develops the significance of Scriptural language depends upon struggle of the sort Bakhtin describes.

In the context of this chapter, Bakhtin’s note regarding perhaps the only speaker to experience unmediated language becomes neatly ironic: “Only the mythical Adam, who approached a virginal and as yet verbally unqualified world with the first word, could really have escaped from start to finish this dialogic inter-orientation with the alien word that occurs in the object” (279). At the time Hutchinson takes up her meditative project, it would difficult to imagine language more highly mediated than that of the Genesis narrative of the Fall. It had been circulating “in other people’s mouths” and in their written words for centuries, becoming vastly overpopulated with intentions and ideological meanings. As Michelle Dowd and Thomas Festa point out in the introduction to their collection of female-authored appropriations of the Fall “it would hardly be an

exaggeration to say that biblical history provided the dominant means of interpreting individual, familial, and political identity in early modern society. These stories, and above all, the story of the Fall, shaped everyone's relationship to each other" (2). Dowd and Festa's claim suggests the full integration of the Fall narrative into everyday and elevated languages in early modern English society. Such ubiquity makes the narrative appear readily available for further appropriation, but does not necessarily ease the act of appropriation for the individual speaker. Not only must the speaker navigate her way through "the Tower-of-Babel mixing of languages that goes on around any object" but she must also deal with the "intense interaction" among all of those languages and her own, already constructed language (Bakhtin 278). On this note, Bakhtin cautions that "not all words for just anyone subject equally easily to this appropriation, to this seizure and transformation into private property: many words stubbornly resist, sound foreign in the mouth of the one who appropriated them and who now speaks them...it is as if they put themselves in quotation marks against the will of the speaker" (294). Hutchinson's representation of Eve's and Adam's speech, as it is interwoven with the language of her previous written work and overlaid with her representation of the dynamics of her own marriage, dramatizes briefly this struggle with appropriation that underlies the composition of *Order and Disorder*. As we will see, the narrator calls attention to the "quotation marks" around her speech. Through such gestures in the closing section of the poem, we can see how Hutchinson derives her artistic authority not by distancing herself from her sources but by selectively assimilating the many voices that sound in her meditations.

A description of meditation given by Danielle Clarke is useful here: “In a sense, meditation was not a private matter, but the means through which the individual negotiated her relationship not only to the text in front of her and the faith that it represented, but also to the wider world. The act of devotion as evinced by reading and writing was one which led to the formulation of morality, ethics, selfhood and authority; as such, it was part of a lifelong process” (125). The composition of *Order and Disorder* can be understood in light of this process of negotiation. Since her husband’s death, Hutchinson’s relationships both to the (Biblical) text in front of her and to the wider world had changed concurrently. As a widow she finds herself with the opportunity, or the necessity, to use devotional reading and writing to formulate a new kind of authority, one which she represents herself having happily surrendered during her husband’s lifetime. Having played the scribe for her husband throughout their marriage, Hutchinson takes up the pen on her own behalf in the meditations that comprise *Order and Disorder*. It is clear from the preface to her Genesis poem that Hutchinson has assumed a more active role as meaning-maker and creator of discourse. The remainder of this chapter sheds more light on the significance of her assumption of that role and explores what it looks like in the Canto 5 conclusion of the poem.

## **Part II**

### **The Staging of Memory**

After the Fall Hutchinson does something she hesitates to do previously in the poem; she departs from the biblical text to imagine a conversation between Adam and Eve, the first one they have had. Elsewhere in the poem, Hutchinson expresses

reservations about going too far beyond the biblical text in attributing to her characters desires and actions that they do not have or take in Genesis. She claims to prefer to leave elements of her narrative ambiguous, preserving awe in the face of God's mysteries rather than indulging in unfounded invention or speculation.<sup>65</sup> Hutchinson explains that she undertook her meditations as an “antidote against all the poison of human wit and wisdom” and warns: “Those that will be wise above what is written may hug their philosophical clouds, but let them take heed they not find themselves without God in the world, adoring figments of their own brains, instead of the living and true God” (Preface 3-4). She admits that those who “understand and love the elegancies of poems” may be disappointed with her work because of its unadorned nature: “I would rather breathe forth grace cordially than words artificially. I have not studied to utter anything I have not really taken in...Had I had a fancy, I durst not have exercised it here; for I tremble to think of turning Scripture into a romance” (Preface 5). Hutchinson’s internalization of scriptural language so that she may “breathe” it forth from the heart has been discussed at length above. Here I am interested in exploring how this conversation which Hutchinson certainly does not “take in” directly from Genesis serves as the culmination of the poem and enacts, in brief, the development of an authorial agency which Hutchinson has been exercising since line one.

---

<sup>65</sup> For example, she does not attempt to account for anything prior to the Creation: “What dark Eternity hath kept concealed / From mortals apprehensions, what hath been / Before the race of time did first begin, / It were presumptuous folly to inquire. / Let not my thoughts beyond their bounds aspire: / Time limits mortals, and Time had its birth, / In whose *Beginning God made Heaven and Earth.*” (1.38-44) On the creation of angels, Hutchinson writes, “But leave we looking through the veil, nor pry / Too long on things wrapped up in mystery, / Reserved to be our wonder at that time / When we shall up to their high mountain climb / ...Then from the height we cannot comprehend, / Let us to our inferior world descend” (1.291-94, 299-300). With regard to Eve’s creation: “Whether he [Adam] begged a mate it is not known. / Likely his want might send him to the spring/...Howe’er it was, God saw his solitude / And gave his sentence that it was not good” (3.312-13, 317-18).

Given the stated resistance to exercise her “fancy,” how are we to account for Hutchinson’s representation of a conversation between Adam and Eve at the end of Canto 5? The language used to introduce each character’s speech emphasizes that they are coming into the poem from elsewhere, outside the space of the previous meditations. There is a hesitant, experimental quality granted by the transitions into direct speech. Eve’s lament, which begins the conversation, drifts into the narrative as a voice from the darkness: “Methinks I hear sad Eve in some dark vale / Her woeful state with such sad plaints bewail.” (5.399-400). Adam’s reply is no more concrete, couched as it is in conditional terms: “If these words Adam’s melting soul did move, / He might reply with kind rebuking love.” *If* Eve voiced her despair in such terms, and *if* her speech moved Adam, he *might* correct and comfort her; through their dialogue, they *might* reunite in love and come to terms with their expulsion from Eden. The language with which Hutchinson frames this scene of reconciliation conveys her continued unwillingness to express with certainty anything that the Scripture does not confirm, but it also expresses her wish to be free from this self-imposed constraint. The fact that Hutchinson does go beyond her sacred source material at this point suggests that the lack of such a conversation in the Scripture is particularly unsatisfying.

It seems obvious but worth stating that a conversation between Adam and Eve does not have to be part of the Fall narrative. Other early modern female poets who appropriate the Fall narrative either address Eve directly in the voices of their narrators or use different combinations of narratorial comment and direct or reported speech from Adam, Eve, and/or God. Aemelia Lanyer employs the figure of Pilate’s wife to speak for

Eve in her impassioned plea against his condemnation of Jesus. Rachel Speght speaks on Eve's behalf, unpacking Eve's intentions to challenge to diatribe levelled against her (and all her sex by extension) by Joseph Swetnam. Alice Sutcliffe's poetic speaker addresses Adam and Eve individually and as a couple, but the figures do not speak to one another. Mary Roper admonishes Adam to "take heed" of disobeying God before she conjures up the temptation scene with the same magic word Hutchinson employs, "Methinks." Roper crafts a speaking part for Eve prior to the Fall mainly to dramatize her ironic reversal of the "helper" role, showing readers how "Had Eve not listened to the serpent's call, / She had not helped Adam to his Fall" ("Man's Shameful Fall, *The Sacred History*, 39-40) Eve rehearses what she has been told about eating from the forbidden tree but after yielding to the serpent's persuasion, she uses her own sweet words to lure Adam. After the Fall only God's voice echoes with the poetic speaker's words. Dorothy Calthorpe's fascinating prose work *A Description of the Garden of Eden* features only an Adam who looks back and laments what his sin has lost for himself and his progeny. The *Description* reads like a guide to Eden as a garden on a seventeenth-century estate, and in addition to all the lovely visual features the visitor is directed towards "poor Adam" perpetually lamenting his loss, perhaps pressed up against the gate which remains shut against him. (134-5).<sup>66</sup> Written on the other side of the Atlantic, Anne Bradstreet's poem "Contemplations" introduces the reader to the figure of Eve as she exists in collective memory, appearing

---

<sup>66</sup> See Aemelia Lanyer, "Eve's Apology" from *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*; Rachel Speght *A Muzzle For Melastomus*; Alice Sutcliffe "Of Our Loss by Adam, and Our Gain by Christ" from *Meditations of Man's Mortality, Or a Way to True Blessedness*; Mary Roper "Man's Shamefull Fall" from *The Sacred History*; Dorothy Calthorpe "A Description of the Garden of Eden"; all reprinted in *Early Modern Women on the Fall: An Anthology*, ed. Michelle M. Dowd and Thomas Festa, Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2012.

when “present times look back to ages past” (64).<sup>67</sup> The rememberer/reader meets her post-Fall, as a new mother:

Here sits our grandame in retired place,  
And in her lap her bloody Cain new-born;  
The weeping imp oft looks her in the face,  
Bewails his unknown hap and fate forlorn;  
His mother sighs to think of Paradise,  
And how she lost her bliss to be more wise,  
Believing him that was, and is, father of lies. (78-84)

In this passage, Eve is unnamed but identified through her fulfillment of the maternal role. Likewise, without explicitly rehearsing Eve’s curse, Bradstreet creates a causal link between the sight of “bloody Cain new-born” on his mother’s lap and her recollections of Paradise. Eve does not speak, but Bradstreet interprets her sigh as expressive of the feeling evoked when Eve contrasts her present state with what she has lost. This survey of early modern Fall narratives argues for the significance of Hutchinson’s choice to compose a dialogue between the exiled Adam and Eve when other options are just as available to her.

One source from which Hutchinson may have “taken in” such a conversation between Adam and Eve is John Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, printed in 1667, eight years before the publication of *Order and Disorder*. Readers familiar with Milton’s work are perhaps more likely to perceive the relative lack of direct speech in Hutchinson’s poem, especially between its protagonists, as an acute absence. God speaks a few lines to Adam and Eve before the Fall, and Adam speaks once to Eve when he declares her “my better self, my flesh, my bone” (3.405). Eve’s entire conversation with the serpent occurs within fifteen lines. There is nothing in *Order and Disorder* like the lengthy dialogues Milton

---

<sup>67</sup> Cited from *The Works of Anne Bradstreet*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 2010

crafts between Adam and Eve. In the first five cantos, Hutchinson's own narrative voice is the one heard most often. This makes her sudden shift to extended direct speech after the Fall more remarkable. Both Hutchinson and Milton use dialogue between Adam and Eve to depict the nature of changes that have taken place in the aftermath of the Fall. The basic circumstances are the same in both poems: A crisis has just occurred, the known world has been fundamentally altered as a result of Adam and Eve's actions, and they are being forced to leave the secure, comfortable home they have shared. And so they talk to each other.

The two poems diverge in the efficacy granted to their post-Fall conversation in guiding them towards consolation and understanding. In turn, the poems present different visions of how the Fall affected the dynamics of the first marriage and thus of the institution which is derived from this model. Hutchinson's Adam and Eve have their first and only conversation after the Fall, and through it hope is restored. Milton's Adam and Eve have productive conversations only before the Fall; after this event they talk to each other but real learning and consolation comes through other means. An angel teaches Adam how to interpret his new reality, while Eve learns from a dream; they have been separated. Maria Magro suggests that this separation occurs along lines which had already been drawn between Adam and Eve: "After the Fall Eve appears to be banished from consideration of mighty intellectual matters such as the vision of human history offered to Adam by Michael. No explicit reason is given for her absence but the reader can assume that Eve's intellectual inferiority, demonstrated through the incident with the serpent, has been firmly established" (Magro 109). Perhaps readers could overlook Eve's

difference from Adam prior to the Fall because although there are some crucial moments in the narrative when Eve is either absent, or treated as if she were absent, she and Adam are almost always together in the books dealing with that part of their lives. But from the “first argument” in Book 9 to the conclusion of the poem, Milton does not allow the split between Adam and Eve to be overlooked. Eve is not welcome to participate in the lesson offered by “the vision of human history” Michael delivers. And, in addition, Adam’s participation in that lesson, his process of learning and understanding, takes place without a thought for Eve’s place in his future. He comes to understand his role in the fallen world without reference to a partner. Eve’s “banishment” from the consideration of such matters coincides with Michael’s pronouncement that she and Adam have been banished from the garden. The former “banishment” ensures that she will receive individual instruction on how to cope with the latter “banishment”—suggesting that her entire experience of the latter will be different from her husband’s.<sup>68</sup>

While Hutchinson may be engaging Milton’s depiction of the postlapsarian marital relationship as it emerges from Adam and Eve’s conversations, I am more interested in the intertextual relationship between the Biblical Fall narrative, the closing section of Canto 5, and Hutchinson’s other writing in *the Elegies* and *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*. As Hutchinson meditates on the significance of expulsion from Eden, she finds models for how Adam and Eve might have responded to their new

---

<sup>68</sup> Shannon Miller convincingly analyzes the scene of Eve’s silencing as Milton’s engagement with the pamphlet debates of the early to mid-seventeenth century. Milton initially casts Eve in the role of defender, demonstrating an awareness of this convention in works by Rachel Speght and Esther Sowernam. In his response, Adam adopts the language of anti-feminist, misogynistic pamphleteers like Joseph Swetnam. He succeeds in silencing Eve, who must then speak the spiritual hierarchy which affirms her subordination, saying that they “both have sinn’dd, but thou / Against god only, I against God and thee” (10.930-31). As Miller says, the status of Adam’s diatribe in the poem remains unclear but it has its desired effect and order is restored.

circumstances and to one another from other memories already inscribed upon her heart. In this way, the concluding 300 lines or so of Canto 5 epitomize the collision of scriptural language and personal memories (also encountered in the form of texts) that occurs in the composition of *Order and Disorder*. Hutchinson's Adam and Eve appear as recollections of herself and her husband as they exist in previous textual representations. On its own, Eve's lament recalls the poetic voice of the "Elegies." Read in combination as a dialogue, Eve's lament and Adam's reply conjure up Mrs. and Colonel Hutchinson coping with upheaval as they do in the final period recorded in the *Memoirs*. At the conclusion of Adam's reply the narrator's voice erupts emotionally back into the poem, questioning her ability to speak Adam's hopeful words in the poem while she drowns in her own "fruitless tears" (5.599). John's presence in the poem, brought back to life in Adam's voice, appears only to emphasize his absence outside of it and for a moment the narrator teeters on the tear-slick edge of Eve-like despair. In this moment the reader wonders: Is Hutchinson doomed to remain always in the shadows of grief and self-doubt, able to imagine consolation for others but never genuinely to find it for herself without an Adam to lead her there? But as the narrator continues we see her pull herself up through a series of closing meditations on the nature of tears, the sin of ingratitude, and the peace that comes from submitting oneself to God's design. In the 1679 published version of the poem, this is the end.<sup>69</sup> As I will discuss below, these final reflections are central to understanding how Hutchinson uses the Fall narrative to tell her own story of coming to terms with her changed position after her husband's death. By the end of the poem, she demonstrates how she has incorporated her husband's voice and assumed his role of

---

<sup>69</sup> The remaining 15 cantos were preserved solely in manuscript until David Norbrook's edition in 2001.

textual authority, able to interpret God's word and apply his truth for herself and for her readers. As Annette Kuhn argues, "Memory work is a conscious and purposeful staging of memory" (186). What motivates Hutchinson to stage these particular memories of herself and her husband in this way and what is the effect of doing so?

A return to Bakhtin's notion of the development of one's own language helps us answer this question. In his account, one's creative voice develops through an intense struggle among various available languages and points of view. The act of representing of these languages forms an important part in the struggle. Representation of the internally persuasive word requires "a few changes in orientation," the repositioning of the word outside of oneself (347). Bakhtin explains that there are certain kinds of internally persuasive discourse that can be fused with the image of a speaking person. In the conversation created in Canto 5, discourses from Hutchinson's own textually mediated past that have become fused with the persons of "wife" and "husband" become attached to Eve and Adam. Hutchinson experiments with these figures, imagining how each might speak in the given circumstances, how each discourse might resonate. Bakhtin ascribes special value to "this process—experimenting by turning persuasive discourse into speaking persons" in cases "where a struggle against such images has already begun, where someone is striving to liberate himself from the influence of such an image and its discourse by means of objectification, or is striving to expose the limitations of both image and discourse" (348). In the very composition of *Order and Disorder*, Hutchinson has taken up the struggle against previous images of herself and her husband as speakers and of their associated discourses. This chapter reads the dialogue between Eve and

Adam as Hutchinson’s intentional objectification of these discourses, which elsewhere appear fundamental to her marriage, for the purpose of critically examining the limitations contained within them.

### **Eve’s Lament and Hutchinson’s *Elegies***

Eve’s “sad plaints” sound first, lamenting lost joys and searching for consolation after having been expelled from Eden. At first, there is no indication that her cry will turn into a conversation; we, along with the narrator, just hear “sad Eve in some dark vale / Her woeful state with such sad plaints bewail” (5.399-400). Her speech is occasioned by the seeming absence of God and, from what we can initially tell, of her husband. By the end of the speech there are clues from pronouns that Adam is present and that she is speaking to him, but the movement of the speech enacts a metaphorical separation between them, as will be discussed below. Isolated in the shadows, Eve resembles the speaker of Lucy Hutchinson’s *Elegies*.

Hutchinson’s claim that Adam and Eve “found themselves strangers in their native earth” conveys the disorientation resulting from expulsion from Paradise (5.314). For Eve, the contingency of mortality most profoundly marks the changes to her world, and it provides the subject matter for the opening of her lament. In Canto 3 Eve stands beside Adam to receive God’s blessing and hear his admonition: from “the tree of knowing good and ill/ .../ you must not eat, for in the day you do, / Inevitable death shall seize on you” (3.429, 431-32).<sup>70</sup> By Canto 5, having eaten from that tree, Eve waits

---

<sup>70</sup> Unlike in *Paradise Lost*. In Milton’s poem God’s pronouncement is reported indirectly through Adam’s recollection of his origins and early time in the garden. Eve knows the prohibition, but is never shown hearing or having heard it directly from God.

impatiently to be seized, as shown by her opening question: “Ah! Why doth death its latest stroke delay?” (5.401). Recent work on the gendering of the early modern English discourse of death provides insight into why this might be an appropriate topic on which for Eve to find her voice. Patricia Phillippe has shown that death altered the conventional proscriptions on female speech, arguing that the large number of texts written by early modern women on the subjects of death and mourning “bespeak not only the widely perceived intimacy of women with death’s physical ravishments, but also the unusual license to write and publish afforded to women in proximity to death—from lamenting wives and mothers to women who spoke with the heightened authority granted from the deathbed” (142). Expecting imminent death but not knowing when or how it will come, Eve is, as far as she understands it, speaking from her deathbed.<sup>71</sup>

Having received God’s divine sentence, Eve reflects on her present state in despair and wishes for the escape death would bring. Throughout her complaint Eve exhausts all the possible sources of comfort and reassurance that she can imagine. As she looks around her and catalogues the unfamiliar sights, each glance causes a further disintegration of her identity. She sets out her general problem: “Wherever I my eyes or thoughts convert, / Each object adds new tortures to my heart” (5.421-422). That Eve casts her “eyes” and “thoughts” in search of reassurance suggests that she simultaneously surveys the garden before her and the one in her memory. In the early modern *ars memoria*, a popular exercise made use of visual imaging to imagine a building or

---

<sup>71</sup>One could read the exchange between Adam and Eve as a debate over how to approach death, therefore placing it in relation to such other female-authored texts in the *ars moriendi* tradition as Rachel Speght’s *Mortalities Memorandum* and Alice Sutcliffe’s *Meditations of Man’s Mortality, or a Way to True Blessedness* (1634).

landscape in which every feature was associated with a particular piece of information. As designed spaces, gardens could serve as mnemonic structures in this way. Though Eve attempts to remember an actual garden, not one constructed in her imagination, she nevertheless attaches certain feelings and facts of her existence with specific sights in that space. She “converts” her thoughts through the memoryscape of her lost garden, but it does not correspond with the landscape before her eyes. Eve tries to attach what she sees to her previous experience, but the differences render her unable to make any sense of it. She experiences a failure of memory that renders her unable to access the past in any productive way or to imagine a meaningful future.

Eve begins her search by looking up to heaven, the former source of all her joys, but “dread” of “Heaven’s threatening frown” makes this familiar gesture strange (423). A new feeling, “shame,” forces her gaze back down and makes “thorns prick [her] eyes,” an image that reinforces the cause of Eve’s suffering as a sort of blinding (424). Casting her eyes on the earth affords no respite either. While Eden had been a locus of “peace and safety,” once outside the gates Eve senses a pervasive antagonism (5.370). She sees only foes in this strange new environment: “looking on either hand / Before me all in fighting posture stand” (5.425-26). When Eve turns her “sorrow-drownèd eyes” back to Eden, she sees “our ne’er to be recovered Paradise, / The flaming sword which doth us thence exclude, / By sad remorse and ugly guilt pursued” (5.428-30). In these lines, the flaming sword which guards the entrance to Paradise and dominates Eve’s view prevents her from recovering a positive memory of the place. Even in her mind, she cannot look past the fiery obstacle.

After this succession of unsettling sights, Hutchinson has Eve turn her eyes upon herself. Having been exiled, she no longer recognizes her former home or sources of comfort, and in the following lines she admits that she no longer recognizes herself. She laments, “If on my sin-defiled self I gaze, / My nakedness and spots do me amaze” (5.431-32). Hutchinson suggests a feeling of transformation, such that Eve’s body is no longer her own. When she looks at herself, two reminders of her sin bewilder her and send her into a panic. To begin with, her very awareness of her “nakedness” only develops after the Fall and, from Hutchinson’s perspective, indicates a new vulnerability. Earlier, in Canto 4, Hutchinson depicts Adam and Eve’s recognition of their nakedness as a moment of violence and violation:

While they remained in their pure innocence  
It was their robe of glory and defence;  
But when sin tore that mantle off, they found  
Their members were all naked, all uncrowned,  
Their purity in every place defiled,  
Their vest of righteousness all torn and spoiled. (4.255-60)

Hutchinson’s metaphor here suggests that while Adam and Eve were not literally clothed, their innocence, purity, and righteousness protected their souls like garments protect the body. The robe, mantle, and vest were all of one cloth, and were one with their wearers, Adam and Eve, suggesting an encompassing wholeness. Now, sin has exposed them on all fronts and weakened their defenses. Eve is battle-torn and the figure she uses to describe her wounds, “spots,” continues the imagery of defilement and spoilage from Hutchinson’s earlier assessment.<sup>72</sup> Having searched in vain for comfort from her

---

<sup>72</sup> Mary Roper, in “The Creation of Man,” uses similar language of spots and defilement: “The smallest sins do make defiled spots, / But greater sins do make such odious blots / That like a leper the soul doth appear / And dares not come before the Lord for fear” (93-96).

surroundings, Eve looks within but finds her hopes equally dismayed. She no longer can access that sense of a whole self that existed prior to the Fall; “every place” has been defiled. This rupture from her prior self prevents her from recalling the virtues (innocence, purity, righteousness) that formed her defense before she sinned. In this way, Hutchinson makes Eve’s nakedness and “spots” function similarly to the flaming sword that excludes her and Adam from the garden: all are experienced as barriers to Eve’s ability to reconstruct her past and cope with the present.

In desperation, Eve finally looks to Adam. By making Eve turn to Adam last, even after looking at herself, Hutchinson suggests the foundational role the relationship to him plays in the formation of Eve’s identity. Adam exists before Eve does; she knows she has been made from him. Thus when she looks back on him in this moment, it may be with the intention to recover some recognizable piece of herself in him. However, Eve finds this view blocked as well—she can no longer see in Adam what she saw before. Even the act of looking has changed. Unable to meet his eyes, she can only turn back “a private glance” (5.433). As shame keeps her from looking to Heaven, so “confusion doth [her] shameful eyes deject” from the sight of her husband (5.434). She draws no comfort from her furtive peek because she sees in Adam’s suffering only the reflection of her own failure as a wife. Eve laments the sight of

the man I love by me betrayed,  
By me who for his mutual help was made,  
Who to preserve thy life ought to have died,  
And I have killed thee by my foolish pride,  
Defiled thy glory and pulled down thy throne. (5.435-439)

From Eve's perspective, she has acted contrary to the basic purpose for which she was created. The repetition of "by me" in lines 435 and 436 conveys Eve's sense of the severity of her fault, and perhaps a sense of disbelief that she has strayed so far. She has to say it twice to come to terms with its significance. In previous lines she characterizes herself as "sin-defiled" and here she claims that she "defiled" Adam, as if her condition were contagious. Her regret that she has "pulled down [Adam's] throne" also recalls Hutchinson's earlier use of the adjective "uncrowned" to describe the action of sin upon both Adam and Eve. Here Hutchinson lets Eve claim sole agency for that action. In her view, she ought to have sacrificed herself in order to prevent Adam's sin, but as she failed to perform this last act of defense, he has been tainted by her error. Her wish that she had "sinned and died alone" recalls that state in which she encountered the serpent and reflects what she believes could have happened had she not brought the fruit back to her husband (5.440). Eve concludes her lament imagining that Adam could have remained happy without her, and that his prolonged glory would have justified her ceasing to exist.

In these strange circumstances, with no readily available interpretive framework, Eve expresses alienation from God, from herself, and from her husband. This feeling is a symptom, but Hutchinson emphatically identifies the root of Eve's affliction as a vision problem. Though Eve's sin and the ensuing expulsion from Paradise do not completely blind her, they cause her to lose focus. Eve's vision requires correction; without it everything appears distorted. Looking up, down, and all around, with her eyes and her thoughts, she finds no familiar landmark by which to chart her course in a new reality

premised on eviction from her home and the inevitability of pain and death. Earlier in the poem, Hutchinson prepares her readers to interpret Eve's vision problem as a symptom of her fallen state. In Canto 3, Hutchinson refers to the Fall as the moment in which "we grew blind" and became subject to "weak judgments and sick senses," the moment in which human ambition "to know more" "brought dullness, ignorance, and error in," clouding the ability to observe and comprehend the nature of things in the created world (3.221, 226-28). This implies that, before the Fall, Adam and Eve could more readily, even intuitively, discern the presence of God in the world. After the Fall, Eve no longer has the eyes to see such sights nor can she make use of her memories of them. To recall the language of Hutchinson's *On the Principles of the Christian Religion*, Eve needs "sacred spectacles."

So far, so much like the grieving voice of Lucy Hutchinson's *Elegies*. Some of the lines from Eve's lament even appear in one of these poems, number 7 in the version edited by David Norbrook. In the 1730s these lines were circulating in manuscript within the Hutchinson family, with one relative assuming "these verses were writ by Mrs. Hutchinson on the occasion of the Coll. her husbands being then a prisoner in the Tower: 1664" (n. ccxcvi 79). Citing this elegy in particular, Kate Chedgzoy suggests that Hutchinson's poetic reflections on the gardens of the family home at Owthorpe portray it as a type of Eden. Though Chedgzoy identifies Hutchinson's "awareness of exclusion from this domestic Eden" as being "expressed in Biblical terms in the elegy beginning 'ah! why doth death its painful stroke delay,'" she does not advance the relationship between Elegy 7 and *Order and Disorder* as fully as she could. Hutchinson's exclusion is

not merely expressed in biblical terms; it is expressed in terms of her meditations on biblical material as they are voiced by Eve in Canto 5 of *Order and Disorder*. The language shared between one of the *Elegies* and Eve's lament suggests a link between the two personas. Hutchinson imagines Eve speaking words that she utters in her own voice in what is generally agreed to be her more directly personal poetry. Looking across Hutchinson's writings, Chedzoy notes the intertwining of "the question of her more intimate grief. Can it ever be moderated and if so, how?" (162). Moderation is not achieved in the *Elegies*, as Hutchinson struggles throughout with the pain of her loss and the difficulty of finding consolation. Chedzoy effectively identifies Hutchinson's self-representation in the *Elegies* as "a ghostly shade" rejecting inadequate consolation and drawing energy from her grief (162). If Canto 5 ended with Eve's lament, we would be left with a similar representation.

Susan Wiseman's responds to the poem as if this were the case. She writes, "Just as it is hard to read *Paradise Lost* without remembering the debates of the Civil War, so it is hard to read the voices of Adam, Eve, and the narrator without recalling the personal and political disaster that struck Hutchinson at the Restoration and which is so vividly explored in the *Elegies*...In Eve's unproductive desire to return to an earlier moment, in her 'remorse,' 'sorrow,' and 'guilt,' we can hear echoes of the political and personal complaint, perhaps despair, of the *Elegies*" (229.) While I agree with Wiseman as far as she goes in her reading of the association between Hutchinson, her narrator, and Eve, she does not follow that association through to the end of Canto 5. Although Wiseman hints at a correlation between Adam and John Hutchinson in her reference to Hutchinson's

personal disaster, she does not consider what it means for Hutchinson to speak in Adam's voice in response to Eve, and then even to supersede Adam's voice and conclude with triumphant reflections in her own narrator's voice. I argue that in *Order and Disorder* Hutchinson recognizes the "unproductive" nature of her own "desire" in Eve's lament and lifts herself out of potential indulgence in it. In the interaction between Adam and Eve, and its resonance with what Hutchinson shares of her meditational composition process, she demonstrates how to move beyond what Chedgzoy calls "the ongoing experience of mourning as a kind of death in life" (Chedgzoy 162). Wiseman's reading stops too soon and in doing so continues a characterization of Hutchinson as endlessly haunted by memories of loss and pain.

### **Speaking "in Adam's Person"**

The appearance of an answering Adam reframes Eve's lament as the first part in a dialogue. Adam's imagined response to Eve's grief departs from the voice of Hutchinson's *Elegies* to invoke different textual ghosts, the figures of the Colonel and Mrs. Hutchinson as recalled in the *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*. Adam speaks as the Colonel speaks, or, as Hutchinson depicts him speaking, in response to an Eve who sounds like Mrs. Hutchinson. Though the illumination Adam provides here of course comes from Hutchinson herself, her choice to deliver it "in Adam's person" (via the person of "Colonel Hutchinson," the character depicted in the *Memoirs*) cannot be overlooked. The next section of this chapter considers the purpose and effect of this decision in relation to the development of Hutchinson's own authorial voice.

Hutchinson figures Eve's inability to interpret her situation as a vision problem, recalling the conceit of "sacred spectacles"; her grief blinds her to the truth but Adam provides correction through the recollection and application of what God has told them. He demonstrates the practice of using the Word to interpret God's works. Through his meditations on God's words and reflections on his prior treatment of them, Adam enables Eve to focus and see what she could not in her initial lament, in effect providing her with the "sacred spectacles" she needs. Adam does not deny the presence of the dangers, foes, frowns, spots, and thorns that Eve chronicled in her survey of their surroundings and that prevented her from finding consolation in either the remembered past or imagined future. Instead he teaches her how they can confront and overcome such obstacles together, creating new touchstones and a new framework from which to build their future. In Adam's speech, Hutchinson celebrates mutual love and cooperation in marriage as powerful means for both finding and expressing divine truth amidst chaos.

From the start of his reply Adam presents evidence that they have not been forsaken, and that they therefore should thank God rather than doubt his will. Eve's lament depicts a world turned upside down; Adam's reply assures her that this state of affairs is not final, but part of an ongoing, alternating succession of contrasting conditions controlled by God. From his limited experience, Adam discerns something of how God works:

If he permit the elements to fight,  
The rage of storms, the blackness of the night;  
'Tis that his power, love and wisdom may  
More glory have, restoring calm and day;  
That we may more the pleasant blessing prize,  
Laid in the balance with their contraries. (5.533-37)

In relation to Eve's bleak statement that she and Adam had outlived their "hope and comfort," these lines are meant to be resuscitative. Through Adam, Hutchinson finds purpose in the turmoil and darkness, something Eve could not do on her own, and with it the confirmation that the fallen pair have not been abandoned.

Once this is established, Hutchinson depicts Adam helping Eve discern God's hand and their place in a divine narrative which connects their past, present, and future states. Eve's emotional response to their trauma leaves her stuck in an endless present of suffering and sorrow—they cannot go back, nor can they meaningfully move forward. The uncertainty of living in "perpetual dread," knowing that death is inevitable but not knowing when it will come, makes time stretch out before her; she seems unable to imagine what to do with all this time when "each moment multipl[ies] their woe" (5.409, 408). Far from being cause for prolonged distress, their continued life becomes, in Adam's reinterpretation, a sign of mercy and an opportunity for redemption. As they could have been immediately "plunged" into "the lowest Hell" but were spared, they "yet are showed how we in death may live / If we improve our short-indulged space / To understand, prize, and accept his grace" (5.464-66). "Improve" here means to make profitable use of or to employ to their advantage. Hutchinson's Adam has already understood the signs they have been "showed" and through his reply he uses them in turn to show Eve how they can best make use of the time they have been allowed.

Adam emphasizes that to move forward with a new focus on the space they have been given, they must recognize the impossibility of returning to or recreating life just as it was before their sin and exile. In this way, Hutchinson exposes the futile, self-defeating

nature of Eve's backward-looking lament; her very mode of remembering prevents her from finding reconciliation. This part of the response establishes the limits of their agency, not with regret for what cannot be accomplished but with hope for what can.

Adam asserts:

To undo what's done is not within our power,  
No more than to call back the last fled hour.  
To think we can our fallen state restore,  
Or without hope our ruin to deplore,  
Are equal aggravating crimes; the first  
Repeats that sin for which we were accursed,  
While we with foolish arrogating pride  
More in ourselves than in our God confide;  
The last is both ungrateful and unjust,  
That doth his goodness or his power distrust. (5. 501-10)

The belief that they can return themselves to the state they were in before the Fall is equivalent to the assumption that God, having punished them, cannot or will not repair the devastation because both ideas stem from misplaced trust. Whether they trust too much in themselves or not enough in God, they find themselves on unstable ground. Thus the point of Adam's correction here is that they must let go of the past; unable to rebuild what has been lost, they must build anew. In this task, they can find comfort in the knowledge that God will aid them. This much becomes clear in the couplet which sums up Adam's sweeping glance at their surroundings: "Whereso'er we look, without, within, / Above, beneath, in every place is seen" signs of God's "goodness" and "power" (511-512). When Eve looks around she sees only discouragement and danger. When Adam looks around he sees God.

In the rest of the response, Hutchinson's Adam revisits each of the sights Eve has seen and teaches her a more generative way to see and interpret their situation. Adam

proposes how he and Eve might respond to present and potential dangers in ways which complement the larger workings of God in their lives. Through this passage, Hutchinson demonstrates the place of individual agency in embracing and working within a Providential design that includes frequent and dramatic change as part of its essential fabric. Throughout this part of Adam's reply, the continued phrase "let us" creates a vision of Adam and Eve working together, with shared purpose, to meet the physical, emotional, and spiritual challenges of a fallen world. Working in mutual cooperation, Adam and Eve can overcome the "dangers" that "like gaping monsters stand" ready to swallow them up; the "briar and thorns" of sin which "pierce through [their] guilty eyes; and spiritual "discord" that sets "the inward world on fire" (5. 539, 545, 546, 549). When they come together in love of one another and God, Adam imagines, their "joy" will make them insensible to Satan's attacks, which are consequently tamed and reduced to "the serpent's little nibblings at [their] heel" (554). As I will show, Hutchinson returns powerfully to this vision in the closing lines of Adam's response.

Perhaps the most traumatic consequence of the Fall dealt with in Eve's lament and Adam's reply is the loss of Paradise as a home. Hutchinson presents their banishment as the final after-effect of their sin, one which God could soften with "rich promises" of deliverance and "clothes that kept them from the weather's harm" but would not prevent: "But after all they must be driven away, / Nor in their forfeit Paradise must stay" (5.291-2).<sup>73</sup> Eve's view from outside the gates is dominated by the flaming sword which renders

---

<sup>73</sup> Ann Rosalind Jones and Peter Stallybrass show how Renaissance accounts of Genesis often analyzed the animal skin clothing God gives to Adam and Eve as the founding of the livery system. The clothing they craft for themselves from fig leaves is insufficient, and is replaced with the animal skins once they are expelled from Eden. Jones and Stallybrass write: "The Lord asserts his right to be their tailor. In Genesis,

their Paradise “ne’er to be recovered.” Adam helps Eve to forego her painful reminiscence by revaluing what they actually lost when they lost Paradise. Extending his gaze beyond the flaming sword, Adam recalls “joys,” “pleasant walks,” and “delights” but with the newly gained knowledge of their impermanence (5.556, 557, 558). Adam’s proposal, “If we look back,” sounds like the beginning of a lesson—one can picture him turning with Eve to face the gate and guiding the direction of her eyes and mind so that she might “see” it differently. Rather than wishing to recover this “Paradise, late lost” they should direct their energy towards the achievement of a more stable and lasting site of peace.

To replace the sight of lost Paradise and relieve Eve’s “sorrow-drownèd eyes” Adam presents a new “prospect” of victory which they will achieve together. When Hutchinson writes in this passage “We shall trample on the monster’s head” she imagines male and female in combination defeating humanity’s adversary, but in Adam’s vision “we” refers specifically to himself and his wife triumphantly stomping on their foe. From here they continue their walk:

Entering into a new and perfect joy  
Which neither sin nor sorrow can destroy:  
A lasting and refined felicity,  
For which even we ourselves refined must be.

---

God is himself a body-maker and tailoring is a role he assumes in his attempt to refashion his unruly subjects” (270). God’s clothing Adam and Eve becomes an act of reclaiming them as his subjects. The animal skins remind Adam and Eve of their relationship to God, in which they offer obedience and receive protection, as well as their inevitable death. In Hutchinson’s account of Genesis, God first teaches Adam and Eve to perform a ritual of sacrifice “to expiate their heinous guilt,” “which, done in faith, did their faint hearts sustain” (5.271, 273) and then uses the skins from the sacrificial animals to fashion clothing for them. Their clothing thus inscribes upon them the sacrificial rite, the practice that maintains their relationship with God. As material reminders of their faithful service to God, the animal skins defend against spiritual threats as well as bad weather, conveyed in Adam’s later claim that God “armed” them with clothes (5.566). At the same time, these clothes serve as reminders that their sin can only be repaid with death, first that of the animals whose skins they wear and then, inescapably, their own.

Then we shall laugh at our now childish woes,  
And hug the birth that issues from these throes. (5.573-80)

An indestructible joy would certainly appeal to an Eve who had so recently seen her familiar sources of joy transformed and taken away. Through this passage Adam instructs her that this new joy will not be found in a single place but instead in a state of being at the end of an arduous process. Significantly, the “prospect” Adam puts before Eve includes the expectation that they will “look back” once they have reached this state. From Eve’s present vantage point looking back, or remembering, is painful. Adam envisions a future in which the enlightened pair will share memory as a source of laughter. Comparing their present “woes” to the “throes” of childbirth echoes John 16.21-22 (the biblical verse cited in the marginal note) and also figures the “throes” as temporary, leading to joy in a new creation which will supplant the memory of any prior sorrow. “The birth” here refers to their heavenly joy but also prefigures the actual children who will, after countless generations, bring about the salvation of humanity. Perhaps they cannot “laugh” yet, but by imagining that they even ever could Adam reassures Eve that their suffering has a purpose and that they will endure it through God’s grace.<sup>74</sup>

Eve’s lament begins and ends with death: the confession that she has “killed” Adam with her pride and the wish that she had “sinned and died alone” (5.438, 440). Adam’s response begins by confronting the possibility of death, but ends with the

---

<sup>74</sup> On its surface this “new and perfect joy...a lasting and refined felicity” recalls Michael’s promise in Book Twelve of *Paradise Lost* of “A paradise within thee, happier far” (12.587). There are significant differences, however, in the context of these two pronouncements. In Hutchinson’s poem, Adam and Eve arrive at an understanding of how to reach this joyful state through their conversation and in their understanding they can only get there together. Together they “trample on the monster’s head”; together they look back and laugh. In Milton’s poem, Michael only instructs Adam how to achieve the “paradise within.” Eve does not share in the lesson, nor does she feature in this particular vision of paradise.

promise of eternal life, the “final triumph” and “salvation” made possible through their future generations. The significance of this difference lies not only in the contrast between death and life as imagined resolutions, but in the relationship between husband and wife upon which each one is predicated. Eve places herself and Adam in an antagonistic relationship, one which violates the very purpose of their union which is, in her words, “mutual help” (436). She focuses entirely on her own failure to act in this capacity, and her subsequent culpability for Adam’s sin as well as her own. Eve wishes she could revise the past, erasing her role in Adam’s temptation and replacing it with her death before the damage can be done. The word “alone” stands out as a sign of Eve’s misguidedness—Hutchinson has already established “alone” as a negative state in her discourse on Eve’s creation in Canto 3. Eve separates herself from Adam, uncoupling their fates and imagining that they could have achieved a better outcome by acting singly than together. In making herself “alone,” even hypothetically, Eve undoes God’s work.

In contrast, the closing lines of Adam’s reply are built on multiple images of reconciliation between himself and Eve, leading, through the embrace of this marital union, to reconciliation with God. To correct Eve’s misevaluation of “alone,” Adam envisions a future which brings into being the ideal model of companionship Hutchinson celebrated in Canto 3. There, Hutchinson proclaims

Sweet friends, both in pleasure and distress,  
Augment the joy and make the torment less.

...

Love raiseth us, itself to heaven doth rise  
By virtue’s varied mutual exercise. (5.369-70, 381-82)

Adam's words show how such sentiment might be put into practice. He exhorts Eve "Let not my share of grief afflict thy mind, / But let me comfort in thy courage find" (5.581-82). Adam takes responsibility for "undoing" himself, attempting to allay Eve's torment at having "killed" him. He cautions against falling into the trap of antagonism and expands on his opening exhortation:

Let's not in vain each other now upbraid,  
But rather strive to afford each other aid,  
And our most gracious Lord with due thanks bless,  
Who hath not left us single in distress.  
When fear chills thee, my hope shall make thee warm,  
When I grow faint, thou shalt my courage arm. (5.587-92)

In this instance, Adam comforts Eve, but he expects that at other moments the situation might be reversed and he will turn to her for strength. Through this advice, Hutchinson suggests that the initial aim of marriage, mutual help, has not been betrayed with the Fall but has in fact become more urgently necessary. Standing outside the gates of Paradise, Adam and Eve need each other's "aid" in a way that they could not have before. While Eve's action has some irreversible consequences, Hutchinson shows that the destruction of her marriage need not, nor should not, be one of them.

Adam's plan encourages a return to their relationship as it was initially created. Hutchinson frames this move as yet another way in which Adam and Eve can put their faith in God's power. In Hutchinson's explanation of the first marriage, God intended husbands and wives to help and support one another. Thus, by performing these actions Adam and Eve demonstrate their trust in God who designed such roles for them. In this way, their attempt to return to their pre-Fall marital harmony represents, in itself, a turn towards God. The conclusion of Adam's speech represents the culmination of this idea

introduced in their initial reconciliation. He continues to envision how he and Eve will encounter future strife, saying:

When both our spirits at a low ebb are,  
We both shall join in mutual fervent prayer  
To him whose gracious succour never fails  
When sin and death poor feeble man assails,  
He that our final triumph hath decreed  
And promised thee salvation in thy seed. (5.593-598)

The repetition of “both” in lines 593-94 emphasizes the mutuality of their anticipated need for spiritual replenishment, the necessity that they approach God as one, and the equal fervency of their devotion. Prayer appears as one of the means by which Adam and Eve will continually reunite throughout their marriage when they are assaulted by fears of “sin and death,” as Eve is at this moment in the narrative. The final two lines of the passage answer Eve’s desired dissolution of their matrimonial bond by recalling both its general redemptive potential and the specific role she will play in realizing that potential. Adam draws on his memory of God’s judgments immediately following their sin in order to present Eve with this closing message of hope. The word “seed” appears earlier in God’s sentencing of “Satan within the serpent” (59): “Between thee and the woman, and her seed / And thine, I will put lasting enmity; / Thou in this war his heel shalt bruise, but he / Thy head shall break” (5.64-67). In her meditations, Hutchinson explicates this sentence, as well as those given to Adam and Eve, to highlight the underlying mercy and love that unifies them. In the final lines of his reply, Adam voices this interpretation as he finds a connection between their “final triumph” and “salvation” and Eve’s “seed.” He highlights Eve’s role in the long progression towards salvation by referring to “thy seed,”

but the overall message is also about what they can achieve together, figured in “our final triumph.”<sup>75</sup>

Hutchinson offers Adam and Eve’s dialogue as sufficient for reconciliation to their new circumstances and closes with Adam’s celebration of mutual victory through love. Nevertheless, at least in this initial moment of their postlapsarian existence, Eve depends on Adam to show her the way out of despair.

### **Adam and Eve as the Colonel and Mrs. Hutchinson**

The exchange between Eve and Adam in Canto 5 of *Order and Disorder* reanimates Hutchinson’s textual memories of herself and her husband as preserved in the *Memoirs*. The pattern of Eve and Adam’s speech, the corresponding conceptions of “husbandly” and “wifely” roles, and the language Hutchinson develops for representing the relationship between them all have roots in the earlier prose text. Though John Hutchinson speaks wisdom throughout his biography, the final section of the *Memoirs* is most densely populated with conversing Hutchinsons. This part of the *Memoirs* records the period from the restoration of Charles II in 1660, through John’s arrest and imprisonment in 1663 and to his death as a prisoner in Sandown Castle in 1664, a period of tremendous upheaval and uncertainty in the lives of the Hutchinson family. One of the

---

<sup>75</sup> Once again, the difference from *Paradise Lost* is worth noting. In Book Eleven, Adam does tell Eve that prayer has brought him “peace” through the memory of “His promise that [her] Seed shall bruise our foe” (11.264). Thus he “hail[s]” her “Eve, right called Mother of Mankind, Mother of all things living, since by thee / Man is to live and all things live for Man” (11.158-61). Adam seems to find some comfort in this remembrance of the maternal role his wife will play in the future of humanity. And yet it doesn’t last. Michael’s pronouncement of banishment is devastating, as God knew it would be, and in the vision of “what shall come in future days” (11.114) Eve’s role in salvation is erased. In Adam’s tearful response to the story of the Messiah’s birth he proclaims a new, clearer understanding of “why our great expectation should be called / The Seed of woman” but the “woman” celebrated here is Mary, not Eve. He continues, “Virgin Mother, hail! / High in the love of Heav’n, yet from my loins / Thou shalt proceed and from thy womb the Son / Of God Most High: So God with Man unites!” (11.379-82). In the progression from Adam’s loins to Mary’s womb to the Son of God, the genealogy in Adam’s great revelation acknowledges no role for Eve.

means by which Hutchinson portrays John's patient and enduring spirit during this period is a series of exchanges with his wife reflecting on their present circumstances. Here too we find gestures towards mutuality, but Hutchinson inevitably affords her husband greater access to spiritual truth and makes herself dependent upon him.

The speech patterns created for Mrs. Hutchinson and her husband will appear familiar by this point. In the *Memoirs*, either Mrs. Hutchinson expresses her doubt and sadness, or the narrator reports that she felt these things and then John offers consolation in the form of something like a domestic sermon. Eve's "perpetual dread" echoes with Mrs. Hutchinson's inability to imagine anything apart from the increase of her family's distress (409). Hutchinson depicts herself as having a "divining heart," a "sad and ill-presaging heart" that dreads a change in John's condition (304, 326). What she is *unable* to "divine" is a positive outcome in which her husband is freed and returns home to her and her family. She expects that he will die in prison, "the weakness of [his] constitution" conquered by the poor conditions (This is in fact just what happens to John, but somehow her turning out to have been right does not increase her authority in the text; there is no "I told him so.") Another structural similarity appears in the relative length and corresponding emphasis of each figure's contribution to the conversations. Eve's lament is shorter than Adam's reply, as he explicates each of her concerns and presents solutions. In the *Memoirs* Hutchinson often does not explain the exact cause of Mrs. Hutchinson's sadness or have Mrs. Hutchinson articulate her feelings in direct speech. Instead the reader is told "Mrs. Hutchinson was exceedingly sad" (303) or "Mrs. Hutchinson was lamenting [John's] condition" (323). In contrast, John's replies are almost always

depicted in the form of direct or reported speech, providing the reader with the specific contents of what he said in order to calm his wife.<sup>76</sup> In neither text does Hutchinson silence the wives' expressions of negative emotion, but at the same time she seems to privilege the husbands' consolatory messages. In the same way that Adam does not completely deny Eve's fears and doubts (acknowledging, for example, that "dangers, then, like gaping monsters stand / Ready to swallow us on either hand"), John never suggests that his wife's worst premonitions are unfounded. He does not say that he could not be sent to Tangier, that he will not die in prison, or that he will without doubt see his home again—instead he offers a perspective on how to cope with any possible outcome. Hutchinson's intention does not seem to be to undermine the experience of negative emotion—to suggest, for example, that Eve and Mrs. Hutchinson were simply wrong to see things as they did, that they had no reason to be afraid or uncertain—but instead to highlight how their misperception can be corrected. Mrs. Hutchinson's need for continual correction repeatedly casts her as a wife who suffers from a vision problem very much like Eve's.

Throughout his replies in the *Memoirs*, John seeks out signs of mercy in the midst of his and his wife's shared affliction. In much the same way that Adam is heartened by the fact that God had allowed him and Eve to remain together after their expulsion, John

---

<sup>76</sup> Only once does Hutchinson give a simple "The Colonel comforted her all he could" without conveying the details of how he did it (326). Hutchinson's commitment to representing John's concern for his wife's grief perhaps surfaces even in the depiction of his final deathbed moments: "Yet did his sense remain perfect to his last breath; for when some named Mrs. Hutchinson, and said, 'Alas, how she will be surprised!' he fetched a sigh, and within a little while departed. (331) Here we have only a slight variation on the familiar pattern: Mrs. Hutchinson feels something; John responds. The only different is that Mrs. Hutchinson's feelings are being anticipated. Does John's final sigh express regret that he will be unable to comfort his wife, or make a last attempt to say what he thinks she will need to hear? Either way, Hutchinson emphasizes his dutiful intent to help his wife until the very end.

Hutchinson encourages his wife to “be thankful for the mercy that she was permitted this comfort to accompany him” on the journey from Owthorpe to London (303). Likewise, when John is committed to the Tower he “bade her be thankful for the mercy by which they had so long in peace enjoyed one another” since the “eminent change” brought about by his arrest (304). At one point Hutchinson recalls John telling her “that if she were but cheerful, he should think this suffering the happiest thing that ever befell him” (321). This sentiment gets amplified in Adam’s urging “Let not my share of grief afflict thy mind / But let me comfort in thy courage find (5.581-82). However, as in *Order and Disorder*, an impression of mutual dependence in the *Memoirs* is somewhat undercut by the fact that Hutchinson never shows us a conversation in which Mrs. Hutchinson interprets Scripture to raise John’s spirits or help him see God’s design behind a particular trying moment.<sup>77</sup>

Throughout the final section of the *Memoirs*, Mrs. Hutchinson’s main source of anxiety seems to be her inability to control what happens to her husband and the constant threat of additional upheaval; if there is a force dictating the order of events it is the malice of her husband’s powerful enemies in the state. John is shown to find peace by submitting to an authority higher than the Restoration government. These depictions become epitomized in Adam’s assertions that “God’s sovereign will and power are absolute” (5.446) and “He holds together the world’s shaken frame, / Ordaining every change, is still the same” (5.531-2).

---

<sup>77</sup> Additionally, John encourages his wife to thank God for his continued patience and good spirits: “He would also bid her consider what reason she had to rejoice that the Lord supported him, and how much more intolerable it would have been if the Lord had suffered his spirit to have sunk or his patience to have been lost under this” (321). It’s fine if the Lord doesn’t “support” Mrs. Hutchinson’s spirit; he supports John’s and John supports hers.

Two passages in particular best demonstrate this aspect of John's responses. The first involves Mrs. Hutchinson's repeated fear that her husband will be shipped off to a remote location: "Another time, when she was telling him she feared they had placed him on the sea shore but in order to transport him to Tangier, he told her, if they should, God was the same God at Tangier as at Owthorpe. 'Prithee, said he, 'trust God once with me, if he carry me away, he will bring me back again'" (322). The point here is that though John might be beyond his wife's reach in Tangier, he would still be well within God's. There are two ways to read John's request that she "trust God once with me." He both encourages his wife to put her faith in God as he does, but also, importantly, asks her to entrust God with him, to accept that God might remove him and to relinquish her fears for his safety. Mrs. Hutchinson worries that if she leaves John's side his enemies will act in her absence and ship him away; he will simply disappear (326). John's assurance that "God was the same God at Tangier as at Owthorpe" emphasizes that under God's watchful eye even the most hostile, foreign place can be as safe as home, where he would be in his wife's care. This sense reappears in Adam's revelation that God "darts on us his beams" even when we cannot see them, "ministering comfort in our worst extremes" (518-19).

Hutchinson again highlights John's willingness to trust in God in his attitude towards their home at Owthorpe. When Mrs. Hutchinson prepares to return home to collect her children and gather supplies, John "was exceeding well and cheerful, and so confident of seeing Owthorpe, that he gave her directions in a paper for planting trees, and for many other things belonging to the house and gardens, which when she received,

‘You give me,’ said she, ‘these orders, as if you were to see that place again.’ ‘If I do not,’ said he, ‘I thank God I can cheerfully forgo it, but I will not distrust that God will bring me back again, and therefore I will take care to keep it while I have it.’” (327) For Mrs. Hutchinson, Owthorpe has already become marked by John’s absence. In effect she, like Eve, sees the “flaming sword” that bars them from ever returning together to the home they once shared, a place Kate Chedgzoy characterizes as a “domestic Eden” (159). In John’s view, the way home may yet be open and so he must prepare himself for either possibility. If their “Paradise” is “ne’er to be recovered,” so be it. Implicit in this first part of John’s reply is the sense that will shape Adam’s response to his and Eve’s lost Eden: the joys they shared in that place were only ever fleeting and more lasting joy resides elsewhere. Nevertheless, John cannot rule out the possibility that God might carry him back home again and therefore he cannot neglect his responsibilities as guardian over that place. John’s attitude towards his garden gets reworked and receives a belated biblical precedent earlier in *Order and Disorder* in Hutchinson’s meditations on the last day of creation. Hutchinson states that “God himself did man employ / To dress up Paradise” and therefore the “moderate joy” we may derive from interactions with creation, through working with the land for example, is not a sin but “our prerogative,” so long as “we fix not our rest / In creatures, which but transient are at best; / Yet ‘tis sin to neglect, not use or prize, / as well as ‘tis to waste and idolize” (3.672-3, 675, 676-79).

Finally, John Hutchinson’s presence haunts Adam’s expression of the need to set his sights on a more glorious future which God has prepared for him and for Eve. Faith in a divine narrative that unfolds according to God’s will allows John to interpret his

present suffering as foreshadowing some future triumph for himself and for the larger political and religious cause to which he remains committed. In John's view, God acts through him. The perspective afforded by his prison cell makes him reinterpret his initial pardon in 1660 as a sign that God "never preserved him so extraordinarily at first but for some great work he had further for him to do or to suffer in this cause" (304). Significantly, this sentiment is shown to derive from Mrs. Hutchinson herself, who earlier in the *Memoirs* uses it to persuade John *not* to offer himself up as a public sacrifice: "being by her convinced that God's eminent appearance seemed to have singled him out for preservation, he with thanks acquiesced in that thing" (286). In the later conversation, John departs somewhat from the intent of his wife's initial conviction, in that he agrees God preserved him but only so that he could make a more meaningful sacrifice at a later time. As usual in the *Memoirs*, John gets the last word. From this perspective, even the prospect of death becomes imbued with new purpose. When his wife fears he will die in prison he answers, "I think I shall not, but if I do, my blood will be so innocent I shall advance the cause more by my death, hastening the vengeance of God upon my unjust enemies, than I could do by all the actions of my life" (321-22). In both of these passages, John expresses a willing passivity that empowers him to face his persecution without fear. His belief in predestination also bolsters his ability to endure his present suffering, as he sees in it the promise of his own salvation. Hutchinson recalls, "Once when his wife was lamenting his condition, having said many things to comfort her, he told her he could not have been without this affliction, for if he had flourished while all the people of God were corrected, he should have feared he had not been accounted among his children if he

had not shared their lot" (323). When Adam sees "all things in present fighting postures" he, like John, finds "in the promise" a "prospect.../ Of Victory swallowing up the empty grave" (5.570, 571-2). Still, we might read Adam's prospect as evidence of Hutchinson revising her husband slightly. Both Mrs. Hutchinson and the Colonel emphasize that "he" has been preserved for future triumph; her task is to witness whatever this might turn out to be and not do anything to prevent it from happening. As shown in the previous section, Adam really celebrates the triumph of "we," emphasizing how he and Eve must work together to bring a brighter future into being.

Adding another layer to the intertextuality of Adam's speech, John Hutchinson's presence in this passage can be felt beyond the words he speaks. The first five cantos of *Order and Disorder* are full of marginal glosses which refer the reader to specific biblical verses. Adam's speech, from line 445 to line 558 in Canto Five, is one of the most highly glossed passages in the poem. The glosses largely refer to the books of the Bible which were known to be John's favorites. David Norbrook refers to Adam's reply as a "palimpsest" of John's preferred Biblical texts and calls the marginal glosses a "reduplicati[on]" of "the gesture in which she had copied out in the *Memoirs* manuscript the texts he had noted in his own Bible" (xlvi-xlvii). Throughout the speech, the reader is directed most frequently to the Psalms. Paul's letters provide the second most common source for the glosses, with the highest frequency referring to Romans. Hutchinson portrays her husband turning to the epistle to the Romans at two of the central dramatic moments in the *Memoirs*. John is shown reading Romans on the day he is arrested and again in the days right before his death. Hutchinson's understanding of the Scriptural

passages cited in the glosses to Adam's reply would have undoubtedly been shaped by her memories of reading them with her husband and documenting their significance to him in the *Memoirs* manuscript. However, her citation of these particular passages does much more than "reduplicate" this earlier act of documentation. In the *Memoirs* manuscript she arranges the passages according to the classifications John created in order to shed light on his understanding and application of these texts. In the margins of Adam's speech, the glosses are composed according to her own sense of the mutually illuminating possibilities of pairing Scriptural and poetic verses. She uses the same verses that were significant to John in a new context in order to construct a new text, an act of appropriation which further indicates her creative agency at work and leads us towards the culminating meditations in Hutchinson's own voice.

**"With these most certain truths let's wind up all": Meditation and the Development of Textual Authority**

At the end of Adam's speech, Hutchinson reveals to her readers a narrator who is deeply affected by this act of imagination, perhaps unexpectedly so: "Ah! can I this in Adam's person say, / While fruitless tears melt my poor life away?"(5.599-600). Why is our narrator crying? With this interjection, Hutchinson acknowledges how her deliberate meditations upon the scriptural material have led her memory to different internalized texts, the lamenting voice of the *Elegies* and the conversations recreated between Colonel and Mrs. Hutchinson in the turbulent final section of the *Memoirs*. The grief expressed in lines 599-600 demonstrates one of the inevitable hazards of meditation. In their work on memory and death, Elizabeth Hallam and Jenny Hockey describe how memory can

“trouble” and “assail” us “by surfacing unbidden in the form of private thoughts, sensations, or dreams, sometimes stimulated inadvertently within the flow of our embodied encounters in the material world” (105). Material objects, including texts, can have “uncontrollable” aspects that powerfully evoke past sensations, mental images, or physical reactions. In the initial process of meditating upon the language of the Fall, the deliberate part of her memory work, languages associated with her own memories of loss and endurance may have been evoked “inadvertently.” “Fruitless tears” are an old enemy of Lucy Hutchinson’s, designated as such in the preface to the *Memoirs* where she writes to build defenses against the “flood of sorrow” (16). These tears which “melt her life away” in line 600 are the same tears she has been crying since her husband died, tears that seep around the margins of the *Memoirs* and flow all through the *Elegies*. The “fruitless tears” are a physical reminder that she has not finished mourning the loss of her husband or the instability attendant upon his absence, first as a prisoner and then in death. And thus it seems that Hutchinson remains stuck in her familiar sadness in the narrator’s outburst over a grief that has not yet abated. Her question highlights a gap between the message of consolation and hope she has just spoken “in Adam’s person” and her own continuing grief. The conversations in the *Memoirs* and the exchange between Eve and Adam establish a pattern in which a sad, misguided wife laments and an enlightened husband consoles, so when the narrator follows Adam’s speech with an admission of tears the outcome is unclear. Someone, we cannot help but remember, is missing. In her husband’s absence, who is there to dry her “fruitless tears” and keep her from “melt[ing]”

into oblivion? Hutchinson questions her ability to speak as Adam, as John, showing a struggle to appropriate that authoritative voice as her own.

But the poem is not over at line 600. If the conversation between Adam and Eve and the interjection in lines 599-600 stage a process of appropriation leading to struggle, the remainder of the poem demonstrates the outcome. In the remaining lines, the narrator revisits the central consolatory messages from Adam's speech. In a sense the Canto closes with a meditation on Eve and Adam's conversation, developing the significance of their exchange more broadly and highlighting how its central message might be applied. Hutchinson's narrator does not parrot the words of Adam/John Hutchinson (which are really her creation anyway) but knowingly incorporates them into her hopeful vision for the future.

Hutchinson begins as Eve began, in tears, but she uses them as the starting point for a discourse on the "pernicious" ill of "discontent," born from "unbelief" and "stubborn pride" and nursed by "ingratitude" (602, 603, 605). As before, the central problem is one of perception: humankind "err in judging what is ill or good" (621). Only by submitting to "th' eternal will and wisdom" can we see truly. Hutchinson then follows the pattern established in Adam's reply, showing her readers how they could find hope in hardship, sacrifice and loss, if only they traded "their false perspective" for "the crystal mirror of God's grace" (692, 693). Therein "all things appear with a new lovely face. / When that doth Heaven's more glorious palace show / We cease to admire a Paradise below / Rejoice in that which lately was our loss, / And see a crown made up of every cross (695 -8). The figure of the "crystal mirror" recalls the "sacred spectacles" of

Hutchinson's *On the Principles* and the language of the preface encouraging readers to look up to "that sun" "the light of truth" instead of "hunt[ing] glow-worms in the ditch bottoms" (4). As in the preface, Hutchinson represents meditation as recuperative.

Stepping back for a moment, it matters that Hutchinson recreates a conversation between husband and wife when she doesn't have to—her Adam and Eve talk to each other in the aftermath of their trauma. They aren't taken off on their separate ways, to have a nap or attend a history lecture delivered by an archangel; they aren't held up and examined individually as types presaging future troubled relationships between the sexes. They talk to each other. And though it is, of course, Lucy Hutchinson speaking words of consolation "in Adam's person" it matters that she chooses to speak them "in Adam's person" and not as Eve or the narrator. The construction of a dialogue is essential to Hutchinson's purpose. Recall Bakhtin's view that experimentation with turning persuasive discourse into speaking persons "becomes especially important in those cases where a struggle against such images has already begun, where someone is striving to liberate himself from the influence of such an image and its discourse by means of objectification, or is striving to expose the limitations of both image and discourse" (348). In the very composition of *Order and Disorder*, Hutchinson has taken up the struggle against previous images of herself and her husband as speakers and their associated discourses. The conversation between Adam and Eve externalizes these discourses in a different way than the majority of the poem not written as direct speech. Hutchinson objectifies these two different discourses and their relationship to one another

in speaking characters, an act Bakhtin helps us see as an essential part of the development of her own creative voice.

The closing meditations are in dialogue with the languages of Adam and Eve, the Colonel and Mrs. Hutchinson. Here Hutchinson brings these languages together in a different context to draw new words and new meaning from them. To give one example, we see Hutchinson take her husband's death-bed command into this new situation (the composition of meditational poetry) and find not only new but more complete, more satisfying answers to her grief. Far from merely repeating John's order that she "grieve" above "the common rate of desolate women," Hutchinson categorizes different types of tears and develops a framework for conveying their significance (*Memoirs* 16). "Natural tears" and "repentant tears" are condoned—they "do not the soul with sinful sorrow drown" but instead are "Love's soft meltings, which the soul refine" (5.658, 660). These "fruitful drops" are in direct contrast to those "fruitless tears" shed by the narrator in line 600, at the conclusion of Adam's speech. Associated with the "gentle showers that usher in the spring," these tears are generative, allowing the soul to grow and flourish from "soaked seeds" (5.661,66). Continuing the weather imagery, these are contrasted with tears of "worldly sorrow," which like "rough winter's storms / All graces kills and loveliness deforms" (5.667-68). Hutchinson's assertion that such tears "augment the evils of our present state" connects them not only with the tears that "melt [her] life away", but with Eve's sense that her sorrows multiply with each passing moment. In passages like these, Hutchinson works across texts, revising John's parting words and fleshing them

out into an interpretive framework that extends beyond that particular moment when they were delivered to her.

As she resurrects specific images of herself and her husband through Adam and Eve, Hutchinson exposes the dependency fundamental to those images as a limitation imposed by her marriage. For all that Hutchinson celebrates the positive qualities of her marriage, she never fails to emphasize her subordination to her husband. Early in the *Memoirs* she depicts herself as a subject of his making, even alluding to the Pygmalion myth. We are told that “it augmented his care” to remove his wife’s “imperfections” and that through this careful shaping “he soon made her more equal to him than he found her” (51). Not ever “equal,” just “more equal” than she had been in her life without him. She is “a compliant subject to his own wise government” (52). She continues describing the nature of her marriage, creating an image often commented on by critics of the *Memoirs*: “she was a very faithful mirror, reflecting truly, though but dimly, his own glories upon him, so long as he was present; but she, that was nothing before his inspection gave her a fair figure, when he was removed, was only filled with a dark mist, and never again could take in any delightful object, nor return any shining representation” (51). As N.H. Keeble points out, this is a “testimony to her love” that can “express itself only through metaphors of self-negation and self-dissolution” (“‘The Colonel’s Shadow’” 232). In the *Memoirs* these metaphors are belied by the reality of Hutchinson as author, but even there her task is to produce “a copy” of him. In *Order and Disorder*, Hutchinson does what she previously said she could not do; she does “take in” a new object through her meditations and, having done so, she assumes John’s creative role, shaping representations both of

him and of herself in the figures of Adam and Eve. When she meets John in the composition of *Order and Disorder*, it is on different terms than those which had she had shown to govern their marriage. The metaphors of “self-dissolution” appear in Eve’s lament and in the narrator’s life-melting tears, but these are explicitly rejected. Bakhtin’s description of the development of textual authority illuminate the circumstances in play here: “One’s own discourse and one’s own voice, although born of another or dynamically stimulated by another, will sooner or later begin to liberate themselves from the authority of the other’s discourse” (348). John Hutchinson’s influence undoubtedly did stimulate the development of his wife’s voice during her years as his “faithful depository” and “faithful mirror,” and that history is neither scorned nor erased by her assumption of a more active, independent role in *Order and Disorder*. Liberation from the authority of her husband’s discourse does not equate with rejection of that discourse in full. Rather, Hutchinson creates her own authority through the process of selectively assimilating John’s discourse with her own. Having done so, she goes even further than he does in the performance of textual agency. After all, she is the Hutchinson who composes and publishes a long poem of meditations on Genesis. She is the Hutchinson remembered as a creator.

The pronouncement of “most certain truths” that “wind up” Canto 5 signify the culmination of Hutchinson’s development of authorial agency as she has fully assumed the role of textual mediator. One of these “certain truths” is that there is but “one real ill”: “divorce” from God “by our repugnant will” (685, 686). But, she promises, when the soul is “reunited” with God, it “no longer mourns,” as “His serene rays dry up its former tears,

/ Dispel the tempest of its carnal fears" (689-90). These lines point to a fundamental change from Hutchinson's earlier poetic work, the *Elegies*. In her reading of the *Elegies*, Sharon Achinstein finds Hutchinson "choosing to remain in the shadows, to insist upon the mode of grief" and practicing "a stubborn resistance to joy" (69, 71). The Hutchinson of Canto 5 might see this as the exercise of a "repugnant will" (686). In contrast to the figure of the *Elegies*, her narrator's consolatory language at the close of *Order and Disorder* demonstrates a choice to dry her tears and "rejoice" in spite of loss (697). We see a similarly marked change from the *Memoirs* as well. Hutchinson concludes that work with a ghost story, set in the time after the Colonel's death at Sandown Castle: "The spring after, there came an apparition of a gentlewoman in mourning in such habit as Mrs. Hutchinson used to wear there, and affrighted the guards mightily at the first; but after a while grew familiar to them and was often seen walking in the Colonel's chamber and on the platform and came sometimes into the guard among them. Which is certainly true, but we knew not how to interpret it" (336). In the notes that follow the end of the main narrative, Hutchinson suggests one way to "interpret" this strange appearance, describing herself as "an airy phantasm, walking about his sepulchre and waiting for the harbinger of day to summon me out of these midnight shades to my desired rest" (337). This Mrs. Hutchinson, wandering in the shadows, animated by defiant grief, has by now become as familiar to critics as the apparition was to the guards at Sandown. But she is not the Lucy Hutchinson who composes *Order and Disorder* and stages the process of her becoming in Canto 5. Though there are echoes of the language from the *Memoirs*, the final four lines of *Order and Disorder* further illuminate the transformation that

Hutchinson's meditations have wrought: "Return, return, my soul, to thy true rest, / As young benighted birds unto their nest; / There hide thyself under the wings of Love / Till the bright morning all thy clouds remove" (699-702). No longer bound to her husband's tomb or wailing impatiently in the "midnight shades" for future rest, Hutchinson shows she has found a means to peace in the present. Though "clouds" remain yet to be cleared away, they can be endured. The marginal gloss Hutchinson gives to line 699 suggests how. The gloss is to Psalm 116, verse 7: "Return unto thy rest, O my soul; for the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee." The Psalm continues: "For thou hast delivered my soul from death, mine eyes from tears, and my feet from falling" (116.8). Hutchinson's meditations bring her back to life. They enable her to create a new voice with which she gives thanks for what her cleared eyes have allowed her to see of God's truth and helps others to read that truth for themselves.

## Bibliography

- Achinstein, Sharon. *Literature and Dissent in Milton's England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. Print.
- Appelbaum, Robert. "Rhetoric and Epistemology in Early Printed Recipe Collections." *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies*. 3.2 (Fall/Winter 2003): 1-35. JSTOR. Web. 20 March 2014.
- Archer, Jayne. "The Queens' Arcanum: Authority and Authorship in *The Queens Closet Opened* (1655)." *Renaissance Journal*. 1.6. (2002): 14-25. Web. 1 March 2014.
- Ashplant, T.G., Graham Dawson, and Michael Roper. "The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration: Contexts, Structures, and Dynamics." *The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration*. Ed. Ashplant, Dawson, and Roper. New York: Routledge, 2000. 3-85. Print.
- Bakhtin, M. M. "Discourse in the Novel." *The Dialogic Imagination*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. 259-422. Print.
- . *Rabellais and His World*. Trans. Helene Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2009. Print.
- Bassnett, Madeline. "Restoring the Royal Household: Royalist Politics and the Commonwealth Recipe Book." *Early English Studies*. 2 (2009): n.pag. Web. 20 March 2014.
- Battigelli, Anna. *Margaret Cavendish and the Exiles of the Mind*. Lexington, KY: UP of Kentucky, 1998. Print.
- Becker, Lucinda. *Death and the Early Modern Englishwoman*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003. Print.
- Brady, Andrea. "Dying with Honour: Literary Propaganda and the Second English Civil War." *Journal of Military History*. 70.1 (2006): 9-30. JSTOR. Web. 12 Aug. 2013.
- Bunyan, John. *The water of life or, a discourse shewing the richness and glory of the grace and the spirit of the gospel, as set forth in Scripture, by this term, the water of life. By John Bunyan. Unto which is added his meditations when in prison*. London, 1763. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Web. 30 June 2011.
- Carlton, Charles. *Going to the Wars: The Experience of the British Civil Wars 1638-1651*. New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.

Carruthers, Mary. *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2008. Print.

*The Case is Altered; or, Dreadful news from Hell*, London: 1660. EEBO. Web. 1 March 2014.

Cavendish, Margaret. *The Life of the thrice noble, high, and puissant prince William Cavendishe, Duke, Marquess, and Earl of Newcastle...written by the thrice noble, illustrious and excellent princess, Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle, his wife*. London: A.Maxwell, 1667. EEBO. Web. 17 October 2013.

---. *Natures Pictures Drawn by Fancies Pencil to the Life*. London: J. Martin and J. Allestrye, 1656. EEBO. Web. 17 October 2013.

---. *Orations of Divers Sorts, Accomodated to Divers Places. Margaret Cavendish: Political Writings*. Ed. Susan James. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. Print.

---. *A True Relation of my Birth, Breeding, and Life. Paper Bodies: A Margaret Cavendish Reader*. Ed. Sylvia Bowerbank and Sara Mendelson. Peterborough, Ontario, Canada: Broadview, 2000. 41-63. Print.

Chalmers, Hero. *Royalist Women Writers, 1650-1689*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Print.

Chedgzoy, Kate. *Women's Writing in the British Atlantic World*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.

Clarke, Danielle. *The Politics of Early Modern Women's Writing*. New York: Longman, 2001. Print.

*The Court & Kitchin of Elizabeth, Commonly Called Joan Cromwell*. London, 1664. EEBO. Web. 1 March 2014.

D'Addario, Christopher. *Exile and Journey in Seventeenth-Century Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.

*A Dialogue Betwixt the Ghosts of Charls the I, Late King of England: and Oliver, the Late Usurping Protector*. London, 1659. EEBO. Web. 1 March 2014.

De Groot, Jerome. *Royalist Identities*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. Print.

Dowd, Michelle M. and Thomas Festa. "Introduction: Adam's Rib, Eve's Voice." *Early Modern Women on the Fall: An Anthology*. Ed. Michelle M. Dowd and Thomas Festa. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2012. 1-21. Print.

Eamon, Walter. *Science and the Secrets of Nature: Books of Secrets in Medieval and*

- Early Modern Culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1996. Print.
- Eckerle, Julie. "Prefacing Texts, Authorizing Authors, and Constructing Selves: The Preface as Autobiographical Space." *Genre and Women's Life Writing in Early Modern England*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007. 97-113. Print.
- Ezell, Margaret J.M. *The Patriarch's Wife: Literary Evidence and the History of the Family*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987. Print.
- Felch, Susan M. "'Halff a Scrypture Woman': Heteroglossia and Female Authorial Agency in Prayers by Lady Elizabeth Tyrwhit, Anne Lock, and Anne Wheathill." *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500-1625*. Ed. Micheline White. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011. 147-66. Print.
- Field, Catherine. "'Many hands hands': Writing the Self in Early Modern Women's Recipe Books." Ed. Michelle M. Dowd and Julie A. Eckerle. *Genre and Women's Life Writing in Early Modern England*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007. 49-63. Print.
- Fraser, Antonia. *The Weaker Vessel*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984. Print.
- Gallagher, Catherine. "Embracing the Absolute: The Politics of the Female Subject in Seventeenth-Century England." *Genders*. 1 (Spring 1988): 24-39. Print.
- Gauden, John. *Cromwells Bloody Slaughterhouse*. London, 1660. EEBO. Web. 1 March 2014.
- The Grand Plunderer*. London, 1643. EEBO. Web. 1 March 2014.
- Hallam, Elizabeth and Jenny Hockey. *Death, Memory, and Material Culture*. Oxford: Berg, 2001. Print.
- Hammond, Gerald. "Translations of the Bible." *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*. Ed. Michael Hattaway. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000. 165-75. Print.
- Helt, J.S.W. "Memento Mori: Death, Widowhood and Remembering in Early Modern England." *Widowhood and Visual Culture in Early Modern Europe*. ed. Alison Levy. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003. 39-54. Print.
- Hill, Christopher. *The English Bible and the Seventeenth Century Revolution*. New York: Penguin, 1993. Print.
- . *The Experience of Defeat: Milton and Some Contemporaries*. New York: Viking, 1984. Print.

--. *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997. Print.

Hinds, Hilary. *God's Englishwomen. Seventeenth-century radical sectarian writing and feminist criticism*. New York: Manchester UP, 1996. Print.

Hirst, Derek. "Remembering a Hero: Lucy Hutchinson's Memoirs of Her Husband." *Anne Clifford and Lucy Hutchinson*. ed. Mihoko Suzuki. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009. 263-272. Print.

Hodgkin, Katharine and Susannah Radstone, eds. *Contested Pasts: The politics of memory*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Houlbrook, Ralph. *Death, Religion, and the Family in England 1480-1750*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. Print.

"House of Commons Journal Volume 8: 1 May 1660." Journal of the House of Commons: volume 8: 1660-1667 (1802): 4-8. British History Online. Web. 25 July 2011. <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=26177>>

"House of Commons Journal Volume 8: 12 May 1660." Journal of the House of Commons: volume 8: 1660-1667 (1802): 24-25. British History Online. Web. 25 July 2011. <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=26187>>

"House of Lords Journal Volume 11: 10 December 1660." Journal of the House of Lords: volume 11: 1660-1666 (1767-1830): 204-205. British History Online. Web. 23 June 2011. <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=14082>>.

Hughes, Ann. *Gender and the English Revolution*. New York: Routledge, 2012. Print.

Hughes, Ann and Julie Sanders. "Disruptions and Evocations of Family Amongst Royalist Exiles". *Literatures of Exile in the English Revolution and its Aftermath, 1640-1690*. Ed. Philip Major. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010. 45-63. Print.

Hutchinson, Lucy. *The Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*. Ed. N.H. Keeble. London: J.M. Dent, 1995. Print.

--. *Order and Disorder*. Ed. David Norbrook. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. Print.

James, Susan, ed. *Margaret Cavendish. Political Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. Print.

- Keeble, N.H. “‘The Colonel’s Shadow’: Lucy Hutchinson, Women’s Writing and the Civil War.” *Literature and the English Civil War*. ed. Thomas Healy and Jonathan Sawday. Cambridge: Cambridge UP: 1990. Print.
- . *The Literary Culture of Nonconformity in Later Seventeenth-Century England*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1987. Print.
- . *The Restoration: England in the 1660s*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2002. Print.
- Knoppers, Laura Lunger. *Constructing Cromwell: Ceremony, Portrait, and Print: 1645-1661*. Cambridge: CUP, 2000. Print.
- .“Opening the Queen’s Closet: Henrietta Maria, Elizabeth Cromwell, and the Politics of Cookery,” *Renaissance Quarterly*, 60.2. (2007): 464-499. JSTOR. Web. 1 March 2014.
- . *Politicizing Domesticity from Henrietta Maria to Milton’s Eve*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011. Print.
- Korda, Natasha. *Shakespeare’s Domestic Economies: Gender and Property in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2002. Print.
- Kuhn, Annette. “A Journey Through Memory.” *Memory and Methodology*. Ed. Susannah Radstone. New York: Berg, 2000. Print.
- Larson, Katherine R. *Early Modern Women in Conversation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Print.
- Lees-Jeffries, Hester. *Shakespeare and Memory*. Oxford: OUP, 2013. Print.
- Looser, Devoney. *British Women Writers and the Writing of History, 1670-1820*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 2000. Print.
- The loyall sacrifice presented in the lives and deaths of those two eminent-heroick patternes, for valour, discipline, and fidelity; the generally beloved and bemoaned, Sir Charls Lucas, and Sir George Lisle, knights. Being both shot to death at Colchester, five houres after the surrender*. London, 1648. EEBO. Web. 17 October 2013.
- Macaulay, Rose. *Pleasure of Ruins*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1953. Print.
- Magro, Maria. “Milton’s Sexualized Woman and the Creation of A Gendered Public Sphere.” *Milton Quarterly*. 35.2 (2001). Print.
- Markham, Gervase. *The English Housewife*. ed. Michael R. Best. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1994. Print.
- Mercurius Publicus*. no. 21. 17-24 May 1660. 330. EEBO. Web. 1 March 2014.

Miles, Abraham. *The last Farewell of three bould Traytors*. London, 1661. EEBO. Web. 1 March 2014.

Miller, Sharon. *Engendering the Fall: John Milton and Seventeenth-Century Women Writers*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008. Print.

Milton, John. *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Gordon Teskey. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2005. Print.

Moss, Ann. *Printed Commonplace Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*. Oxford: OUP, 1996. Print.

*A most true and exact relation of that as honourable as unfortunate expedition of Kent, Essex, and Colchester by M.C., a loyall actor in that engagement, Anno Dom. 1648.* London, 1650. EEBO. Web. 17 October 2013.

Munroe, Jennifer. *Gender and the Garden in Early Modern English Literature*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008. Print.

Narveson, Kate. "Authority, Scripture, and Typography in Lady Grace Mildmay's Manuscript Meditations." *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500-1625*. Ed. Micheline White. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011. 167-84. Print.

Nelson, Holly Faith and Sharon Alker. "Memory, Monuments, and Melancholic Genius in Margaret Cavendish's *Bell in Campo*." *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 21.1 (Fall 2008): 13-35. Print.

Ng, Su Fang. *Literature and the Politics of Family in Seventeenth-Century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.

Nora, Pierre. *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*, Vol. 1. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. New York: Columbia UP, 1996. Print.

Norbrook, David. "Lucy Hutchinson and *Order and Disorder*: The Manuscript Evidence." *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700*. Ed. Peter Beal and Margaret J.M. Ezell. London: The British Library, 2000. 257-291. Print.

--. "Lucy Hutchinson's 'Elegies' and the Situation of the Republican Woman Writer." *English Literary Renaissance*. 27 (1997). 468-521. Print.

--. "Margaret Cavendish and Lucy Hutchinson: Identity, Ideology, and Politics." *In-between: Essays and Studies in Literary Criticism*. 9:1-2 (2000). 179-203. Print.

Pennell, Sarah. "Perfecting Practice? Women, Manuscript Recipes and Knowledge in Early Modern England." *Early Modern Women's Manuscript Writing: Selected*

- Papers from the Trinity/Trent Colloquium*. Ed. Victoria E. Burke and Jonathan Gibson. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004. 237-58. Print.
- Phillippy, Patricia. "The Mat(t)er of Death: The Defense of Eve and the Female *Ars Moriendi*." *Debating Gender in Early Modern England, 1500-1700*. Ed. Cristina Malcolmson and Mihoko Suzuki. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002. 141-60. Print.
- . *Women, Death, and Literature in Post-Reformation England*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Purkiss, Diane. *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War*. Cambridge: CUP, 2005. Print.
- Raithby, John, ed.. "Charles II, 1660: An Act of Free and Generall Pardon Indempnity and Oblivion.." Statutes of the Realm: volume 5: 1628-80 (1819): 226-234. British History Online. Web. 25 July 2011.  
[<http://www.britishhistory.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=47259>](http://www.britishhistory.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=47259).
- Rees, Emma L.E. *Margaret Cavendish: Gender, Genre, Exile*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2003. Print.
- Rose, Mary Beth. *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature*. Chicago, IL: U of Chicago P, 2002. Print.
- Ryves, Bruno. *Mercurius Rusticus, or The countries complaint of the murthers, robberies, plunderings, and other outrages committed by the rebels on His Majesties faithfull subjects*. Oxford ,1643. EEBO. Web. 17 October 2014.
- Salzman, Paul. *Reading Early Modern Women's Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. Print.
- Sec. Nicholas to the Earl of Orrery 2 February 1661, *State Papers Ireland: Charles II* 306, 546.
- Seelig, Sharon Cadman. *Autobiography and Gender in Early Modern Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. Print.
- Sherlock, Peter. *Monuments and Memory in Early Modern England*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008. Print.
- Smith, Hilda L. ““A General War Amongst the Men . . . But None Amongst the Women”: Political Differences Between Margaret and William Cavendish.” *Politics and the Political Imagination in Later Stuart Britain*. Ed. Howard Nenner. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1997. 143–160. Print.

- Snook, Edith. “‘Soveraigne Receipts’ and the Politics of Beauty in *The Queens Closet Opened*.” *Early Modern Literary Studies*. 15 (2007): 1-19. Web. 1 March 2014.
- Spraggon, Julie. *Puritan Iconoclasm During the English Civil War*. Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2003. Print.
- Stevenson, Jane and Peter Davidson, eds. *Early Modern Women Poets (1520-1700): An Anthology*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2001. 193-95. Print.
- Sullivan, Garrett A. *Memory and Forgetting in English Renaissance Drama: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Webster*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.
- Suzuki, Mihoko. *Subordinate Subjects: Gender, the Political Nation, and Literary Form in England, 1588–1688*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003, 165–202. Print.
- Swiss, Margo. “Repairing Androgyny: Eve’s Tears in *Paradise Lost*.” *Speaking Grief in English Literary Culture: Shakespeare to Milton*. Ed. Margo Swiss and David A. Kent. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press, 2002. 261-83. Print.
- Thurley, Simon. *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240-1698*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1999. Print.
- Virgil. *Aeneid*. ed. Barbara Weiden Boyd. Mundelein, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 2004. Print.
- W.M., *The Queens Closet Opened*. London, 1655. EEBO. Web. 1 March 2014.
- Wall, Wendy. *Staging Domesticity: Household Work and English Identity in Early Modern Drama*. Cambridge: CUP, 2002. Print.
- Walters, Elizabeth. “Gender and Civil War Politics in Margaret Cavendish’s ‘Assaulted and Pursued Chastity.’” *Early Modern Women: An Interdisciplinary Journal*. 8 (2013): 207-240. Print.
- Weber, Harold. *Memory, Print, and Gender in Early Modern England, 1653-1679*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. Print.
- Whitaker, Katie. *Mad Madge: The Extraordinary Life of Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, the First Woman to Live by Her Pen*. New York: Basic Books, 2002. Print.
- White, Micheline. “Introduction: Women, Religious Communities, Prose Genres, and Textual Production.” *English Women, Religion, and Textual Production, 1500-1625*. Ed. Micheline White. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011. 1-13. Print.

- Williams, Grant and Christopher Ivic. “Introduction: Sites of Forgetting in Early Modern English Culture and Literature.” *Forgetting in Early Modern Literature and Culture: Lethe’s Legacies*. Ed. Ivic and Williams. New York: Routledge, 2004. 1-17. Print.
- Wiseman, Susan. *Conspiracy and Virtue: Women, Writing, and Politics in Seventeenth-Century England*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. Print.
- Wright, Joanne H. “Not Just Dutiful Wives and Besotted Ladies: Epistemic Agency in the War Writing of Brilliana Harley and Margaret Cavendish.” *Early Modern Women: An Interdisciplinary Journal*. 4 (2009). 1-25. Print.
- . “Questioning Gender, War, and ‘the Old Lie’: The Military Expertise of Margaret Cavendish.” *The History of British Women’s Writing, 1610-1690*. Ed. Mihoko Suzuki. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. 254-69. Print.
- Wynne-Davies, Marion. “‘My Fine Delitive Tomb’: Liberating ‘Sisterly’ Voices during the Civil War.” *Female Communities, 1600-1800: Literary Visions and Cultural Realities*. Ed. Rebecca D’Monté and Nicole Pohl. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000. 111-28. Print.
- Yates, Frances. *The Art of Memory*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2001. Print.