

BORDERS AND BOUNDARIES: HISTORICAL DISCOURSES IN SEVENTEENTH-  
CENTURY WOMEN'S LIFE WRITING

by

JESSICA ANNE WALKER

(Under the Direction of Frances Teague)

ABSTRACT

The English Renaissance is a period of interest in historiography and national consciousness, as well as a period in which women were starting to make their voices heard, despite the unacceptability of women's writing and public discourse. This dissertation seeks to explore the effect of historiography and national consciousness on women and how their writing fits into (or how women find their places outside) important cultural and literary developments between the Protestant Reformation and the Restoration of the English monarchy following the English Civil War. It establishes the sixteenth-century historiographical, literary, and gender contexts that contributed to the development of seventeenth-century women's historiography and life writing and explores how the limitations of women's education in the sixteenth century cut them off from participation in discourse about national identity and history and how those discourses began to evolve and change throughout the Stuart period.

In order to uncover how these issues are at work in seventeenth-century women's life writing, this dissertation examines the diaries, memoirs, and literary output of Anne Clifford, Anne Halkett, Ann Fanshawe, Lucy Hutchinson, and Margaret Cavendish. The simultaneous experiences of war, which encourages women to speak of important events in their lives, and

exile, which drives them beyond the strictly enforced boundaries of home and nation, undermine the dominant discourses of silence and enclosure that had discouraged women's writing. As a result, these women write across multiple points of fracture: disunity within the English state; the problem of writing national experience from outside the bounds of the nation; and the tension between urge to record and analyze their experiences for public consumption and the discourse that forbids them from doing so.

INDEX WORDS: Historiography, Early Modern Writing, Women's Writing, Biography, Autobiography, War, Life Writing, Memoir, Diary, Drama, Speculative Fiction, Oratory, Epistolary, Reformation, Restoration, Renaissance

BORDERS AND BOUNDARIES: HISTORICAL DISCOURSES IN SEVENTEENTH-  
CENTURY WOMEN'S LIFE WRITING

by

JESSICA ANNE WALKER

B.A., University of West Georgia, 2001

M.A., University of Georgia, 2003

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2009

© 2009

Jessica Anne Walker

All Rights Reserved

BORDERS AND BOUNDARIES: HISTORICAL DISCOURSES IN SEVENTEENTH-  
CENTURY WOMEN'S LIFE WRITING

by

JESSICA ANNE WALKER

Major Professor: Frances Teague

Committee: Christy Desmet  
Elizabeth Kraft  
Miranda Pollard

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
December 2009

## DEDICATION

To my supportive parents, inspiring sisters, amazing nieces and nephews, and dear husband, William Harris. Your love and support helped bring this project to fruition.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been privileged to work with many distinguished scholars who have guided me along my way. In particular, I would like to thank my committee, Dr. Frances Teague, Dr. Christy Desmet, Dr. Elizabeth Kraft, and Dr. Miranda Pollard, for their support and inspiration over the years; Dr. Andrew Hartley and Dr. Coburn Freer, for their guidance through my early years as an early modern scholar; Dr. Sujata Iyengar, Dr. Anne Williams, and Dr. Tricia Lootens, for leading me through the wilds of feminist theory; Dr. Cynthia Camp and Dr. Erin Kelly, for helping shape my work as a scholar of historiography; and the Early Modern Union of Scholars and my wonderful colleagues in the University of Georgia graduate English program, for all your friendship and support.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
CHAPTER	
1 Sixteenth-Century Contexts .....	1
Works Cited .....	30
2 Seventeenth-Century Contexts.....	35
Works Cited .....	57
3 “At this time I fell directly in to the green sickness”: Crossing Boundaries in Anne Clifford’s Early Life Writing .....	60
Works Cited .....	82
4 “Loyalty being the principle”: Divided Duty and Narrative Shaping in Anne Halkett’s Memoirs .....	84
Work Cited.....	107
5 Dead Mothers and Hoyting Girles: Terror, Adventure, and Gender in Ann Fanshawe’s Memoirs .....	109
Work Cited.....	131
6 “Which is certainly true, but we knew not how to interpret it”: Making Sense of History and Place in Lucy Hutchinson’s Life Writing .....	132
Work Cited.....	166
7 “If you be killed, you die unconquered”: Fear and Fame in Margaret Cavendish’s	



Work .....	167
Work Cited.....	211
8 Conclusion .....	213

## Chapter 1:

### Sixteenth-Century Contexts

During the English Renaissance, interest in historiography and national consciousness increased in response to cultural change. With increased learning among the laity and middle classes came increased access to historical knowledge, and a new sense of English identity, fueled by the Protestant Reformation, both sprang from and created a demand for English historical narratives (Burke 18-19; Rackin ix, 5). In addition to these social changes, the Renaissance also marked a time of increased access to literary discourses through education and Reformation for women as well as men. If women did not “have a Renaissance,” as Joan Kelly-Gadol famously argued, they certainly lived through one, but their participation in such discourses was severely limited.

As English historiography progressed from the national narratives of the sixteenth century to the life writing of the seventeenth, how did historiography and national consciousness affect women, and how did they fit into, or find themselves ostracized from, important cultural and literary developments of the period between the Reformation and the Restoration? A close examination of women's historical texts, through the lenses of both early modern historiography and the study of early modern Englishwomen's writing culture, reveals how women gradually came to express their places in history and how their contributions to historiography and life writing fit into a broader context of the development of literature from the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries. The purpose of this dissertation is to examine five cases of seventeenth-century women's life writing to show how these women writers used language to cope with

anxieties about space, genre, authorship, and trauma. In order to fully understand the pressures and opportunities with which history and historiography presented these women, we must first understand the social and literary contexts which preceded and surrounded them. Therefore, this chapter will examine the rise of English historiography, nationalism, and women's writing during the sixteenth century, while the second will explore how changes wrought by the seventeenth century helped bring about the forms of women's self-expression with which this dissertation is concerned.

The chief change that characterizes Renaissance historiography is an increased interest in “second causes,” the “effects of political situations and the impact of human will and capabilities” (Rackin 6). The role that human beings—specifically, men—played in shaping their own history was of paramount importance to understanding the unfolding of events. In a time of jarring social and religious change, history offered important lessons to its students, who believed it could “inspire the living, reveal the secrets of statecraft, teach the details of military tactics, expose the deceits of fortune, and illuminate the ways of providence” (Rackin 3). As the disparate loyalties of the feudal era became increasingly unified under a centralized government, and a sense of nationalism increased through events such as the Reformation, the defeat of the Spanish Armada, and colonial expansion into Ireland and the New World, the English turned to their history to shape national identity, learn how to avoid the conflicts and traumas of the past, and “stabilize and legitimate their new identities” (Rackin 4). Authors and educators such as Elyot and Roger Ascham made history a vital part of the humanist curriculum, multiple accounts of ancient and medieval history saw publication over the course of the period, and the English history play enjoyed a brief, but active, life on the late sixteenth-century stage.

The participants in the process of history, however, both those who made it and those who recorded it, were predominantly male: “Renaissance historiography constituted a masculine tradition, written by men, devoted to the deeds of men, glorifying the masculine virtues of courage, honor, and patriotism, and dedicated to preserving the names of past heroes and recording their patriarchal genealogies” (Rackin 14). Because history has been written as a record of “wars and revolutions, outbreaks of violence, and contests of might for prizes of territory, political power and public place” (Boxer and Quataert “Introduction” 6), women have been “[d]epicted as a blank page awaiting the inscription of patriarchal texts, silenced by the discourse of patriarchal authority” (Rackin 147). Men, as students and recorders of history, were invited to establish a place for themselves in their nation’s narrative; women, denied opportunities either to read or to write about historical topics, were not encouraged to envision themselves as participants in English history. As I will show, early modern historiography developed in specifically gendered ways, as a cultural project by and for the benefit of men; women, however, developed ways to negotiate a place for themselves within or in relation to such discourses.

Pearsall argues that an increased “sense of national feeling” came about in the early modern period as “the result of particular circumstances—the new English translation of the Bible in the 1520s and the beginning of the Henrician Reformation, both of them giving unprecedented urgency to the idea of England the nation” (Pearsall 15). The Reformation’s emphases on the English monarch’s supremacy over the Church instead of the Pope’s, the importance of reading the Bible in English translation, and the religious break from the Continent, isolating “many of the English under ‘true’ religion, in opposition to most of Europe,” all contributed to a heightened sense of national consciousness (Escobedo 4). This new sense of a

Protestant nation created an urgent need for that nation's history, particularly because of the traumatic break England had experienced from its own religious past. The Reformation “deeply . . . divorced the religious present from the national past,” and new Protestant converts found little comfort in a history populated by Catholics, even if they were English Catholics; the destruction of medieval manuscripts during the reign of Henry VIII further enforced this sense of isolation from national history (Escobedo 28). Thus with the shift in religious beliefs during the Protestant Reformation came a need for a drastic shift in historiography.

In order to reconcile the past and the present, the narrative of the nation would need to be rewritten from a Protestant point of view. To this end, the most significant work of early Protestant historiography was John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, which, as a “history of England written from the perspective of the true reformed Church,” served to “shap[e] perceptions of history in Elizabethan England” (Levin 113). Of particular importance to this rewritten narrative was the assertion that Protestants were not radical upstarts but rather inheritors of a purer, pre-Catholic religious tradition with a “long tradition of justified resistance to papal authority” (Shrank 65). As “innovation and novelty were words that invariably met with mistrust,” Protestants asserted that the reformed religion was “restorative” change rather than something new (Woolf *Circulation* 50, 51). Foxe's work traced England's religious heritage “not through an unbroken line of Roman pontiffs descended from Saint Peter, but in a spiritual descent from the early church to Queen Elizabeth as a 'godly' monarch” (King “Religious Dissidence” 144); John Bale's *The Actes of Englysh Votaryes*, a “bold, even heroic revision of English history that describes the nation's struggles against the corrupt influences of the Church of Rome,” reinterpreted Bede's famous tale of Gregory and the slave boys as a criticism of celibacy among “sodomitical Roman clergy” (Frantzen 25, 29).

Through Protestant historiography, “the Reformation began to arrange itself as linear history“ as an account of an “unbroken line of Protestant religious martyrs“ (Matchinske 25). English historians also began reaching further back into the English past for a sense of history, portraying the Anglo-Saxon era as the “true English nation” and the “Golden Age of Law” strangled by the so-called “Norman yoke,“ a narrative that would take on particular significance in the following century as Parliamentarians began to associate this “yoke” with Royalist oppression (Thom 23, Rouse 70). A “revival of Arthurian narratives” ( Escobedo 4), including Caxton's printing of *Le Morte D'Arthur* in 1485, Spenser's Arthurian epic poem *The Faerie Queene* in the late sixteenth century, and Henry VII's choice to “lard out his claim to [the throne] with claims of Arthurian descent, even naming his first-born son after the legendary king,” further bolstered England's sense of a glorious non-Catholic past (Pearsall 26). The development of the printing press, a “powerful engine in the creation and dissemination of a national master-narrative,“ gradually suppressed local histories in favor of a “national' past contained in history-writing“ that “eventually fed back, principally via print media, into the local“ (Woolf *Circulation* 295, 273).

The advent of a “centralized and national calendar” in the sixteenth century helped develop a sense of “a single social time that overlapped with and gave shape to the sense of subjective personal time“ (Woolf *Circulation* 10). As the result of “the growth of central and local bureaucracy” in the early modern period, “greater care [was] taken to preserve the memory and record of the exact times and days of events such as crimes, births, funerals, marriages, and even more banal occurrences”; clocks became more common domestic items and “the keeping of parish registers, begun in 1538, provided an officially sanctioned . . . record of the local population” (Woolf *Circulation* 11). Many medieval structures were torn down, fashion begins

to change more quickly, and people felt that this time was changing with greater rapidity than in previous ages (Woolf *Circulation* 27,31).

With this new historiography came new anxieties. Escobedo argues that “English nationhood in the Renaissance . . . was linked to a perception of historical loss, the sense that the past was incommensurate with and possibly lost to the present” (3). Histories of the early Church and early medieval past, many of them based on “historical records of dubious accuracy,” could not fill “a wide (Catholic) gap in English religious history, a gap that many English writers found uncomfortable” (Escobedo 4, 28). Fear that the civil strife of the fifteenth century would repeat itself when the childless Queen Elizabeth I died resulted in a proliferation of literature about the Wars of the Roses, including Shakespeare's two Henriad cycles, Samuel Daniel's *The First Four Books of the Civil Wars*, and Edward Hall's *The Union of the Two Noble and Illustrate Famelies of Lancastre and Yorke*. Historical writing was not simply an assertion of national pride but a response to crisis, a compulsion to chase down a past that seemed to be getting farther away and yet still threatened.

At the same time, a sense of unification and national culture was on the rise in early modern England; it is difficult to say whether it caused, or was the result of, the increase in historical consciousness, for “[t]he nation creates a history that creates the nation” (Escobedo 246). A variety of cultural and political changes in the early Renaissance “made national identity more important” (Breuilly 84). As a result of Tudor absolutism, by the late sixteenth century historical narrative had become more structured and centered around the monarch (Helgerson 10). As power became centralized around the ruler, the machinations of church and state “were increasingly interfering in daily life”; bureaucracy and surveillance helped the Tudor government monitor the behavior of its subjects and “regional affiliations” gave way to “a national

uniformity” (Montner 217; Matchinske 14; Escobedo 4). As Matchinske argues, the English began to internalize this ideology, identifying with the state that controlled them (Matchinske 17). In medieval England, only a “few fixed points of monarchical government” such as “royal faces on coins [and] images on bridges“ served to “portray a public, national culture to most people” (Breuilly 81). As the Renaissance progressed, however, increases in historiographic and national literatures, literacy, and print publication meant that more people (though most of them still middle- or upper-class and male) had access to national narratives:

Those persons who were privileged with the knowledge of how to read, a number that rose throughout the seventeenth century, had a key which allowed them to pass back and forth easily between their personal experiences and those of others living and dead. The higher one moved up the social ladder, the greater the possible overlap between personal memory and memories of either the community or of society as a whole. (Woolf *Circulation* 295)

A proliferation of English historical drama, such as Shakespeare's histories and Marlowe's *Edward II*, and frequent royal progresses by Elizabeth I meant that founding narratives had become accessible to more than just the elite. Due to economic changes in the early Renaissance, “merchants working together, forming a self-definition as English in an international marketplace, lent new significance to premodern notions of nationhood”; as economic trade with other nations increased, a “defensive discourse of the nation” developed against the threat of “the dissolution of identity presumably produced by international interaction and exchange” (Higginbotham 163, 174). The more unified England became around a sense of self, the more need the nation had for historical narratives that, in turn, reinforced a sense of nationalism. Of particular importance to the development of English national identity is the role of public service and the place of historiography in developing and encouraging that role. For this reason,



the role of historical texts in early modern England cannot be separated from the public performance of masculinity. Elizabethan nationalism was one of “action, work, war, masculinity, bodies” (During 150); humanism valued “civic activism and political commitment” over “the Christian ideal of contemplative monastic living” and “extolled the virtues of public action” (Boxer and Quataert “Women” 20; Hampton 16). “[T]he common weal,” asserted pedagogical scholar Richard Mulcaster in 1582, “is the measure of every man's being” (qtd. in Cressy 100). The ideal man, as set forth in texts such as Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano* and Elyot's *The Boke named the Governour*, led an active, public life devoted to the good of the state. One could not simply perform such service, however, without a thorough humanist education, which was “the means by which a learned man could gain the power to influence the ruler for the good of the state” (Lamb 113). The “good or ill bringing up of children,” argued Roger Ascham, Elizabeth I's girlhood tutor, would lead to “the good or ill service of God, our prince and our whole country” (qtd. in Cressy 18). Public action meant public speech, and the “basis for humanist upward mobility is the eloquence developed through a programme of reading” (Brace 99). If rulers and magistrates, Elyot argued, would fully “employ their study and mind to the public weal,” the commonwealth “must needs be both honorable and wealthy” (qtd. in Cressy 15). Elyot's text offered advice for “forming the gentle wits of noble men's children” so that they could best contribute to the good of the state (qtd. in Cressy 15).

Because of the importance of a humanist education to public service, and the importance of public service to national identity, the educated were associated most strongly with a sense of Englishness. “Miserable is the face of any nation where neither schools nor universities be frequented,” Christopher Wase asserted in 1678 (qtd. in Cressy 19); in 1682, Edward Chamberlayne connected English nationalism and education thus:

Nothing was ever devised more singularly beneficial to God's church and man's happiness than what our ancestors have, to their eternal renown, performed by settling such vast revenues and erecting such admirable structures for learning as our universities do contain . . . . In the beautiful fabric of the kingdom of England the two eyes are the two universities, Oxford and Cambridge. (qtd. in Cressy 119)

Funding for and access to education made great strides in the Tudor period; over a hundred new grammar schools appeared in the second half of the sixteenth century, and by the century's close, nearly a third of Englishmen could write (Cressy 8-9). Of as much importance as actual increased access to education was the cultural belief that the Renaissance constituted a new age of learning: "If we are to believe social critics of the Henrician period, education was not highly valued or greatly sought before the mid-sixteenth century" (Cressy 4).

History had a special place in the humanist curriculum and the participation in the public sphere it enabled. In 1580, Nicholas Carlisle asserted that the "scholars of the master's forms . . . shall be called upon to have and read in private study . . . all good histories" (Nicholas Carlisle 1580 qtd. in Cressy 82). Elyot explained history's power as a tool to teach valuable lessons and prepare the reader for public life thusly:

[H]istorie . . . leaveth nothinge hydde from mannes knowlege, that unto hym may be eyther pleasaunt or necessarie. For it nat onely reporteth the giftes or actes of princes or Capitaynes: their counsayles and attemptates: entreprises, affaires, maners in lyvinge good and bad: descriptions of regions and cities with their inhabitauntes. But also it bringeth to our knowlege, the fourmes of sondry publike weales with their augmentations and decayes, and occasion therof. More over preceptes, exhortations, counsayles, and good persuasions comprehended in

quicke sentences and eloquent orations. Finally so large is the compase of that whiche is named historie, that it comprehendeth all thynges that is necessary to be put in memorie. (247)

Because early modern scholarship emphasized memorization, educated men carried a knowledge and understanding of history with them anywhere: “Memory enabled man to fulfil his duties by providing his powers of judgement with the relevant information; it stored examples and patterns from the past so that the mind could reflect and make appropriate judgements in the present” (Woolf *Circulation* 260).

As Woolf argues, “Meaning arises not from some central core of identity but rather at a margin of difference. Self-definition comes from the not-self, from the alien other . . . . To constitute itself as a nation-state, a political or cultural community must distinguish itself not only from its neighbors but also from its former self or selves“ (Woolf *Idea* 22). In order to differentiate themselves from the Catholic past while still exploiting medieval tales of English heroism, historiographers “confined their gaze principally to medieval and modern time” (Woolf *Idea* 14). In the medieval period, “saints of the Church calendar were the lifelong companions of most people, and their legends may be seen . . . as a series of mirrors for humanity”; in the Renaissance, however, saints' lives were replaced with tales of national heroes (Speed 143). Particular historical figures became known for their virtues (Edward I, Henry V) and vices (Edward II, Richard III) (Woolf *Idea* 30). Works such as Boccaccio's *De casibus virorum illustrium*, Lydgate's *The Fall of Princes*, and the *Mirror for Magistrates* illustrated the terrible consequences of bad rule while the exemplary tradition offered models from antiquity and the medieval English past for emulation to “[engage] the reader in a dialogue with the past, a dialogue to be played out . . . on the stage of public action” (Hampton 5):

In setting forth the deeds of the exemplar the Renaissance text provides the reader with an image of the self, a model of an ideal soul or personality which mediates between ideals of public virtue and the reader's self- understanding. In this sense it aids in the process of socialization, of the creation of norms of behavior— procedures crucial to ideological hegemony and to practices of subjectivization. Through his relationship to exemplary figures the Renaissance schoolboy grows into the garments prepared by family and society. (Hampton 19). The Reformation broke down the relationship between the living and their ancestors and purgatory; prayers for the dead give way to funeral services preached for the benefit of the living, virtuous examples to live by (Woolf *Circulation* 75). History was considered an intellectual enterprise, a lesson for public life, rather than an account of personal, lived experience as it would increasingly become after the Civil War.

As historiography became entrenched in the educational system and the national consciousness, poets and playwrights found that history “offered the writer ready-made subjects without binding him to relate the literal truth of a chronicler“ (Woolf *Idea* 77). Historical literature grew swiftly in popularity during this period to the point that the “conception of 'English literature' itself cannot be separated from the writing of the nation” (Hadfield 18). The close of the sixteenth century and the beginnings of the seventeenth saw some of the Renaissance's most significant works of historiography and historical literature, including Edmund Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*; Richard Hooker's *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastical Politie*; William Camden's *Britannia*; Shakespeare's Henriad cycles; Marlowe's *Edward II*; Michael Drayton's *Mortimeriados*, *England's Heroical Epistles*, and *Poly-Olbion*; and Sir Walter Raleigh's *History of the World*. By exploring what had happened, these authors sought to understand what was happening around them and predict what was to come. Historical literature

allowed poets and playwrights to offer commentary on a wide range of issues past and present, such as the late Elizabethan succession anxiety evident in Shakespeare's *Richard III* and Spenser's justification of England's policies in Ireland in the fifth book of *The Faerie Queene*. History “offered Tudor authors the means of establishing a longstanding literary tradition,” and authors such as Spenser and Milton consciously styled themselves as English Virgils, the inheritors and perpetuators of a national literature (Shrank 17). Divided from their past, “the men who wrote England” used history to forge a cultural space for themselves in the future (Helgerson 13).

There is a direct line between humanistic learning, the social mobility and public participation it encouraged and enabled for men, and early modern England's historical narratives. As Helgerson argues, the authors of seminal early modern history texts such as Spenser and Shakespeare

shared an unusual social, economic, and psychic mobility. They were what students of more recent nationalist movements have called 'transitional men,' men uprooted by education and ambition from familiar associations and local structures, men who were free--and compelled by their freedom-- to imagine a new identity based on the kingdom or nation. (Helgerson 13)

These developments bring us to the center of a rapidly changing society and a vibrant literary culture that both encouraged and responded to issues of national consciousness, history, and public roles. Many who lived in this atmosphere, however, lacked access to these powerful discourses. In 1977, Joan Kelly-Gadol famously asked whether women had a Renaissance. She argued that developmental periods of history (that is, men's history) affect women differently, even “adversely” (Kelly-Gadol 176). Female sexuality became more regulated, and women's

economic, political, and cultural roles more limited, in the early modern period (Kelly-Gadol 176). As Kelly's work shows, genre shifts in literature between the medieval and early modern periods reflect a gradual decrease in women's agency. While medieval courtesy books taught men to please women, early modern manuals mandated women's behavior (Kelly-Gadol 188). The wandering knight, devoted to the service of his lady, was replaced by the humanistic man of letters, devoted to the service of his monarch (Kelly-Gadol 189). Of course, very few people, male or female, "had" a Renaissance; all but a few educated, socially mobile middle- and upper-class men (and perhaps a very small, select number of women such as Queen Elizabeth I) were excluded from direct participation in the exciting cultural and political changes we associate with the Tudor and Stuart reigns. What did it mean for women to live in a Renaissance that could never fully be their own? What stake did they have in these discourses, and how did they embrace, reject, and negotiate their place in them? In order to explore this issue, we must now turn our attention to education, public and private spaces, and historical discourses from early modern women's perspectives.

While men's literature and education flourished, women's progressed significantly but more gradually. The importance of Bible reading in the Protestant Reformation encouraged literacy for women as well as men; women's ability to read, Mulcaster wrote in 1591, was "very needful for religion" (qtd in Cressy 110). As a result, women's education made important strides during this period, and the scholarship of upper-class young women such as Princess Elizabeth, Lady Jane Grey, and the daughters of Sir Thomas More rivaled that of their male contemporaries; in 1673, John Newton encouraged women's education by reminding readers of "that maiden queen of blessed memory, Queen Elizabeth; let her learning be your pattern" (qtd in Cressy 112). Statistics are difficult to establish, but "the large sales of almanacs and bibles

throughout the period does suggest that reading might have been much more widespread than was once thought, and the popularity of cookery books, in particular, implies that many women could read” (Hobby 5). The move towards Biblical literacy, however, took away as much agency as it gave, for the “basis for male authority and female obedience was firmly established in the scriptures” (Hobby 6).

Furthermore, since the roles for which education was considered necessary—namely “the priesthood, politics and commerce”—were unacceptable for women, “there seemed little point in wasting precious resources on their education” (Cressy 106). Mulcaster asked “[y]oung maidens” to “give me leave to speak of boys first, because naturally the male is more worthy and politically he is more employed, and therefore that side claimeth this learned education as first framed for their use and most properly belonging to their kind” (qtd. in Cressy 109). Mulcaster's language—“naturally,” “kind”—reflects the belief that women's exclusion from the public sphere a natural inevitability rather than a social construct:

Until women's studies as a discipline became recognized as a legitimate scholarly pursuit and had an effect on academic habits of mind and inquiry, most disciplines left unchallenged the assumption that men represented the public world of growth and change and women . . . represented the private world of stasis, leisure, emotion and nurture . . . . The dichotomies between spheres of life and consequently the sexes were analytically rigid. Unchallenged assumptions about reality become reality. (Kaufman xi)

Rather than active participation in public cultural life, women's education encouraged virtue in the private sphere; hence both sexes were taught “the way of serviceableness towards the society wherein they live, that they may be enabled, each in their sex respectively, to follow

lawful callings for profitable uses” (John Dury 1649 qtd. in Cressy 22). The “link between labour and political and economic agency” we find in early modern discourses on education for men “is suppressed in humanist accounts of education for women” (Brace 99). Women's education ideally focused on “those things which it becomes a woman to know and to do; that is to say, all that enable her to look after her husband and promote the welfare of her husband and her family” (John Amos Comenius, 1657, qtd. in Cressy 111). These skills included the ability to “govern and direct her household, to look to her house and family, to provide and keep necessaries through the goodman pay, to know the force of her kitchen for sickness and health in herself and her charge” (Mulcaster qtd. in Cressy 111). Talents such as music were useful for “the parents' delight” (Mulcaster qtd. in Cressy 111).

To this end, rather than “void verses [or] wanton or trifling songs,” pedagogical writers such as Juan Luis Vives, writing in 1523, recommended “some sad sentences, prudent and chaste, taken out of holy scripture or the sayings of philosophers” (qtd. in Cressy 107). Books considered appropriate for women included handbooks offering advice on “how to educate young girls, how to live as a wife, as a widow, or as a nun, how to give birth to babies . . . how to behave to servants, how to write letters, garden, cook, dress, use English correctly, speak French, create fine needlework, or how to concoct the homemade medications of the day” (Hull 31).

Of perhaps more importance to women's education was what they should not read. “The professed goals of a humanistic education,” Lamb notes, “were perverted when they were applied to women” (Lamb 124). The same learning that prepared men for a public role could be dangerous in the hands of “a subtle and crafty woman” who might learn “no good manners and virtues” (Juan Luis Vives 1523 qtd. in Cressy 107). In 1535, Richard Hyrde warned that Latin



and Greek writing would “of likelihood both inflame their stomachs a great deal the more to that vice that men say they be too much given unto of their own nature already, and instruct them also with more subtilty and conveyance to set forward and accomplish their froward intent and purpose” (qtd. in Cressy 107). In 1657, John Amos Comenius advised against educating women “in such a way that their tendency to curiosity shall be developed, but so that their sincerity and contentedness may be increased” (John Amos Comenius, 1657, qtd. in Cressy 111). Vives worried that women might experience “pleasant gratification in amorous reveries . . . . For such girls it would have been preferable not only that they had never learned literature but that they had lost their eyes so that they could not read, and their ears so that they could not hear” (Vives 74). He also lamented that so many books concerned love and war: “What does a girl have to do with weapons, the very mention of which is unbecoming to her?” (Vives 73).

Romances were dangerous not only because they were sexually suggestive, but because they encouraged women's freedom and agency: “doe not become the idle Sisters of the foolish Don Quixote, to beleeve every vaine Fable which you reade, or to think you may bee attired like Bradamant, who was often taken for Ricardetto her brother; that you may fight like Marfiza, and winne husbands with conquest, or ride allryde like Claridiana, and make Gyants fall and your stirrups, (the Morals will give you better meanings) which if you shunne, and take | the grosse imitations, the first will deprive you of all good societie; the second, of noble affections; and the third, of all beloved modestie” (*Hic Mulier* B3-B3ob). Romances such as Sidney's *Arcadia* and Spenser's *The Faerie Queene*, which could give women access to political discourses, were considered inappropriate reading material (D. Clarke 234-236). Such was the anxiety surrounding women's learning that Bathsua Makin, advocate for women's education, opined in 1673 that a “learned woman is thought to be a comet, that bodes mischief whenever it appears”

(qtd in Cressy 112-113). Censure may have been a greater problem than lack of access to learning, for “educated women were caught in an internal conflict between humanist ideals and the traditional female role. They recognized that convention forced them to choose between these ideals; they could not be truly learned, or at least publicly learned, and still be ladies“ (Weisner 12); they risked being characterized as “an Amazon, recalling the self-mutilated warrior women of antiquity who repudiated all men, gave up their sons, and raised only their daughters” (M. King and Rabil xxv).

A few writers argued that women could, at least, contribute to the commonwealth through their learning. Thomas Becon, urging the founding of a sort of Protestant nunnery for the teaching of young girls in 1559, asked: “Is not the woman the creature of God so well as the man? Is not the woman a necessary member of the commonweal?” (qtd. in Cressy 109). Vives—who, as I shall show below, was stridently opposed to women having public roles—understood that the future Queen Mary, for whom he wrote *De ratione studii puerilis* (On a Plan of Study for Children) in 1524, would need reading “much more oriented to government than those recommended in the *De institutione*,” such as “dialogues of Plato relating to the government of the state, More's *Utopia*, and Erasmus's *Education of a Christian Prince* [and] the secular wisdom of the Distichs of Cato, the Mimes of Publius, and the Sentences of the Seven Sages collected by Erasmus” (Fantazzi 13). There were always limits, however, to such agency; even though Bathsua Makin argued, more than a century after the educational reforms of humanism, that “[w]ere women . . . educated now I am confident the advantage would be very great. The women would have honour and pleasure, their relations profit, and the whole nation advantage, she also believed that “God hath made man the head; if you be educated and instructed as I propose I am sure you will acknowledge it, and be satisfied that you are helps” (Makin 1673 qtd. Cressy 113).

Most important to the development of women's writing, women were encouraged to be passively, rather than actively, involved in their own learning. Men's education “gave [authors] the tools with which to express, promote, interrogate, and define their own relationship with a national identity that was founded on questions of literature, history, language, topography, economics, law, and statecraft, no less than those of religion”; they were given sufficient knowledge to contribute well-crafted, relevant material to cultural and political debates (Shrank 20). Women, on the other hand, “copied the words of others but [were] not instructed further in how to judge, write, or inspire” (Wayne 23). Many women who could read were not taught sufficient literacy for anything besides signing their names or perhaps keeping household accounts. The only writing Vives recommended for women was copying down the wise sayings of men, “which by often writing she may fasten better in her memory” (Vives 1523 qtd. in Cressy 107). Good readings such as “some grave saying or a wise and holy sentiment from the holy Scriptures or the writings of philosophers . . . should be copied out many times so that they will remain firmly fixed in the memory” (Vives 71). A common precept of early modern female education was that women should learn to write in order to better collect men's thoughts, not in order to write their own. The literacy advocated by the Protestant Church “encouraged education for women so that they could read the Bible and the appropriate commentaries, not so that they could speak or write their own ideas” (Hannay 7).

Despite their educational limitations, early modern women did enter the public sphere as writers, but there were severe social consequences for those who did so. Female speech was associated with unchastity and disorder in a tumultuous postwar age in which disorder was greatly feared, and women who dared publish risked allegations against their chastity, which was their only real social commodity. Literature for women, rather than encouraging them to speak

and write in turn, urged them repeatedly to “be chaste, silent, obedient” (Hull 142). Although some types of public discourse were more unacceptable than others, there was no truly safe form of expression, and the blame for being unfairly censured fell solely on women for inviting such criticism. In Vives’s *Education of a Christian Woman*, after listing a long series of double standards and impossible expectations—“If you speak little in public, you are thought to be uneducated; if you speak a lot, you are light-headed; unlearnedly, you are accounted ignorant; learnedly, you are malicious”—he asks: “How many occasions are there for corruption and misconduct when one is in public?” (Vives 125). Lest one’s be interpreted as inappropriate (men being the only interpreters), it was best not to speak at all. A woman who risked censure by writing was “forced to devote much of her energy to self-justification, defending her right to be learned and articulate” (Hannay 1).

Yet though “writing for publication was not a socially approved activity, women both wrote and tried to justify” their choice to do so (Crawford 211). As their “range was restricted by their lack of education” as well as by public censure, women were far more likely to tackle “private” concerns such as domestic skills, religious instruction, and the occasional love sonnet rather than write about public matters (Crawford 215). As we discover more female-authored texts from the early modern period, however, and as we widen our definition of women’s participation in literary culture to include a wide range of activities including private circulation, journaling, translation, gift books, marginalia, and influence through patronage, we have discovered ways that women commented on and influenced public and private discourse through their writing.

Some women produced literature in the more traditional sense; most of them were upper-class and very educated, with ties to court and to powerful families. Among these were Lady

Mary Wroth, Sir Philip Sidney's niece, who authored the prose romance *Urania* and the sonnet sequence *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*, and Elizabeth Cary, who produced the closet dramas *The Tragedie of Mariam, the Faire Queene of Jewry* and *The History of the Life, Reign and Death of Edward II*. Middle-class women such as Isabella Whitney and Aemilia Lanyer produced poetry. Other well-educated, aristocratic women turned to translation as a means of literary expression; such work was considered “‘defective’ and therefore appropriate to women . . . . By engaging in this supposedly defective form of literary activity, women did not threaten perceptions of male superiority” (Lamb 109, 116). Anne Prescott has argued, for instance, that the future Elizabeth I reinterpreted Marguerite de Navarre's work in order to express anger at her father's behavior towards his family; Danielle Clarke has argued that Mary Sidney Herbert's translation of the French drama *Antonie* explores tensions between personal and political relationships, while Beth Wynne Fisker argues that from Mary Sidney's translation of the *Psalmes* readers can “sketch an outline of her personality, temperament, tastes, and interests” (Prescott 68; D. Clarke 90; Fisker 172).

Religious discourses met with more acceptance than secular ones; as the Reformation “encouraged women to take responsibility for their own salvation, so [regarding religious writing] women had an area of freedom” (Crawford 221). Common forms of religious writing included private devotions and journaling, which set in motion among women writers a tendency towards recording and reflecting on their thoughts and experiences: “In many cases, the initial impetus to write was devotional and the framework for repeated self-analysis took the form of prayer or confession” (Wilcox 48). These practices would eventually develop into the seventeenth-century biographical and autobiographical texts which are our focus of study here. Although ostensibly private, many “records of [women's] spiritual lives . . . were published

posthumously,” and quotation from “the spiritual journals of godly women” was common at their funerals (Crawford 221; E. Clarke 216).

Letter-writing was another common activity among literate women that, like journaling, toyed with divisions between public and private discourse. As Magnusson argues, we need “to question the projection of nineteenth- and twentieth-century experience back onto the early modern period—such as the idea that the letter is a form of private expression” (Magnusson 51). Early modern women's letters “represent a surprisingly wide range of public actions” including appeals concerning the loss of property or titles, the imprisonment of their male relatives, or the loss of access to their children (Magnusson 56). The letters of early modern English female courtiers show how information that we might consider “gossip”—such as “rumours about suitors vying for the hand in marriage of a rich heiress, tales of how much money the Spanish ambassador spent on fireworks, talk of what colour gloves the Queen most liked”—actually had great “political importance in a society preoccupied with rank, status, reputation, power, and influence, a society in which such details as what gifts would best please the monarch was important political capital” (Daybell 125).

Even without taking pen to paper themselves, women could participate actively in literary culture. Literary patronage by wealthy women proved “culturally significant in the seventeenth century” (Quitslund 184), and patronesses such as Mary Sidney Herbert, the subject of some thirty dedications, “were sought for their ability to buy or promote (by use of their names) new literary wares” (Hull 18). Powerful women's influence over education and literary culture helped the Protestant Reformation take hold: the patronage of women such as “the Duchess of Suffolk (Catherine Brandon), the Duchess of Richmond (Mary Fitzroy), and the Duchess of Somerset (Anne Seymour)” led to “advanced reformers” being trusted with the education of the heirs of

powerful families, including the Princess Elizabeth herself (King “Patronage” 44). Reformist authors such as Thomas Becon, Nicholas Denisot, and William Samuel found promotion under Anne Seymour (King “Patronage” 53).

Beyond these ostensibly “private” discourses, early modern women also wrote about public, political matters, and did so with more frequency and self-assurance as the sixteenth century progressed into the seventeenth. They protested injustice, petitioned the government, recorded their experiences with the justice system, and urged religious reform; more conventionally “literary” works by women such as romances, poetry, and closet drama such as Cary's *Miriam* also offered commentary (albeit carefully cloaked) on issues of politics, power, economics, and class. Such writing, however, even when presented with self-confidence by its author, even when it falls into the narrow boundaries of acceptable work, is always fraught with tensions, apologies, and self-deprecations.

Although women's education and literary production progressed in the early modern period, historical texts were largely absent from girls' curricula and women's literary production. The study of history was considered vital to the development of skills for public service; educated upper- and middle-class women, on the other hand, perfected “accomplishments” like music and dancing, French, household skills, and knowledge of the Bible (Charlton 12-13). Women's lists of their own reading consist largely of Biblical commentary, sermons, domestic handbooks, and romances (Snook 17-20, Charlton 14-15). The reading and writing of history, particularly the accounts of late medieval English history so in vogue in the sixteenth century, seems to be almost exclusively a male enterprise. There are exceptions, of course; a few of the most educated, most privileged women, such as Anne Clifford and Elizabeth Cary, are known to have read traditional history. A handful of women even wrote it: Anne Dowriche's 1589 poem

*The French Historie* retells the story of the persecution of French Protestants in the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre in order to contrast England to France as a safe, ideal Protestant nation and remind Elizabeth of a monarch's duty to her subjects; early modern women's historical drama included Mary Sidney Herbert's aforementioned translation of Grenier's *Antonie* and Elizabeth Cary's *Mariam* and *Edward II*.

Although avenues to women's writing and commentary on public and national events were available (if socially unacceptable), however, they were largely silent on the subject of their nation's past, particularly in comparison with the proliferation of men's historical discourses. Women writers offer almost no commentary on medieval England in comparison with men. Woolf notes of early modern historiography that "even if they were fortunate enough to acquire the necessary literate skills to gain 'read-only' access to the social memory most people below the level of gentry were excluded from making an active contribution to it"; the same could be said of early modern women of any rank (Woolf *Circulation* 297). We find little discourse overtly forbidding women to read history; in all probability, women expressed little interest in reading it because it failed to speak to them as readers. Sixteenth-century historiographer Thomas Blundeville defined history as "deedes done by a publike weale, or agaynst publike weale, and such deedes, be eyther deedes of warre, of peace, or else of sedition and conspiracy" (qtd. Woolf *Idea* 3-4). Historical subjects were valued for their bravery in battle or their wisdom in governance, and historiography "was structured about turning points of limited significance for the female sex" (Boxer and Quataert "Introduction" 8).

Even among humanists who supported humanistic education for women, "the aims in providing instruction for those women usually differed from the aims for men" (Wayne 16). Humanists held that the "best life, the one which earned oneself and one's family the most honor,



was that which included not only scholarly activity, but also political and public service“ (Wiesner 12). For women, however, “a public reputation was dishonorable, a sure sign of immorality and scandal“ (Wiesner 12). As history was implicitly understood as a pattern for public life, women had no need for historical examples. The few who read conventional history took away negative messages, unable to “escape the prejudicial and hostile views about the inferiority of the female sex that were a part of secular as well as religious texts” (Boxer and Quataert “Women” 23).

The break with Rome had separated Englishwomen from their religious pasts as it had Englishmen, albeit in different ways. Nunneries were abolished and their inhabitants forced out; women lost a powerful connection to their ancestors as the Virgin Mary and the female saints lost their relevance and state anniversaries set by the monarch replaced saints' days (Montner 207, Escobedo 26). Although the new church in some ways valued and supported women as helpmeets in the ideal Protestant marriage and as souls capable of ensuring their own salvation through reading the Bible, the new Protestant historiography that accompanied it made no real effort to find a place for women in the nation's past, as it had for men. Female historical models existed, but they did not encourage women's agency. The only examples from history to which early modern women had access were negative in both senses of the word: the religious or wifely ideal who withdraws from public life and has no agency or action outside obeying her husband's or God's wishes; or the bad example who should not be followed, such as Eve, Delilah, or the Whore of Babylon. The exemplary tradition of early modern historiography “aim[ed] at exhorting the reader to move from words to deeds, from language to action“ (Hampton 29). Women's models, on the other hand, drove them to inaction and silence. Chastity was the “principal and, I might almost say, the only concern“ of women's education:

[M]any things are required of a man: wisdom, eloquence, knowledge of political affairs, talent, memory, some trade to live by, justice, liberality, magnanimity, and other qualities that it would take a long time to rehearse . . . . But in a woman, no one requires eloquence or talent or wisdom or professional skills or administration of the republic or justice or generosity; no one asks anything of her but chastity . . . . You may take away from a woman her beauty, lineage, wealth, charm, eloquence, intelligence, knowledge of the skills suited to a woman, but if you add chastity, you have given her everything in full measure . . . . In all aspects of life, the man is freer than the woman. Men have to look after many things; women are responsible only for their chastity. (Vives 71, 85, 86, 232).

Biblical models, commonly found in texts for women, crossed class lines: the “women petitioners or 1642, 1649 and 1653 cited Deborah, Jael and Esther” (Crawford 221) while the “women who sang before the ark, those who sang for David's triumphs, and Deborah, the judge and poet of Israel” were the “only known models” for Anne Finch, Countess of Winchelsea (Hannay 3). Aemilia Lanyer, in 1611, used Biblical women to argue for women's agency in her passion poem *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*. Religious change also robbed women of their exemplars, however; while Catholicism offered models of women's learning such as St. Catherine, “even this model was virtually discredited for most Englishwomen by the Protestant Reformation” (Hannay 7).

Classical heroines also appeared frequently as models, but were reduced to their chastity; “the figure of Penelope was abstracted from Homer's account and used to represent the ideal chaste and faithful wife” (Ziegler 31), and Vives praised “virgins in pagan times, ennobled by chastity alone” (Vives 119-120) to “support his hyperbolic ideals of the devoted wife” (Fantazzi

21). The closest analogue to traditional history for women was the catalogue tradition.

Boccaccio's *Concerning Famous Women*, 1365, “praised 106 notable women from pagan Greek and Roman antiquity, from the Bible (Eve), and from the medieval religious and cultural tradition” (M. King and Rabil xix). This account was “unfriendly to women, for it singled out for praise those women who possessed the traditional virtues of chastity, silence, and obedience. Women who were active in the public realm—for example, rulers and warriors—were depicted as usually being lascivious and as suffering terrible punishments for entering the masculine sphere” (M. King and Rabil xix). Chaucer's *Legend of Good Women* and Elyot's *Defence of Good Women* are early examples. Thomas Heywood published a series of “slight and superficial works mainly concerned with mythological figures” (Pritchard 25): in 1624, *Gunaikeon: Or Nine Bookes of Various History Concerninge Women* and then, in 1640, *The Exemplary Lives and Memorable Acts of Nine the Most Worthy Women of the World*. George Rivers described “seven classical female role-models” in his 1639 *The Heroinae*; Francis Lenton praised Henrietta Maria's court in 1638's *Great Britains Beauties, or, the Female Glory*. Eulogies and devotional books describing the lives of good women also found publication. Like other exemplary texts, these works encourage private good behavior, not public service.

Perhaps the most significant text of the Reformation, John Foxe's 1563 work *Acts and Monuments*, offered accounts of women in English history. The text played an “influential role . . . in the ardent debate about women's capacities as rulers that had been going on throughout the sixteenth century” (Levin 115). Foxe praises Protestant queen Elizabeth I, but his accounts of rulers such as Isabel of France and Margaret of Anjou “betray some of the ambivalence that he felt about the concept of a woman ruler. Although he praised Elizabeth's rule as God's plan, he also showed God's role in punishing other strong women rulers” (Levin 117). Because his “view

of medieval queens who exercise power is negative,” he fails to “present Elizabeth with appropriate models, though he is certainly providing cautionary tales on the misuse of power“ (Levin 123). The religious heroism of sixteenth-century Tudor Protestant queens such as Catherine Parr, whom Foxe portrays as “an intelligent, forceful woman who is also virtuous and pious,” serves as a more acceptable model (Levi 124). Foxe's account is one of the few whose exemplars hail from medieval and early modern English history. Most catalogs offered a wide range of “illustrious women of the biblical, classical, Christian, and local pasts” (M. King and Rabil xix), as if female, private virtue were universal, while men's public virtue was tied to English history. The most universal exemplar was, of course, the mother of all women, Eve, whom Vives cited as a reason women should be barred from teaching: “since woman is a weak creature and of uncertain judgment and is easily deceived (as Eve, the first parent of mankind, demonstrated, whom the devil deluded with such a slight pretext), she should not teach, lest when she has convinced herself of some false opinion, she transmit it to her listeners” (Vives 72). Although we find common themes in the kinds of behavior that historiography encouraged for early modern men, that is not to suggest that they followed the lessons of a single narrative of history that clearly mapped out their lives. Rather, they had access to a wide variety of narratives: multiauthored histories, multivocal dramas, competing interpretations. Humanism encouraged them to decipher and take meaning from these histories. Women, for all their models Biblical, classical, even English, were given one lesson: be chaste.

All these contexts bring us to how women, given this environment, might negotiate their places in a national history during the early modern period. Joan Wallach Scott argues that women have been “defined by their bodies; they were objects of male desire or agents of reproduction, performing timeless, 'natural' functions that do not figure in textbook histories.

From this perspective the term 'women's history' [is] an oxymoron, ridiculous, easy to ridicule” (Scott xii). Anthony D. Smith defines the nation as “a named human population sharing an historic territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass, public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members” (14). Early modern women, who were relegated to the private sphere, denied access to the economy, told different (usually non-national) stories about themselves, denied rights, and given different duties, did not, by this definition, occupy the same nation as early modern men. Similarly, Susan Reynolds defines nationalism as an “idea of the objective reality of nations or peoples as communities with collective political rights as well as shares histories and cultures” (Reynolds 54). Early modern women, however, do not share political rights with men; they do not, officially at least, share community and culture as the rules of chastity require them to keep separate spheres; they do not share a history, or at least not a historiography, a sense of inhabiting the same past. If history-writing occupies such a significant space in the construction of English identity in this period, and if this history is one of the deeds of men rather than of God, what does it mean that women cannot participate in this narrative as subjects of history, readers, or writers? If women of the period do not have access to a sense of their own national history, can there be such thing as a self-identified early modern Englishwoman? These questions, of course, cannot be answered definitively; but by closely examining a few examples of seventeenth-century women's historical discourses, we can uncover ways and which they responded to and even overcame such limitations.

My search for answers led me to examine texts by five seventeenth-century women: Anne Clifford, who records her decades-long struggle to gain ownership of her family's property in her diary; Anne Halkett, who defends herself against accusations of sexual and political

misconduct; Anne Fanshawe, who records her adventures as a diplomat's wife in exile during the English Civil War; Lucy Hutchinson, who writes her late husband's biography to defend his memory; and Margaret Cavendish, the first woman to publish her autobiography and a prolific author of prose, poetry, and drama. Of course, we cannot draw blanket conclusions about how women “did” history, nor make sweeping generalizations based on these five cases. The accounts, as I shall show, vary greatly in content, purpose, politics, genre, and style. Yet from these women's texts emerge fascinating similarities in how they recorded and interpreted their own lives in response to the political, religious, and gender pressures that surrounded them. To do so, we must first explore the historiographical, literary, and political circumstances surrounding them as the seventeenth century developed.

## Work Cited

- Three Pamphlets on the Jacobean Antifeminist Controversy: Facsimile Reproductions with an Introduction by Barbara J. Baines.* Delmar: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1978.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* New York: Verso; 1991.
- Boxer, Marilyn J. and Jean H. Quataert. "Introduction to the First Edition: Restoring Women to History." *Connecting Spheres: European Women in a Globalizing World, 1500 to the Present.* Ed. Marilyn J. Boxer and Jean H. Quataert. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Brace, Patricia. "Isabella Whitney, A Sweet Nosegay." *A Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing.* Ed. Anita Pacheco. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. 97-109.
- Breuilly, John. "Changes in the Political Uses of the Nation: Continuity or Discontinuity?" *Power and the Nation in European History.* Ed. Len Scales and Oliver Zimmer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Burke, Peter. *The Renaissance Sense of the Past.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969.
- Clarke, Danielle. *The Politics of Early Modern Women's Writing.* New York: Longman, 2001.
- Clarke, Elizabeth. "Beyond Microhistory: The Use of Women's Manuscripts in a Widening Political Arena." *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450- 1700.* Ed. James Daybell. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2004.
- Charlton, Kenneth. "Literacy, Society and Education." *The Cambridge History of Early Modern English Literature.* Ed. David Loewenstein and Janel Mueller. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 15-54
- Crawford, Patricia. "Women's Published Writings 1600-1700." *Women in English Society 1500-1800.* Ed. Mary Prior. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1985.
- Daybell, James. "'Suche newes as on the Quenes hye ways we have mett': The News and Intelligence Network of Elizabeth Talbot, Countess of Shrewsbury (c. 1527- 1608)." *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700.* Ed. James Daybell. Ashgate Publishing Limited: Aldershot, 2004.
- During, Simon. "Literature—Nationalism's Other? The Case for Revision." *Nation and Narration.* Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Escobedo, Andrew. *Nationalism and Historical Loss in Renaissance England: Foxe, Dee, Spenser, Milton.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.

- Fantazzi, Charles. "Introduction: Prelude to the Other Voice in Vives." *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual*. Edited and translated by Charles Fantazzi. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Fisken, Beth Wynne. "Mary Sidney's *Psalmes*: Education and Wisdom." *Silent But for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*. Ed. Margaret Patterson Hannay. Kent: Kent State University Press, 1985.
- Frantzen, Allen J. "Bede and Bawdy Bale: Gregory the Great, Angels, and the 'Angli.'" *Anglo-Saxonism and the Construction of Social Identity*. Ed. Allen J. Frantzen and John D. Niles. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1997.
- Hadfield, Andrew. *Literature, Politics, and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Hampton, Timothy. *Writing from History: The Rhetoric of Exemplarity in Renaissance Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Hannay, Margaret P. "Introduction." *Silent But for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*. Ed. Margaret Patterson Hannay. Kent: Kent State University Press, 1985.
- Helgerson, Richard. *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Higginbotham, Derrick. "Impersonators in the Market: Merchants and the Premodern Nation in the Croxton *Play of the Sacrament*." *Exemplaria* 19:1 Spring 2007 163- 182.
- Hinds, Hillary. "'Who May Binde Where God Hath Loosed?': Responses to Sectarian Women's Writing in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century." *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance*. Ed. S.P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.
- Hobby, Elaine. *Virtue of Necessity: English Women's Writing, 1646-1688*. London: Virago Press, 1988.
- Hull, Suzanne. *Chaste, Silent & Obedient: English Books for Women 1475-1640*. San Marino: Huntington, 1982.
- Kaufman, Debra Renee. "Introduction." *Public/Private Spheres: Women Past and Present*. Ed. Debra Renee Kaufman. Boston: Northeastern University Printing Services, 1989.
- Kelly-Gadol, Joan. "Did Women Have a Renaissance?" *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*. ed. Renate Bridenthal et al. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987.



- King, John. "Religious Dissidence in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*: Humanism or Heresy?" *Religion and Literature* 32.2 (2000) 141-156.
- . "Patronage and Piety: The Influence of Catherine Parr." *Silent But for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*. Ed. Margaret Patterson Hannay. Kent: Kent State University Press, 1985.
- King, Margaret L. and Albert Rabil Jr. "The Other Voice in Early Modern Europe: Introduction to the Series." *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual*. Edited and translated by Charles Fantazzi. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Lamb, Mary Ellen. "The Cooke Sisters: Attitudes Toward Learned Women in the Renaissance." *Silent But for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*. Ed. Margaret Patterson Hannay. Kent: Kent State University Press, 1985.
- Levin, Carole. "John Foxe and the Responsibilities of Queenship." *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. ed. Mary Beth Rose. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1986.
- Magnusson, Lynne. "A Rhetoric of Requests: Genre and Linguistic Scripts in Elizabethan Women's Suitors' Letters." *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700*. Ed. James Daybell. Ashgate Publishing Limited: Aldershot, 2004.
- Matchinske, Megan. *Writing, Gender and State in Early Modern England: Identity Formation and the Female Subject*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Montner, William. "Protestant Wives, Catholic Saints, and the Devil's Handmaid: Women in the Age of Reformations." *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*. ed. Renate Bridenthal et al. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987.
- Pearsall, Derek. "The Idea of Englishness in the Fifteenth Century." *Nation, Court and Culture: New Essays on Fifteenth-Century English Poetry*. Ed. Helen Cooney. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001.
- Prescott, Anne Lake. "The Pearl of Valois and Elizabeth I: Marguerite de Navarre's *Miroir* and Tudor England." *Silent But for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*. Ed. Margaret Patterson Hannay. Kent: Kent State University Press, 1985.
- Pritchard, Allan. *English Biography in the Seventeenth Century: A Critical Survey*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Quitslund, Jon A. "Spenser and the Patronesses of the *Fowre Hymes*: "Ornaments of All True Love and Beautie." *Silent But for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*. Ed. Margaret Patterson Hannay. Kent: Kent State University Press, 1985.

- Rackin, Phyllis. *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Reynolds, Susan. "The Idea of the Nation as a Political Community." *Power and the Nation in European History*. Ed. Len Scales and Oliver Zimmer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Rouse, Robert. "English Identity and the Law in *Havelok the Dane, Horn Childe and Maiden Rinnild and Beues of Hamtoun*." *Cultural Encounters in the Romance of Medieval England*. Ed. Corinne Saunders. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2005.
- Scott, Joan Wallach. "Foreword to the First Edition." *Connecting Spheres: European Women in a Globalizing World, 1500 to the Present*. Ed. Marilyn J. Boxer and Jean H. Quataert. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Shrank, Cathy. *Writing the Nation in Reformation England 1530-1580*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Smith, Anthony D. *National Identity*. Reno: University of Nevada Press, 1991.
- Snook, Edith. *Women, Reading, and the Cultural Politics of Early Modern England*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2005.
- Teague, Frances. "Queen Elizabeth in Her Speeches." *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance*. Ed. S.P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.
- Thom, Martin. "Tribes Within Nations: The Ancient Germans and the History of Modern France." *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Vives, Juan Luis. *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual*. Edited and translated by Charles Fantazzi. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Wayne, Valerie. "Some Sad Sentence: Vives' *Instruction of a Christian Woman*." *Silent But for the Word: Tudor Women as Patrons, Translators, and Writers of Religious Works*. Ed. Margaret Patterson Hannay. Kent: Kent State University Press, 1985.
- Wiesner, Merry E. "Women's Defense of Their Public Role." *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. ed. Mary Beth Rose. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1986.
- Wilcox, Helen. "Private Writing and Public Function: Autobiographical Texts by Renaissance Englishwomen." *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance*. Ed. S.P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.
- Woolf, D.R. *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and "The Light of*

*Truth" from the Accession of James I to the Civil War.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Woolf, D.R. *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

## Chapter 2

### Seventeenth-Century Contexts

As tensions increased between King and Parliament in the seventeenth century, the past became more overtly politicized, and those on both sides of the conflict referenced historical events in order to further their political goals, “defend[ing] their actions as an expression of piety towards their ancestors and deference to the ancestral wisdom which had been sanctioned by centuries of custom” (Woolf *Circulation* 84). Radical groups such as the Levellers and Diggers referred to Charles I’s rule as the “Norman yoke,” arguing that “the post-Conquest period amounted to nothing more than a betrayal of ancient freedoms” (Woolf *Circulation* 85). Historiography, once “consensual in character,” began to become “truly dialectical, even confrontational” (Woolf *Idea* 33). Ancestry and private family history, as we will see in the texts of Anne Clifford, Lucy Hutchinson, and Margaret Cavendish, had grown in importance; “[e]xpressions of family pride” are evident “in diaries, letters, draft genealogies, and rather less often, in lengthier biographical tracts” (Woolf *Circulation* 89). As a “much more intimate connection between the familial and national pasts” began to develop, ancestry, particularly for the higher classes, “provided part of the living individual’s identity, his or her ‘self’” (Woolf *Circulation* 98, 97). The “pedigree craze” (Woolf *Circulation* 105) only intensified as ancestry became less relevant.

The focus on historical discourse as a means to achieve specific political goals and the use of family history to bolster one’s sense of personal identity indicates the way “the individual self and the private life, realms in which women could claim some authority, were beginning to

be publicly valued in the seventeenth century" (247). Biographical history, in particular, became increasingly inclusive: "[d]uring the course of the [seventeenth] century an enormous increase took place in the number and forms of biographies and in the range of biographical subjects," which "extended far beyond figures of exalted rank and position to many members of the gentry and middle classes and to a wide range of professions and occupations" (Pritchard 9). Works such as Fuller's 1662 text *History of the Worthies of England* were "radical in [their] social inclusiveness" (Pritchard 22). While historiographers of the Restoration era had written "English history as a story of national resistance to alien invaders rather than a series of self-destructive civil conflicts," Civil War-era history turned inward, increasingly focusing on current, personal experiences rather than shadowy figures from the distant past (Escobedo 26)

News pamphlets from the Civil War period portray history as something happening around its observers rather than something from the past to be recounted, and the supply of new information could not keep up with the demand. Information was valued according to its novelty, exclusivity, and immediacy, and many publications sought to identify exact places and times from whence the news came: "there is come into my hands a piece of most rare sedition" ("An Answer" 2); "Since my last to you, dated the 14. of this instant, the Scots Horse are advanced from *Carlisle*" ("Bloody Nevves" A2); "Every day produces novelties" (*An Exact Relation*). Such news frequently claimed to come from eyewitnesses, privileging history as a lived experience rather than an abstract intellectual exercise as it had often been for Renaissance humanists: "You may confidently believe this narration; for you receive it not from my ear, but from my eye" ("A Copie of a Letter" A4); "*History (saith Cicero), is the witness of the times, the life of memory, and the light of verity: I have therefore undertaken to testifie that, whereof I was*

an eye-witnesse” (A Iovrnall I). Writers were compelled to report news even when that news could not be verified:

and so it pleased God to give unto him this victory also, which as though I doubt not but will be ratified by insuing relations, yet for the present, because I am the first that have written of this matters, and unwilling to write the least untruth, wherby the Kindome might be mis-informed, I shall omit many particulars touching the said fight at Barnham, yet it is reported that the Lord Fairfax took at least 2000 armes . . . (“Another miraculous Victorie” 2-3).

Pamphlets even reported news when there was none to tell, or when it seemed unimportant: “A Diary of the Siege of Colchester by the Forces under the Command of Generall Fairfax” has several entries recording “Nothing of importance” and, in one case, “Nothing of note. This night 30 houses were burnt.”

This increased focus on the individual and, as I discuss below, the tensions of the Civil War helped bring about a proliferation of biographical works. Although “[d]evelopments in the eighteenth century, particularly the distinction of Samuel Johnson and James Boswell as biographers, have tended to obscure the prior history of the form,” most “radically new [biographical] works belong to the second half of the century” (Pritchard 3, 7). Consequently, “[t]he autobiography and biography are generally regarded as seventeenth-century innovations, as this period saw the first great outpouring of such works (Hobby 78). Through a series of cultural changes, as I shall show, autobiography would become an increasingly acceptable and fruitful form of writing for women.

The seventeenth century was not an era of simple progress or regress for women but, rather, an era of multiple tensions that wrought both positive and negative effects that ultimately

resulted in increased access to literary discourses for women. The succession of the male sovereigns of the Stuart dynasty after half a century of female rule led to a “growing prejudice against female education. Since women were not expected to assume positions of power, it was thought difficult to justify the education of girls” (Cerasano and Wynne-Davies 16). Although the early modern period had seen “such scholars as Lady Jane Grey, Queen Elizabeth I, Mary Sidney and the daughters of Sir Thomas More,” under James I “it became unfashionable, if not downright dangerous, to teach a girl Latin or Greek” (Jones 11). After her passing, however, “the full impact of Elizabeth's unconscious example as an independent intellectual woman was felt” (Cerasano and Wynne-Davies 8), and learned aristocratic women “gathered about the less compelling, but still defiant, figure of Queen Anne” (Cerasano and Wynne-Davies 9), who wished to see and express herself as independent from being simply James' queen (Lewalski 7). Aemilia Lanyer's preface to *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum* praises her as a protector of women, and authors such as Thomas Heywood, George Wither, and George Webb compared her to Queen Elizabeth (Lewalski 53-54).

Debates about women intensified when Elizabeth I first was crowned, and despite resistance to female rule, “[b]y the close of the sixteenth century many writers had come to the defense of women” (Baines v). Antifeminist discourse surged, however, after her death and the succession of James I (Lewalski 2). As “masculine” fashion became more common for women, literary commentary on gender-bending dress appeared, such as Middleton and Dekker's *The Roaring Girl* around 1607, Jonson's *Epicoene* in 1609, and the pamphlets *Hic Mulier* (the mannish woman) and *Haec-Vir* (the womanish man) in 1620. Political conflict, population growth, inflation, land shortage, poverty, and vagrancy in the period leading up to the Civil War produced a “crisis of order,” and anxiety increasingly began to center around unruly women and

threats to patriarchal power and family structures (Underdown 116). As women were to their husbands as subjects were to kings, female independence, many feared, could overturn all existing hierarchies.

For some women writers, however, these antifeminist discourses offered them an opportunity for self-expression. (How many women writers contributed to these debates is unknown, since some of them may have been male writers using pseudonyms.) In 1589, Jane Anger published the first (ostensibly) female contribution to the *querelle*, *Her Protection for Women*. Joseph Swetnam's *The Arraignment of Lewd, Idle and Unproductive Women* in 1617 was met with responses from Constantia Munda, Esther Sovernam, and Rachel Speght; both Speght and Sovernam reappropriated the Biblical discourses that had been used against women by arguing that “woman was created from Adam's side to be his equal, not out of his foot to be crushed” (Crawford 230). Perhaps the most powerful piece of literature to emerge from the *querelle* is Aemilia Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*, a stirring call for women's freedom in the form of a passion poem.

The language of the *querelle* would help shape political debate with the coming of the Civil War. Gendered discourse, as scholars such as Layoun and Joan Wallach Scott have argued, “is the foundation of nationalism. The very basic rhetorical and organizational principles of the nation are tropes for and expressions of gendered power” (Layoun 14). As “contemporary political thinkers . . . were accustomed to express their convictions about political authority in terms of gender,” both sides of the Civil War employed misogynistic discourse to further their cause (Mack 21). Royalists feared that any threat to “social stability” could damage social structures on all levels public and private, leading to “instability, social inversion, anarchy and dissolution” (de Groot 194). Using a “traditional familial model predicated upon patriarchal



infallibility,” they conceived of the king as the father of the country, arguing that “any challenge to his authority was blasphemous” (de Groot 195). Using the same model, Parliamentarians identified with “the dutiful wife, who could justifiably abandon her ungodly husband” (Mack 21). More often Parliamentarians characterized Charles I as an “effeminate tyrant” whose uxoriousness and tyranny threatened the “masculinity of the head of the household, the property-owning paterfamilias” (Purkiss 53).

Many women, however, found that the Civil War opened up previously unavailable opportunities and discourses. With many of the men fighting or exiled, women became “defenders of their homes, pensioners for estates and generally responsible for their families’ survival” (Crawford 213). Wartime news pamphlets such as “A Briefe and Exact Relation of the Most Materiall and Remarkeable Passages that hapned in the late well-formed (and as valiently defended) Seige laid before the City of Gloucester” report the risks women faced and the contributions they made: “Our Women and Maides wrought all this after-nooned in the little meade out of our workes in the very faces of those horses, in fetching in Turfe for the repairing of our workes” (3); “The enemy shot divers Granadoes out of their battery . . . one fell into the street neer the South gate, but a woman coming by with a payle of water, threw the water thereon, and extinguished the phuse thereof” (6); “This day and night following the enemy shot divers Granadoes into the Town . . . One piece fell in the Kitchin Chimney, where three women were sitting by the first, but by Gods blessing hurt neither of them” (7); “It was admirable to observe . . . The cheerfull readinesse of yong and old of both sexes, as well of the beter as inferiour sort of people by day and night, to labour in the further fortification of our Citie. Nay, our maids and others wrought daily without the works in the little Mead, in festching in turfe in the very faces of our enemies” (13).

The Civil War period offered sudden and surprising access to public discourses for women. Women “petitioned parliament,” “agitated for social reforms” (Hobby 85), and took part in political debate, which “forced them to refine and sharpen their arguments, and so led to further publications” (Crawford 213). When censorship of the press ceased in 1641, “they shared with men in the greater freedom to publish,” producing political commentaries, prose literature, and personal narratives (Crawford 231). The circulation and publication of women's religious discourses, in particular, became more acceptable, especially among various Puritan sects. Although “Puritanism was scarcely an ideology of women's liberation,” the Puritan marriage model encouraged partnership, and “[a]mong the more extreme separatists women often had a much greater degree of equality in church membership” (Underdown 136). Women were able to justify their public speech by claiming that “the Spirit had indeed given them the right to address public religious matters” (Weisner 21). Religious autobiography was “recognised primarily as a political genre” (Cerasano and Wynne-Davies 17), and apocalyptic prophesying could be used to “air social discontent or legitimate transgressive behavior after the fact” (Matchinske 130). These Puritan discourses helped “grant a more widespread female autonomy” and “laid a new foundation for female activism—one that was shared, moreover, by non-Puritans” (Cerasano and Wynne-Davies 18, 17).

However, this “encroach[ment] . . . into men's territory” resulted in a “virulent attack on female petitioning” from royalists who responded with a series of parody pamphlets which “reduce[d] women's complaints to a desire for more sex, and their bargaining power to the threatened withholding of sexual activity from their husbands” (Hobby 17-18). Women found that the Parliamentary cause, likewise, “had little interest in improving the status of women, within either the home or the state” (H. Smith xi). The backlash against female autonomy grew

even stronger after the Restoration of Charles II's "essentially misogynous" court (Hobby 86). As Hobby argues, the problem was not the Restoration's exploration of sexual freedom but the "predatory male culture developed at court" in response to such freedoms (Hobby 18). Because of this setback, "[i]t was not until the late seventeenth century . . . that women began to express publicly sentiments that might be labelled truly feminist, recognizing that women as a group suffered discrimination and should be given rights and privileges because of, not despite, their femaleness" (Weisner 15). Ultimately, however, the period represent a time of progress for women's discourses; we find by the late seventeenth century a "growing awareness that women could write for publication, and women gained a sense of their own developing literary tradition" (Crawford 231) In the second half of the seventeenth century, "writings by more than 200 women were published on every conceivable topic" (Hobby 1).

For women throughout the early modern period, the mere act of speaking about oneself was "potentially transgressive" (Ottway 231). We see a few fifteenth- and sixteenth-century examples such as Margery Kempe and Anne Askew, but for the most part, "Early Modern women had not added to the accounts men wrote of their public lives and the development of their careers. When a woman wished to assert herself as a member of the community whose experience was worth recording, she was confined to the family history--her role as daughter, wife, and mother--or to the accounts of religious experience" (Rose 245). As the seventeenth century progresses, however, "many female writers described or analysed their experiences" (Hobby 78). Most of these works were not intended for publication, but such was the case of most secular autobiography, whether male- or female-authored (Rose 247). Autobiography, however, "even if not intended for print publication, presupposes an audience beyond the self"

(Seelig 73), and these works usually had intended audiences: usually one's immediate family, descendants, or religious community

In the life writing that this dissertation will explore, discourses of identity, nationality, and speech are closely tied to issues of physical space. As the early modern period progressed, “a divide grew up between 'public' and 'private' spheres,” and for women, family life was “supposed to map out the limits of their world” (Hobby 3). These limits were often physical as well as cultural, for the “equiement of chastity kept women at home, silenced them, isolated them” (M. King and Rabil xxiii). Women were considered inherently uncontrollable, uncontainable, transgressive: “Prey to a hysterical animal within her (the uterus), woman could not control her emotions, nor discipline her sexual impulses, nor act in any consistent fashion according to reason. This justified her relegation to home and hearth and exclusion from participation in public affairs” (Boxer and Quataert “Women” 25). Any act in the public sphere could threaten a woman's most valuable commodity, her reputation: “for women to be in public affairs was for women to be whores” (Purkiss 67). Changes in marriage law and restrictions on women's financial liberties, property rights, and employment opportunities further limited their freedoms (Weisner 3, 6).

Juan Luis Vives' 1523 educational manual *The Education of a Christian Woman*, commissioned by Catherine of Aragon for Princess Mary, demonstrates the early modern association between chastity and enclosure, unchastity and open space. Vives' work is “the first systematic study to address explicitly and exclusively the universal education of women,” and it laid the groundwork for the Elizabethan age of the cultured woman” (Fantazzi 1, 3). This text, however, could more accurately be described as a guidebook for how to isolate women. Men need a broad education, Vives asserts, because they “are occupied both within the home and

outside it, in public and in private” a woman's only concern, on the other hand, “is chastity; therefore when this has been thoroughly elucidated, she may be considered to have received sufficient instruction” (Vives 47). A good woman “best . . . stay at home and be unknown to others”; if she must go out, she should be “retiring and silent, with her eyes cast down so that some perhaps may see her, but none will hear her” (Vives 72). An unmarried woman should “rarely appear in public, since she has no business there and her most precious possession, chastity, is placed in jeopardy” (Vives 110); if she leaves the house, she risks “a fatal judgment of her beauty, modesty, prudence, propriety, and integrity, since there is nothing more fragile or more vulnerable than the reputation and good name of women; it may well seem to hang by a cobweb” (Vives 125). Women, therefore, are responsible not only for their chastity, but for everyone else's judgment of it:

At home there is no occasion to commit wrong; outside there are innumerable occasions that crop up on all sides and multiply like the heads of the hydra. On the girl hidden away in her house, no one passes judgment. One who is seen often in public, everyone has something to say, whence arises dishonor, and her reputation is easily besmirched according to the diverse opinions of her critics.  
(Vives 167)

Women bear full responsibility for maintaining their chastity, yet they are not permitted to own it: “do not mistake the fact, woman, that modesty and chastity have been entrusted to you, given into your custody, and commended to you by your husband. For which reason it is more unjust that you give away what belongs to another without the consent of the owner, so that you add to your other crimes the crime of theft” (Vives 181).

Withdrawal is the only appropriate response to mistreatment: “She must not allow herself to be pinched or touched in a lewd manner. Let her change her place and leave if she cannot avoid it in any other way” (Vives 130). He recommends that newly married women “stay at home for several months after they have lost their virginity” (Vives 247) and that wives should “not allow anyone to enter the house without the orders of her husband” (Vives 262). Ideally, a woman will not only restrict herself to the house, but further isolate herself from others in it, “choos[ing] for herself—daily, if possible, but if not, on feast days—a secluded part of the house, apart from the noise and bustling” where she can “meditate on the contempt of these worldly things” (Vives 263). She would never conceive of herself as part of a nation; she isn't even allowed a community: “A woman should live in seclusion and not be known to many. It is a sign of imperfect chastity and of uncertain reputation to be known by a great number of people” (Vives 126). Stripped of all other contexts and authority figures, she should regard her husband as her king and her God:

As the companion of her husband, wherever he is, there she has a country, home, hearth, parents, close friends, and wealth . . . . [L]et a woman be convinced that she performs great acts of worship when she serves her husband and goes the round of great churches [ie, goes on pilgrimage] when she stays at her husband's bedside. (Vives 186-187, 207)

Vives' figurative language similarly reflects an obsession with enclosure. He advises women to “close your eyes and ears, which give entrance to the machinations the devil makes use of in his assaults upon us” (Vives 82); she needs virtuous occupation because otherwise, “[p]erhaps she will think. About what? A woman's thoughts are swift and generally unsettled, roving without direction, and I know not where her instability will lead her” (Vives 59).

Such discourses persisted into the seventeenth century; antifeminist pamphlets of the period often focus on limits, boundaries, and transgressions. In *Hic-Mulier*, good women are enclosed, motionless geography: “Castles impregnable, Rivers unfaileable, Seas immoveable” (*Hic Mulier* A3ob). Dressing in inappropriately masculine styles, however, places them out of the bounds of humanity, turning them into a “monstrous deformitie” (*Hic Mulier* A4). They must be recalled and contained (“I present these Masculine women in the deformities as they are, that I may call them backe to the modest comelinesse in which they were” [*Hic Mulier* A4ob]) lest they transgress boundaries entirely to become something beyond binary, erased (“neither men, nor women, but just good for nothing” [*Hic Mulier* B2]). In order to avoid this fate, the author recommends clothing that conceals and encloses, a “comely Hood” (*Hic Mulier* A4) or a “concealing straight gowne” rather than a “French doublet . . . all unbutton'd” (*Hic Mulier* A4ob). Language of stillness and enclosure, openness and wandering pervades the speaker's warnings:

Let not a *wandering* and lascivious thought read in an intising Index the contents of an unchaste volume . . . . But for those things which belong to this wanton and lascivious delight and pleasure: as eyes *wandering*, lips bylling, tongue inticing, bared brests seducing, and naked armes imbracing: O hide them, for shame *hide them in the closest prisons* of your strictest government: *shield* them with modest and comely garments, such as are warme and wholesome, *having every window closed with a strong Casement, and every Loope-hole furnished with such strong Ordnance*, that no unchaste eye may come neere to assayle them. (*Hic Mulier* B3ob, B4, italics mine).

Transgressive fashions cross the boundaries of both geography and behavior in the author's comparison of wearing foreign fashions to being sexually involved with outsiders: "these Apes of the City have *inticed forraine Nations to their Cels*, and there comitting grosse adultery with their Gewgawes, have brought out such unnaturall conceptions, that they whole world is not able to make a Democritus big enough to laugh at their foolish ambitions" (*Hic Mulier C*, italics mine). These women "thrust vertue out of doores, and give a shamelesse libertie to every loose passion," becoming vulnerable to "any pick-locke of flattering and deceitfull insinuation" (*Hic Mulier C2*). The companion text, *Haec-Vir*, similarly employs metaphors of the dangers of open space, accusing the *Hic-Mulier* of "Shamelesnesse, in casting off all modest softnesse, and civilitie, to runne throrow every desart and wilderness of mens opinions, like carelesse untamed Heyfers, or wilde Savages" (*Haec-Vir A4ob*).

During wartime, however, the "Trenches of humane Reason, and impregnable walles of sacred Divinitie" are replaced with actual battlefields and fortifications; terror of the figurative "shipwracke and destruction" of unchastity would give way to the fears haunting women who experienced shipwreck, saw their childhood homes torn down, and watched their children die (*Hic Mulier B4*). Under such conditions, the stillness and enclosure valued so highly in a chaste woman were no longer an option. Danger and exile drove women from their homes and forced them into the public space in both ideological and physical ways. In discourses of the nation, "the horizon is clearly bounded" (Anderson 30); "[i]nsofar as the landscape is seen, it is enclosed, and the seer has authority over the construction of the land" (Speed 148). Women writing in a state of exile, which Brennan calls "nationalism's opposite" (Brennan 60), however, write doubly removed from their nations, first by gender than again by the circumstances which drove them from their homes.



To move is not necessarily to be free: women who, in wartime, “move (or are moved) from one place to another . . . are immobilized nonetheless by their utter lack of social rights and protections, by their often brutal abuse or exploitation in their mobile state . . . . [Mobility] is not simply or necessarily a freedom” (Layoun 175). For the wealthy in exile, “privileged mobility makes the diaspora no less poignant, nor the return home any less impossible” (Layoun 178). Such states of liminality, however, provide opportunities as well as sorrows. Women forced across national borders, be they physical or ideological, became acutely aware that the binary between public and private life was a fiction: relegated to the private sphere but finding their lives shaped by the actions of public men, they find themselves constantly forced across that imaginary boundary, and they write from this liminal position, “poised at the borderline between hiddenness and expressiveness,” “intermingl[ing] matters of domestic and national importance” (Wilcox 60, 59). To rewrite in a state of exile is to rewrite the boundaries and meaning of one's nation or community:

The refugee experience of the community or nation in crisis as it is represented in cultural and oral narratives potentially challenges established boundaries of community and nation. For it is precisely those inviolable boundaries that the refugee knows only too well to be violable. Thus, the telling of refugee stories is at least sometimes also a radical reconceptualization of the very definitions and ground rules of community or nation and of the roles of those who claim to speak for and from them. Refugee stories reconstitute, with a difference that is often ignored in official political discourse, boundaries and official and unofficial rules for crossing them in ways that are only arguable unimaginable or impossible. (Layoun 66)

Different groups, as Woolf notes, remember history in different ways: “Children have different memories from adults, and, in most cultures, men from women, since what is remembered depends entirely on how information is encoded and catalogued” (Woolf *Circulation* 293). Looking at early modern women's historical narratives gives us a radically different view of the events that shaped English history and “challenges the inherited assumption that historical significant events are publicly recognized events only” (Boxer and Quataert “Introduction” 6). As Layoun argues, “to consider only official or ruling party or governmental or international proclamations . . . and to read them literally, as statements of fact . . . is to forget the ways in which they construct fact, the ways in which they are sometimes desperate attempts to constrain fact” (Layoun 9). In narratives that speak to us from the margins, however, “the role of the state or dominant political organization or leader as authoritative narrator is constantly challenged” (Layoun 8). Recalling a woman's story of her wartime experiences, Layoun notes:

In the context of sifting through the remnants, textual and otherwise, of nationalism in crisis for traces of alternative ways of defining community, gender, nation, and ethnicity, there are two facets of the old woman's narrative that seem particularly significant. One is her insistence on her own wide-ranging authority in the narrative present in which she tells her story. What seemed most important to her, what she emphasized over and over, was her ability in the narrative present to tell the larger story as well as her own past experiences, and the preferred manner in which she told both. (Layoun 6)

By examining women's historical narratives, written at the intersection of public and private life, we can better understand how individuals seek to understand and articulate their experiences within a wider context of national events. Without the literary tools provided by a humanist

education, early modern women historians were guided only by the desires and fears that compel them to write. Reading their texts “in relation to other writing generated by the same set of political circumstances . . . can reveal unexpected insights into the ways in which individuals and groups perceived and tried to influence the course of history during a period of rapid and disorienting change” (Wilcher 3). Women write history as an act of history itself, as an attempt to reshape their world.

During the development of women's seventeenth-century life writing, the world from and about which they wrote was often fractured and fearful. News pamphlets of the period tell of the suffering caused by the war. “A Diary of the Siege of Colchester by the Forces under the Command of Generall Fairfax” reports that many of the “Besieged & the poorer sort of people began to rise for want of bread . . . . They rise in great Numbers, and come to the Lord Gorings Quarters, some bringing their Children starved to death, they crying out, so long as Horseflesh, Dogs, and Cats were to be had, they did not complain.” One pamphlet begs its readers to think of the “poore children [who] have not been remembered, who have (indeede) the greatest cause of all the complain, because we are least able to help our selves, and yet the deepest ingaged in these present bleeding miseries” (“A Povverfvll, Pitifvll, Citi-fvll Cry” 1); another calls for an end to the war by listing the myriad ways in which their lives have been worsened by both parties

engaging our Nation into a Civill, bloody, and destructive War, invading our Laws and Liberties, endangering all our lives, and utterly disabling us to relieve our distressed brethren in *Ireland*: Wee beseech you likewise to consider the effects of continued war, as the destruction of Christians, the unnatural effusion of blood; Fathers against Sons, brothers by brothers, friends by friends slaine, then

famine and sicknesse, the followers of civill war, making way for a generall confusion, and invasion by a foraigne Nation, while our Treasure is exhausted, our Trade lost, and the kingdome dis-peopled. (The Petition of the Most Substantiall Inhabitants of the Citie of London)

The tensions and dangers of the Civil War and Interregnum “stimulated the writing of lives in ways that demonstrate how productive of biographies eras of disruption may be . . . . It would be difficult to exaggerate the impact of the Civil War upon the development of English biography in the seventeenth century” (Pritchard 11-12). “[N]othing,” Benedict Anderson argues, “connects us affectively to the dead more than language,” and these women write in response to crisis and grief, struggling to make sense of their trials (Anderson 145).

The language of nationalism “seeks to define and bound the nation, to construct and maintain the boundaries and internal organization of the national” (Layoun 16). In discourse of war, women's “figures are positioned as boundary markers in a national project of impossible containment. The situation of their bodies as boundary suggests, even invokes, the bodies of women as precisely that which will be overrun, violated, conquered” (Layoun 23). These crossings, however, can also implicate and undermine violence, putatively rigid identities, and patrilineal production(s)” (Layoun 95): instead of being transgressed against, women can use times of crisis to resist, cross, and trouble boundaries.

All these women write under the stress of physical or ideological dislocation, responding to experiences of exile. Clifford, trying to regain her family's estates, self-fashions her identity as their rightful owner through writing, attaching great importance (at once historical and personal) to physical spaces in her diaries. Halkett writes as a woman rejected by her family and her lovers, driven from one place to the next by war and poverty, a Royalist Englishwoman living

and writing in Scotland under the tensions of James II's reign. Fanshawe's narrative is structured around a series of wartime displacements, resulting in a Gothic anxiety about spaces associated with family violence. Lucy Hutchinson is the only one of this dissertation's Civil War subjects not to experience exile, but the Restoration brings public concerns into her private family space, turning the security of domestic enclosure to the horror of prison. Cavendish lives for many years in exile on the Continent, recalling her upbringing in a country that has violently driven her out and seeking the safety of fame in an imaginary literary space.

By daring to live noteworthy lives and write about them, these women transgress the binary between public and private spheres that govern early modern women's behavior. These women bravely assert their rights to physical and psychological spaces: their bodies, their chastity, their homes, their religion, their histories. Denied material and cultural rooms of their own, these women set up imaginative real estate, creating worlds that will help them to understand their experiences, pushing against the limits of being a woman speaking history in the seventeenth century, setting their own horizons. Hence my title, "Borders and Boundaries": borders are for crossing, traveling over, discovering new places and identities; boundaries are for being stopped at, sites of transgression.

Boundaries, Layoun argues, "are redrawn figuratively and symbolically as well as literally and concretely" in discourses of nationalism (Layoun 167). Often these discourses are "contradictory, full of slippages and gaps. Therein lies the vulnerability of nationalism as narrative . . . . But there too, in those moments of narrative slippage and contradiction, lie possibilities of recasting or at least renegotiating the specific order . . . of nationalism" (Layoun 13). The authors discussed here often betray acute awareness of the transgressive nature of their writing. Although seventeenth-century history frequently employed biographical detail and the

“finest contemporary histories of seventeenth-century events,” such as the Earl of Clarendon's history of the Civil War, “are rich in biographical elements, in portraits and analyses of individuals” (Pritchard 111), these texts reflect tension, consciously or unconsciously, about combining public and private events.

This tension emerges structurally, as various kinds of narrative fracture and multivocality. Unlike the other subjects discussed here, forced into history by the pressures of the English Civil War, Anne Clifford grows up understanding herself as part of history, the only heir of an ancient family. Her fight to regain her ancestral estates is driven by both a private desire to connect with her ancestors and descendants, and a public desire to fulfill her duty as the mistress of vast estates with many tenants. Of all our subjects here, Clifford is most at ease with her dual identity as private woman and public historian, but she cannot reconcile this binary through traditional forms of history. Rather, Clifford literally fractures her text, dividing and uniting the public and private on the page; her dual-columned diaries allow her to place experiences in a variety of contexts, allowing her to live and write on the border between public and private. This binary is particularly troubled in the case of Anne Halkett; as a Royalist spy who helps the Duke of York escape imprisonment, the inappropriateness of her participation in public politics is compounded by the private, secretive nature of political conspiracy. Her relationship with her co-conspirator, the double agent Joseph Bampffield, makes her vulnerable to accusations of sexual misconduct; but in order to defend herself by arguing that their private meetings were charged with passion for the Crown rather than one another, she must expose herself to accusations of inappropriate behavior as a female political agent. To reinforce the nature of her private innocence, therefore, she appropriates the language of drama and strides the line between

memoir and fiction in a text that prefigures the female-voiced defense narratives of Samuel Richardson, Daniel Defoe, and Frances Burney.

Anne Fanshawe's memoirs, at first glance, are the ideal expression of the proper subservient wife: she writes privately for her descendants and keeps her marriage and her devotion to her husband central in her text. To do so, however, she must sublimate both her former, more mischievous self, the “hoyting girle” of her youth, and the maternal self who suffers numerous miscarriages, stillbirths, and loss of children as she accompanies her husband, a Royalist diplomat, on his travels. These aspects of her identity, refusing to be repressed, arise in a series of narrative fractures that do not quite fit into her tale of obedient wifeness. Her “hoyting girle” self emerges in daring performances as a cross-dressed boy and “Ms. Harrison” in times of danger, while her preoccupation with maternity and mortality emerges in a series of Gothic tales of family trauma.

Lucy Hutchinson also finds her private identity as a wife disrupted by the course of public history. While she claims her purpose is private and appropriate for women's writing—she simply seeks to “moderate [her] woe” following her husband's death—the thoroughness of her political and historical analysis of the rise and fall of the Parliamentarian party betrays a desire to understand and place herself in the context of a major historical shift. But doing so requires her to step outside the bounds of private discourse—boundaries that, for reasons of both politics and gender, she hesitates to cross. The result is a narrative split between two identities—the “Mrs. Hutchinson” who participates in and observes her husband's narrative and the Lucy Hutchinson who records and shapes it. The fractured identities that emerge in her text recall Fanshawe's: first in memories of herself as an uncontrollable girl who rejected feminine roles, hiding in closets to

read and ripping apart her friend's dolls; later as the shadowy ghost-figure who haunts the room where her husband died.

Cavendish's autobiography is simultaneously a failed history, in which she constantly strives for understanding of herself and her upbringing but reaches no conclusions, and an antihistory, in which she rejects outside contexts and denies the effect they have on her personal life. Without a past or a country, she has no story to tell, and so her autobiography spins around in a series of negations. Having erased herself, she can only articulate what she is not; and so she does so repeatedly, carving out a space for herself as an act of simultaneous self-inscription and self-annihilation. What emerges is perhaps the ultimate statement of the limits of early modern women's history—completely private, completely isolated, unable to achieve any true expression. The autobiography enforces, rather than eases, her terror of being erased from history. Only by turning to other literary forms—particularly her martial drama *Bell in Campo* and her science-fiction novel *The Blazing World*—can she create worlds in which she seeks to understand her own history and establish her fame.

Pritchard notes that in a “period when biography was commonly seen as a branch of history, the lines were often not drawn clearly enough between the life of an individual and more general history, and in the biographies public events tended to overwhelm or displace the personal and private” (Pritchard 92). Although some may categorize these women's work strictly as biography, life writing, or imaginative literature rather than as history, they respond to the same pressures and seek to make the same negotiations as traditional history: “When women at last began to seek after literary expression, it was inevitable that they should attempt to tell a story. There has always been, and there always will remain, deep-rooted in the human heart a desire to hear something told of the world without us and within” (MacCarthy 1).



Only one of the women examined here, Lucy Hutchinson, wrote about the public history of England before her own lifetime. (The content of Clifford's texts, while spanning several centuries back, focuses on her own family history.) All of them chose to focus primarily on their own lives or important events occurring during their lifetimes. Instead of looking to history as a pattern for behavior, they wish to become patterns, to understand their place in history as it happens, to create themselves as historical subjects. Unlike men, they cannot rely on status or public image to support them; they have to carve a place out for themselves in national discourse so that they and theirs will be remembered. They are driven by a need to understand and contextualize the events that shape their lives, a need to inscribe themselves against the threat of annihilation. While the male historian wrote of the past for the edification of his peers in the present, the female autobiographer writes of the present for the edification of her descendants in the future, simultaneously making and recording history.

Examining these women's work consequently requires an interdisciplinary approach; as these preceding chapters have shown, this dissertation operates at the intersection of multiple contexts: early modern literature and life writing; early modern history and historiography; women's studies and women's history. I must, therefore, acknowledge my own limitations as a scholar as I attempt to cross the boundaries of academic discipline. I am trained in the study of literature, and some would debate whether unpublished scribbles about personal experiences would qualify as such. I lack the same extent of formal training in history and women's studies, and consequently scholars of all three fields may quibble with my methods. However, I hope my work will lead scholars of multiple disciplines to a better understanding of these brave, brilliant, fascinating women.

## Works Cited

- “An Answer to a Seditious Pamphlet, Intituled, Plain English: wherein the reasons against an accommodation are answered, the miseries of the kingdom in generall laid open and shewn to be kept up for the maintenance of a few persons of decayed fortunes, and an application to the much wronged city.” Oxford: L. Lichfield], 1642.
- “Another miraculous Victorie obtained by The Lord Fairfax, Against the Earl of Newcastle, At *Barnham-Moore*, where 1500. men were slain, with the number of officers, colours, commanders, and common souldiers that were taken prisoners, with ordnance, arms and ammunition: as it was informed to some members of the House on Monday the 12. of June.” London: Robert Wood, 1643.
- “A Briefe and Exact Relation of the Most Materiall and Remarkeable Passages that hapned in the late well-formed (and as valiently defended) Seige laid before the City of Glocester, collected by John Dorney, Esquire, towne-clarke of the said city, who was there resident the whole siege and appled himselfe wholly to this businesse.” London: Thomas Underhill, 1643.
- “A Copie of a Letter Sent from a Gentleman in his Majesties Army, to an especiall friend in London: Containing a true Relation of his Majesties Army since their removal from Oxford, to an especiall friend in London: containing a true relation of his Majesties army since their removall from Oxford, to the 16. of this present Novemb.” London: 1642.
- “Bloody Nevves from the Scottish Army, Concerning The late bloody Fight upon *Munday* last, six miles on this side Carlisle, between the 2. armies of England and Scotland, the one commanded by Major Gen. Lambert, the other by his Excellency Duke Hamilton. With the number that were slain and taken prisoners on both sides, and the resolution of the Scottish Army thereupon, and the names of the chiefe commanders of Scotland, which were wounded in the fight. Likewise the Scottish message to the English army, and their answer and resolution thereupon. With the declaration of the county of Kent, concerning the landing of the Duke of York, and the coming in tothe [sic] Scottish army.” London: 1648.
- “A Diary of the Siege of Colchester by the Forces under the Command of Generall Fairfax.” London: 1648.
- “An Exact Relation Of the Siege before Yorke, of the taking of the suburbs, and of the approaches made within 40. yards of the walls: of the taking of the Kings mannor house there: and how the associated forces of Essex, Suffolk, &c. under the Earle of Manchester, have severall times repulsed the enemy, and preserved some part of the suburbs from being consumed with fire. As it is sent in severall letters, dated at the Leaguer before York, the 6. and 7. of June.” London: R. White, 1644.
- “A Iovrnall, Or, a true and exact Relation of Each dayes passage, of that party of the Right Honourable The Earle of Manchesters Army vnder the command of the ever honoured

Maior Generall Craford, from the first of August to the end of the same month : wherein there is truly related the taking of severall places.” London: Hugh Perry, 1644.

*Three Pamphlets on the Jacobean Antifeminist Controversy: Facsimile Reproductions with an Introduction by Barbara J. Baines.* Delmar: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1978.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* New York: Verso; 1991.

Baines, Barbara. “Introduction.” *Three Pamphlets on the Jacobean Antifeminist Controversy: Facsimile Reproductions with an Introduction by Barbara J. Baines.* Delmar: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1978.

Boxer, Marilyn J. and Jean H. Quataert. “Introduction to the First Edition: Restoring Women to History.” *Connecting Spheres: European Women in a Globalizing World, 1500 to the Present.* Ed. Marilyn J. Boxer and Jean H. Quataert. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Cerasano, S.P. and Marion Wynne-Davies. “Introduction.” *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance.* Ed. S.P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.

Crawford, Patricia. “Women's Published Writings 1600-1700.” *Women in English Society 1500-1800.* Ed. Mary Prior. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1985.

de Groot, Jerome. “Mothers, Lovers and Others: Royalist Women.” *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700.* Ed. James Daybell. Ashgate Publishing Limited: Aldershot, 2004.

Escobedo, Andrew. *Nationalism and Historical Loss in Renaissance England: Foxe, Dee, Spenser, Milton.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004.

Hobby, Elaine. *Virtue of Necessity: English Women's Writing, 1646-1688.* London: Virago Press, 1988.

Jones, Kathleen. *A Glorious Fame: The Life of Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle, 1623-1673.* London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1988.

King, Margaret L. and Albert Rabil Jr. “The Other Voice in Early Modern Europe: Introduction to the Series.” *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual.* Edited and translated by Charles Fantazzi. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Layoun, Mary. *Wedded to the Land?: Gender, Boundaries, and Nationalism in Crisis.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2001.

- Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. *Writing Women in Jacobean England*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Mack, Phyllis. "Women as Prophets During the English Civil War." *Feminist Studies* 8:1 Spring 1982 19-45.
- Matchinske, Megan. *Writing, Gender and State in Early Modern England: Identity Formation and the Female Subject*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- MacCarthy, B.G. *The Female Pen: Women Writers and Novelists, 1621-1818*. New York : New York University Press, 1994.
- Ottway, Sheila. "Autobiography." *A Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing*. ed. Anna Pacheco. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 2002.
- Pritchard, Allan. *English Biography in the Seventeenth Century: A Critical Survey*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Purkiss, *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Rose, Mary Beth. "Gender, Genre, and History: Seventeenth-Century English Women and the Art of Autobiography." *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. ed. Mary Beth Rose. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1986.
- Speed, Diane. "The Construction of the Nation in Medieval English Romance." *Readings in Medieval English Romance*. Ed. Carol M. Meale. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1994.
- Underdown, D.E. "The Taming of the Scold: The Enforcement of Patriarchal Authority in Early Modern England." *Order and Disorder in Early Modern England*. ed. Anthony Fletcher and John Stevenson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Vives, Juan Luis. *The Education of a Christian Woman: A Sixteenth-Century Manual*. Edited and translated by Charles Fantazzi. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Wiesner, Merry E. "Women's Defense of Their Public Role." *Women in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. ed. Mary Beth Rose. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1986.
- Wolf, D.R. *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500-1730*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

### Chapter 3:

“At this time I fell directly in to the green sickness”:

#### Crossing Boundaries in Anne Clifford's Early Life Writing

Anne Clifford was born in 1590 to one of England’s wealthiest aristocratic families, her parents’ only surviving child and therefore “a sole heiress to a great fortune” (Acheson “Introduction” 11). Clifford’s parents, George and Margaret the Earl and Countess of Cumberland, separated when she was an infant, and she was brought up primarily under her mother's influence. The baronies of Clifford, Westmoreland, and Vescy had been part of her family's property for more than three centuries. Women had been allowed to inherit baronies in the past, but “the law was not settled in one way or another” (Acheson “Introduction” 18). When Anne’s father George died in 1605, he left Anne a substantial dowry but willed all his estates to his brother, Francis Clifford. Clifford’s biographers have argued that this was a sound decision as “the estates were not cleared of debt until more than sixty years after George’s death . . . [and] creditors and others would have been less likely to extend their generosity to an underage girl and her female guardian” (Acheson “Introduction” 17). Anne saw the decision as an enforcement of patriarchy, however, rather than one made in her best interest:

My father, for the love he bore his brother, and the advancement of the heirs male of his house . . . did leave to his brother Francis . . . all his castles, lands, and honours . . . with a proviso that they should all return to me, his only daughter and heir, if the heirs male failed . . . . (Clifford *Life of Me* 221)

Clifford and her mother commenced a legal battle that would last for nearly four decades. To prove that the inheritance of these particular lands was not restricted to male heirs, Margaret and Anne began to collect documents of the Clifford family history going back to the reign of King John. In addition to this family research, Clifford began to keep records of her own life, including a memoir of the year 1603 recording her experiences of Queen Elizabeth's death and King James' accession and diaries recording the years 1616 through 1619.

Legal decisions made in 1609 by the Court of Wards (the "Judges' Award") and in 1617 by King James (the "King's Award") both found that Clifford's uncle would continue to hold ownership of the property and that Clifford would be given a monetary settlement, but "Clifford never did accept the Award and agree to its terms" and continued to fight for the property in spite of the disapproval of the King, the community, and her husbands (Acheson "Introduction" 25). In 1641, her uncle died; two years later, his only son died without a male heir. Clifford, at the age of 53, finally claimed the estates for which she had fought for so long by outliving all the male claimants. Once she had possession of the property, "she spent the rest of her life compiling proof that it should have been hers all along," assembling the Clifford family history into a thousand-page tome known as *The Great Books of the Clifford Family*, "employ[ing] professional scribes to make three almost identical copies of the series which would be preserved for use and edification of her posterity" (Myers 581). In addition to her family history, the work included her autobiography (starting at conception, no less) and "annual accounts for the years 1650 to 1675" (Acheson "Introduction" 32). Clifford also spent her remaining years restoring her properties to their medieval state and inhabiting them like a "medieval feudal lord" (Suzuki). She died in 1676, continuing to keep a diary until the day before her death.

As Acheson observes, Clifford's writing was “motivated by the desire to document the histories of her family and herself, a desire stimulated by the need to construct a picture of her lineage and rights that would help her in the legal disputes” (“Introduction” 15). That Clifford continued to compile the “Chronicles” (a word that she uses to describe both her family histories and her diaries) even after they were no longer needed, however, suggests that they fulfilled some other purpose beyond backing her legal claim. As important as the actual possession of the property was Clifford’s sense of identity—to herself, her contemporaries, and her descendants—which hinged on her position as the rightful inheritor of her father’s lands and her status as a participant of history, a student of her own history, “a commentator of the family’s past and a guardian of its future” (Myers 588).

We can best understand Clifford's unusual relationship with history by turning from her more traditional “historical” texts and instead reading her earlier work, particularly the 1603 memoir and the diaries for 1616, 1617, and 1619, as documents of historical record that demonstrate the “distinctive, if in our view unconventional, history” that she practiced (Suzuki). We have failed to understand Clifford’s diaries adequately as historical texts because of the narrow limits that scholars have placed on “history,” privileging the public affairs of men:

Women have been left out of history not because of the evil conspiracies of men in general or male historians in particular, but because we have considered history only in male-centered terms. We have missed women and their activities, because we have asked questions of history which are inappropriate to women. (Lerner qtd. in Showalter “Wilderness” 260)

Unlike conventional history, we commonly think of diaries as accounts of private, individual experiences. Clifford’s diaries, however, tell us surprisingly little about her personal feelings,

and although many of the experiences here are private in the strictest sense—her needlework, her dress, her days spent alone in her chamber—these experiences are by no means in the majority. Clifford intended for the diaries to be preserved and read, and had scribes copy them out to that end, adding further notes in the margins later to provide a wider context for her observations. They provide a record of Clifford's legal battles, which “Clifford wanted to document for the future uses of her family members and herself” and which had repercussions for a great many people; the estates “spread over hundreds of square miles, and provided the structure for the communities that inhabited them and the adjoining properties. To possess them was not just to hold the basis for extraordinary wealth; it was to own the means to govern the local people, landscape, and culture” (Acheson “Introduction” 26, 20).

Clifford's diaries therefore are not “private” texts but a different kind of historical writing, a response to and rejection of the emphasis on male participants, linear narrative construction, and public/private binary characteristic of male-authored history. I do not suggest that the “public” content of Clifford's diaries was radical in and of itself, for Shuger notes that it was fairly typical of diaries of the time for “verbal self-expression . . . to take unexpectedly politicized and aggressive forms” (Shuger 65). Taken in context with her other writings and projects, however, we can read Clifford's diary not just as a “private” work dealing with or seeking agency in “public” matters but as a historical text that attempts to trouble our understanding of early modern history as a means by which men learned to navigate the public sphere.

Clifford's historical sensibility “accords with her contemporaries' growing interest in local and family histories and their implications for English history” (Suzuki), but despite the importance of historical narratives in early modern England, they were not considered an



appropriate subject for women's reading. Clifford was one of the few women with access to such narratives: the Appleby Triptych, a painting commissioned by Clifford that shows her at the ages of fifteen and fifty-six, shows "numerous volumes of history" among her reading material and Samuel Daniel, "the author of important works of English history," was her tutor (Suzuki). Traditional, male-authored texts, however, did not have much to say to female readers. As the introduction of this dissertation has shown, history portrayed women not only as irrelevant but as "obstacles to the historical process" (Suzuki). Clifford's history, in terms of actual past events, was her ballast, and only stories from her family's past could justify her claim. But history, as a genre, had failed her; there was no place for her in it.

Clifford was inspired, however, rather than defined by the texts that made up her education. The placement of historical texts in the Appleby portrait, Lamb argues, "insists upon . . . the presence of an active subjectivity controlling, rather than being controlled by, the authors she read":

Clifford's denial of the authority of books is inextricably connected with her necessary denial of other cultural authorities, especially of husbands and kings. She has transcended the patriarchal texts of her culture to use them rather than to be defined by them, just as she has appropriated a male-authored canon as a means of creating herself. (Lamb 366)

One finds little variation among Renaissance historical narratives, for "[o]nce a number of influential histories had been produced in the early Tudor decades, and reproduced by the medium of print, it was far easier, and more natural, to imitate than to challenge them" (Woolf 31). Reacting to the turmoil of the civil wars of the fifteenth century, "[a]ll Tudor and early Stuart historical writing . . . reflects a conservative ideology of obedience, duty, and deference to

social and political hierarchy” (Woolf xiii). In defiance of such ideology, Clifford creates a historical narrative that privileges women. As history helped Englishmen shape a sense of themselves, Clifford uses it to understand her own identity, not as an Englishwoman but as a Clifford: not by producing traditional historiography but by applying the *importance* of historiography to a new way of inhabiting and recording the past. Clifford’s diaries are not private records but a different kind of history that resists many typical features of the genre: centralization of men’s stories, linear narrative, and a binary between public and private events. This work, as I will show, shares features with what some feminist theorists have called a “feminist aesthetic” or *écriture féminine*.

If we are to apply feminist literary theory to Clifford's texts, we much wrestle first with the question of Clifford's own feminism. Most historians would argue that Clifford does not demonstrate an early example of feminism. She is not compelled to secure property rights for all women; rather, she believes that her status as an aristocrat conferred upon her that privilege and is fighting for her place in patriarchy rather than fighting patriarchy itself: “texts other than the diary . . . reveal Clifford’s resolute refusal of what we might call nascent feminism, as is evidenced by her abiding attachment to her noble family’s history and the sense of aristocratic entitlement that history represented” (Acheson “Modernity” 40). It is still surprising, however, that Clifford never questions whether her gender should block her rights and never suggests that her king, father, or husband know best either because of their gender or their status, which is a powerful assertion of self-worth at a time when culture, history, and religion constantly taught women a sense of their own inferiority. This sense of self-worth, if not feminism, represents an important move toward it. Rosalind Coward argues that “[f]eminism must always be the alignment of women in a political movement with particular political aims and objectives. It is a

grouping unified by its *political interests*, not its common experiences” (Coward 238). The way in which Clifford’s community of women bonded together for self-protection and self-promotion in the face of patriarchal hostility, however, is arguably a political act, albeit one that they did not attempt to make available to all women:

These are not proto-feminists—they do not seek access to resources or power for *women* as a group. Neither, however, are they dupes and puppets for their male masters, as Clifford’s own life and actions make clear. They are women who worked both individually and in groups to enhance their positions in their immediate world, and to exercise power normally denied their sex. (Acheson “Introduction” 27)

Ultimately, a writer does not have to fit our definition of “feminist” (especially a seventeenth-century writer for whom our definitions would be unfairly anachronistic) in order to produce work of feminist importance. Clifford’s diaries, in troubling traditional notions of history-writing, represent an important work of early feminist historiography. Exploring what “women’s writing” is, DuPlessis asks: “What happens at the historical moment when the voiceless and powerless seek to unravel their riddle?” (274). Clifford’s work, as one such historical moment, is a powerful feminist statement, whatever the limits of Clifford’s own feminism.

Women’s writing, by its very nature, resists definition: “[i]t is impossible to *define* a feminine practice of writing, and this is an impossibility that will remain, for this practice can never be theorized, enclosed, coded—which doesn’t mean that it doesn’t exist” (Cixous 353). I do not argue that writing style is biologically determined or that there is a particular aesthetic characteristic of all or most female writers. The feminist aesthetic is better used as a way of understanding the various but loosely related ways in which women have resisted traditional,

masculinist literary forms: “The concept of *écriture féminine*, the inscription of the female body and female difference in language and text, is a significant theoretical formulation in French feminist criticism, although it describes a Utopian possibility rather than a literary practice” (Showalter “Wilderness” 249). The notion of *écriture féminine* can help us better understand Clifford's writing as a statement of difference, a reaction to mainstream, exclusionary, masculinist historiography.

Whatever her relationship to protofeminism, Clifford read very much as a feminist critic, one who questioned the usefulness of traditional narratives in forming her own sense of self. Feminist criticism is concerned with “the feminist as *reader*, and it offers feminist readings of texts which consider the images and stereotypes of women in literature . . . . All feminist criticism is in some sense revisionist, questioning the adequacy of accepted conceptual structures” (Showalter “Wilderness” 245, 246). In the case of history, “the subject of women has been either grafted on to other traditions or studied in isolation from them . . . . How could women be added to a history presented as a universal human story exemplified by the lives of men?” (Scott 16, 18) Rather than simply adding women's stories to a pre-existing narrative, an entirely new historical narrative is needed, for “[s]o long as we look to androcentric models for our most basic principles—even if we revise them by adding the feminist frame of reference—we are learning nothing new” (Showalter “Wilderness” 247). While Clifford's family history made room for female ancestors in the frame of traditional history, her diaries rewrite the framework entirely by centralizing female figures, rejecting linear narrative in favor of drawing nonlinear temporal and spatial connections based on personal (usually female) relationships, and creating an inclusionary history that refuses a division between public and private experiences.

Although many critics have noted Daniel's influence concerning Clifford's awareness of history, Suzuki notes that "Daniel's emphasis on the queen's function as a vehicle of monarchical succession corresponds to the structure of history according to the reigning monarch, and to its representation of women's role as limited and marginal" (Suzuki). Clifford's own histories, "by notable contrast to her tutor's negative assessment of female agents in history," emphasize female progenitors, particularly her thirteenth-century ancestor Isabella de Viteripont, whom she admired for filling the office of Sheriff of Westmoreland as Clifford herself hoped to do: "Clifford repeatedly traces the origin of the Cliffords to Isabella, making her virtually the founder of the Clifford line" (Suzuki). Similarly, Clifford's memoirs and diaries differ from standard historical narratives in moving women from the margins of history to the center. The two chief characters of her history are Queen Elizabeth I, whose death and the resulting political change is the central narrative concern of the 1603 memoir, and her mother, Margaret, whose death she records in the 1616 diary.

Traditional androcentric narratives did not provide many significant female historical figures in whom female readers could see themselves. Unlike many women before the seventeenth century, however, Clifford had within her remembered history the inspirational example of powerful female rule and triumph over danger and hardship:

Elizabeth appears . . . to have had a profound influence on the ability of women to imagine political possibilities for themselves in the generation that followed her . . . . [R]epeated references to the queen throughout the diary indicate that Clifford apparently found an inspiring model and example in Elizabeth, who suffered years of adversity under Mary Tudor's rule and who eventually triumphed to assert the inheritance of her title and crown from Henry VIII. (Suzuki)

Elizabeth was able to ensure her security through self-fashioning, the construction of a public identity for the purpose of securing some sort of social aim. We typically associate such self-fashioning with “new men”—More, Elyot, the courtiers that Spenser hoped to instruct through *Faerie Queene*. Elizabeth was, however, probably the most accomplished self-fashioner of them all: “Her real passion . . . was the theater of politics. There she was the principal thespian, the star performer ever conscious of her effect on her courtly and popular audiences. It might be said that a gift for the histrionic was the source of her political genius and survival” (McDonald 312).

Clifford was similarly conscious of self-fashioning behaviors; next to her in the Appleby Triptych are found “two conduct books—Castiglione’s *Book of the Courtier* and Primaudaye’s *French Academy*— [which] are primarily oriented toward the fashioning of gentlemen, rather than of gentlewoman, readers” (Lamb 363). Rather than aping the behavior of a higher class, however, she plays the role of a Clifford—the Clifford that gender would keep her from being. Elizabeth’s famous declaration, “We Princes, I tell you, are set on stages, in sight and view of all the world” (541), is echoed in Clifford’s diaries: “I was much sent to and visited by many . . . everybody persuading me to hear and to make an end since the King had taken the matter in hand, so as now I had a new part of play upon the stage of this world” (23 December 1616 105). Like Elizabeth, Clifford had been disinherited by her father and so, like Elizabeth, strives to reclaim his power through public self-identification as his daughter: Clifford through her diligent recording of the family line, Elizabeth through “explicitly employ[ing] rhetorical strategies of identification with her father” and “by her tenacious maintenance of the royal supremacy and her consummate cultivation of the aura of sacred kingship” (Montrose 20, 36). Both even emphasized physical resemblance to their fathers. Elizabeth “responds to the sexually provocative compliment that she has ‘the softest belly of any woman kynde,’ by asking

rhetorically, “Be not thease the armes, legges, and body of King Henry?” (Montrose 205), while Clifford paints herself as the perfect copy of both her parents:

The colour of mine eyes were black like my father, and the form and aspect of them was quick and lively like my mother's . . . with a peak of hair on my forehead, and a dimple on my chin, like my father, full cheeks and round face like my mother, and an exquisite shape of body resembling my father. (*Life of Me* 220)

Clifford's first surviving memoir testifies to the importance of Queen Elizabeth I's memory and the community of women that surrounded her. She was “much bound” to her “aunt of Warwick” (her mother's sister, Anne Russell), she writes, “for her continual care and love of me”:

in so much as if Queen Elizabeth had lived, she intended to have preferred me to be of the Privy Chamber, for at that time there was as much hope and expectation of me both for my person and my fortunes as of any other young lady whatsoever. (1603 43).

In addition to missing the chance to find favor at Elizabeth's court, Clifford is judged “too young” to sit with Elizabeth's corpse with her mother and “not high enough” to accompany the body as a mourner (1603 45). The Queen's death therefore places Clifford in a strange historical space between what *was* (a momentous period of history coming to an end with the Queen's life), what *is* (the accession of James I, whose “peaceable coming in . . . was unexpected of all sorts of people” [1603 43]), and what would never be because Clifford, too young to participate in these events, is lagging behind history (her preferment at the Queen's court and attendance of the Queen's body). Likewise, when Clifford and her mother rush to meet the Queen for the first time, they are so eager to “overtake” her aunt that they “killed three horses that day with extreme

of heat” (1603 49). This strange back-and-forth motion, this tension between different points on the timeline, emerges (as I discuss below) in Clifford's nonlinear narrative.

Equally important to Clifford's gynocentric historical narrative is her mother, Margaret, her chief ally in reassembling her family's history and reclaiming her ancestral right: “if George illegitimately diverted the course of history, Margaret through her lawsuits and refusal to acquiesce to her husband’s will brought it back on course” (Suzuki). This emphasis on “matrilineal heritage” (Lewalski 136) runs counter to attitudes toward the maternal in male-authored history:

[T]he repressions and elisions of patriarchal discourse betray deep anxieties about female power and authority. The validating object of men's desires, the deepest threat to their fulfillment, the specter of the women hovers at the margins of the patriarchal text, constructed as a paradox that exposes the contradictions in patriarchal history, a truth that eludes expression in authoritative patriarchal discourse. Never present in patriarchal history, women could only be represented, and what they represented was the material physical life that patriarchal discourse could never completely capture or control. (Rackin 193)

Clifford's diaries reflect that, in adulthood, she continued to rely on her mother's aid; she records that “[f]or some two nights my mother and I lay together and had much talk about this business” (1 April 1616 75), and later her husband’s uncle and brother and several other powerful men “persuaded me both by divine and human means to set my hand to these agreements but my answer to his Lordship was that I would do nothing till my Lady and I had conferred together” (17 February 1616 71). While the decisions her father made upon death have a tremendous effect on Clifford's life, her diaries rarely mention him. The pivotal moment in the narrative, instead, is



her mother's death. As Showalter argues, "As the death of the father has always been an archetypal rite of passage for the Western hero, now the death of the mother as witnessed and transcended by the daughter has become one of the most profound occasions of female literature" ("Toward" 135). On the 9th of May 1616, Anne receives letters informing her "how extreme ill my mother had been"; later that evening, she receives word from her husband, angry at her stubbornness in pursuing her claim, that "his determination was the Child should go live at Horsely and not come hither anymore, so this was a grievous and sorrowful day to me" (79). Anne's links to the female line in the past and the future, both named Margaret, are simultaneously threatened. As Anne does not learn of her mother's passing until five days after her death, the tension is heightened by diary entries hoping for her improvement while marginalia informs us that she has already passed away.

Although her autobiography records this time as one of "unspeakable grief" (*Life of Me* 228), Clifford's diary tells us very little about her feelings following her mother's passing, saying only, upon learning the news, that it was "the greatest and most lamentable cross that could befall me" (29 May 1616 87). Her posthumous influence continues to surface in Clifford's text, however; she regards her mother much in the way readers of history regarded great figures of the past, as those who could be looked to for lessons and inspiration. When Clifford's husband once again tries to convince her to cease her proceedings, she tells him "that my promise was so far passed to my mother and to all the world that I would never do it whatsoever became of me and mine" (16 April 1617 129); her marginalia for August 1617 notes that "About this time I began to think much of religion and do persuade myself that this religion in which my mother brought me up in is the true and undoubted religion so as I am steadfastly purposed never to be a papist" (August 1617m 144).

Clifford's emphasis on influential female figures in her own life extends to the way in which she records the historical experience of her community as a whole. While both the main text and the marginalia record events concerning men, her social circle is "small, and essentially tribal in its structure" (Acheson "Introduction" 26), and the vast majority of her observations concern news and scandal among the powerful women of Clifford's community: visiting Lady Raleigh in prison (8 January 1616 65); the arrest and arraignment of Lady Somerset (24 March 1616m 74; 24 May 1616 85); the kidnapping of Lady Hatton's daughter (July 1617m 140). Motherhood is a significant event in their circle, and Clifford's diaries record some dozen pregnancies and births over the course of the three-year record. Clifford never treats these events as private matters or speaks of their personal effect on her; rather, she speaks of them in terms of their effect on the community at large: for instance, when Lady Roos is sent to the Tower, Clifford calls it "one of the foulest matters that hath fallen out in our time" (February 1619m 158). She treats even events that must have been painful and humiliating with a certain distance: "This coming hither of my Lady Pennyston's [her husband's mistress] was much talked of abroad in the world and my Lord was much condemned for it" (August 1619m 182).

The way in which Clifford refers to members of her community often privileges men for their connections to women or privileges women in describing couples: "my Aunt of Bath [Clifford's mother's sister] and her Lord" (1603 47); "my Lady Thomas Howard's son" (rather than her husband's cousin's son) (3 January 1616 63); "my Lord Chancellor Egerton my Lady Derby's husband" (March 1617m 122). Even sovereigns themselves are not given primacy in Clifford's sentence structures: "I went to the court, where the Queen sent for me into her own bedchamber and here I spoke to the King" (4 November 1617 149); "This summer the King of Spain's eldest daughter called Anna Maria came into France and was married to the French King

and the French King's eldest sister went into Spain and was married to the King of Spain's eldest son" (June 1616m 90).

Since there were no specific laws governing whether baronies could descend through the female line, "throughout the sixteenth century the matter was decided on the whim of the monarch and the influence of the parties involved" (Acheson "Introduction" 18). Knowing the importance of influence, Clifford drew on the support of the powerful women of her social circle. Her most important ally was Queen Anne, who before Clifford's meeting with King James "gave me warning to take heed of putting my matters absolutely to the King lest he should deceive me" (18 January 1617m 110). At times Clifford embraces a sense of isolation: while her husband "went much abroad to cocking, to bowling alleys, to plays and horse races and was commended by all the world," she "stayed in the country having many times a sorrowful and heavy heart, and being condemned by most folks because I would not consent to the agreements, so as I may truly say I am like an owl in the desert" (12 May 1616 83). But she sought out powerful connections—"I wrote a letter to my sister Compton and my aunt Glenham I being desirous to win the love of my Lord's kindred by all the fair means I could" (29 May 1617 137)—and found support in her community: "Upon the 28<sup>th</sup> my Lady Selby came hither to see me and told me that she had heard some folks say that I have done well in not consenting to the Composition" (28 May 1616 85).

Clifford highlights the importance of these women by drawing connections between them through a nonlinear timeline. Clifford's diaries do not read like what we would consider traditional "history," in part, because they make no attempt to construct a cohesive narrative. Her text is a collection of observations, drawing connections between seemingly unrelated events. Such refusal of typical narrative, Lanser notes, is characteristic of women's writing:

If again and again scholars of women's writing much speak in terms of the 'plotless' . . . then perhaps something is wrong with the notions of plot that have followed from Propp's morphology. Perhaps narratology has been mistaken in trying to arrive at a single definition and description of plot. We will learn more about women's narrative . . . if we make ourselves find language for describing their plots in positive rather than negative terms. (Lanser 688)

Women's writing, Irigaray argues, rejects linear forms; it "is always *fluid* . . . . Its 'style' resists and explores every firmly established form, figure, idea, or concept" (572). Clifford may have had this sense of historical sensibility long before her legal troubles began, for the family motto, *Desormais* ("Henceforth"), reflects a complex and troubled relationship to linear time:

The word is a complicated compression of past, present, and future. Tradition held that the Cliffords had adopted this motto following the attainder and restitution of their lands, so it is itself a kind of historical property deed. At the same time, it insists that the future continuously unfolds from the present moment. (Myers 586-587)

Clifford's writing resists forward movement, doubling back on itself, creating meaning through repetitions and connections, placing events in context with other important times and places rather than telling them in a linear order:

The 29<sup>th</sup> in the morning died my sister Beauchamp's daughter Mrs Anne Seymour in the same house her father died five months before. The child was opened, it having a corrupt body, so it was put in lead and the day following Legge brought it to Knole which day was my birthday I being now 29 years old. (29 January 1619 157-158)

While Clifford occasionally notes connections to husbands and fathers, most of her connections link important female figures: "The child was brought down to me in the gallery which was the

first time I had seen her after my mother died” (December 1616m 102). Private spaces take on historical significance as Clifford makes connections between things that have happened or will happen there: “the message [of Queen Elizabeth's death] was delivered to my mother and me in the same chamber where afterwards I was married” (1603 43); “I was in the room where my Lord’s mother in law [stepmother] died” (22 April 1619 169); a marginal note for November 1617 reads that “These three days was the last time that ever I was in my mother’s chamber in St. Augustine Friars, which was the same chamber I was married in to Richard Lord Buckhurst who was Earl of Dorset three days after I married him” (148). Particularly momentous events, such as the deaths of queens, receive the most contextual detail:

I was at Queen Elizabeth’s death 13 years old and two months and this day Mr Richard Sackville was 14 years, he being then at Dorset House with his grandfather and that great family. At the death of this worthy Queen my mother and I lay at Austin Friars in the same chamber where afterwards I was married. (1603m 42)

Upon the 2<sup>nd</sup> [Queen Anne] died at Hampton Court between two and three in the morning . . . . Legge brought me the news of her death about four o’clock in the afternoon, I being in my bed chamber at Knole where I had the first news of my mother’s death . . . . She died in the same chamber that Queen Jane, Henry the 8th's wife, died in. (2 March 1619 161). . . . The old Queen dowager of Denmark was alive when her daughter Queen Anne of England died. (March 1619m 160)

Rather than adhering to a strict chronology, Clifford counts the time between related events. The marginalia to her attendance of the Queen’s funeral observes: “This 13<sup>th</sup> day it is just 13 years and two months since my father his funeral was kept and solemnized in the Church at Skipton as

Queen Anne her body was this night buried in the Abbey church at Westminster” (13 May 1619m 174). Her record of her mother’s death attempts to place it in context with every other significant event of Clifford’s life:

Upon the 24<sup>th</sup>, being Friday, between the hours of six and seven at night died my dear mother at Brougham in the same chamber where my father was born, thirteen years and two months after the death of Queen Elizabeth and ten years and four months after the death of my father, I being then 26 years old and four months and the child two years old wanting a month. (24 May 1616m 84)

Clifford also gives seemingly insignificant events historical weight by noting whenever something occurs for the first or the last time. Most of these firsts concern her young daughter, Margaret. Noting milestones is common to parents of young children, but Clifford’s records cover an unusually wide range of such events: “the first time [her daughter] stirred abroad since she was sick” (6 April 1617 127); Margaret’s first whalebone bodice, the subsequent removal of the cloth strips meant to help steady a toddler learning to walk, and her first velvet coat (28 April 1617, 1 May 1617 133, 1 January 1619 155); her first time sleeping with her mother since her birth and her first time sleeping with both her parents (13 May 1617 135, 3 August 1617 143). Noting the last time things happen, of course, can only happen in retrospect. In her margins, she notes “the last time ever I was so near King James as to touch him” (4 November 1617m 148); “the last time I saw my old Lady of Pembroke [Mary Sidney]” (13 May 1619m 174), and “the last time I saw my Lord of Hertford” (14 May 1619m 176). Thirty-eight years following her mother’s death, Clifford erects a monument at the site of their last “heavy and grievous parting” (2 April 1617 75, Acheson fn). Renaissance beliefs about the past were characterized by “two seemingly contradictory notions of the movement of time”: as a pattern of natural cycles

characteristic of classical history, or as a providential history consisting of a straight line from Creation to Apocalypse (Woolf 5). Clifford's aristocratic pedigree, however, had not been enough to secure her future; history had not provided Clifford with reliable pattern. In her diaries we find Clifford seeking out a pattern of her own, a search for meaning in the connections between the momentous events of her life, the births and passings and marriages.

DuPlessis characterizes the feminist aesthetic as “the thrilling ambition to write a great, encyclopedic, holistic work, the ambition to get everything in, inclusively, reflexively, monumentally” (DuPlessis 279). If androcentric history defined the English against what they were not, creating splits, binaries, hierarchies, Clifford's history, like Lucy Hutchinson's, is characterized by the broadness of its scope. Reacting to a history that excludes her, Clifford includes *everything*. Scholars have been selective in approaching Clifford's content—because her diaries cover such a wide range of topics, they can pick what they find most conducive to their arguments: “Only the directly autobiographical portions of her diary are treated as source material; everything else is extraneous” (Kunin 598). The inclusivity of Clifford's diaries, however, makes them a fascinating piece of historical writing; so defiant is she of traditional definitions of history, of the basic understanding of history as *things that have happened*, that she records when nothing has happened at all: “The time grew tedious so as I used to go to bed about eight o'clock and lie abed till eight the next morning” (11 March 1617 123); “Upon the 31st I sat still thinking the time to be very tedious” (31 July 1617 143), or when she cannot recall what has happened: “Upon the 30th I do not remember whether my Lord went to the church or stayed at home” (30 November 1617 151).

Of particular significance is Clifford's inclusion of events of both “public” and “private” importance. Traditional histories set boundaries on what is and isn't considered “historical”: war,

law, the public sphere. As women have been excluded from these activities, so have they been excluded from the historical record, and so denied a sense of self. Rather than a binary, events in Clifford's record appear along a wide spectrum of private and public spaces: the days spent alone in her room; her daughter's illnesses and her husband's gambling debts; the legal troubles of powerful aristocrats and the marriages of kings. Clifford easily combines experiences that are associated with women or the "private sphere" with those associated with men's public, political lives. Despite the emphasis in the 1603 memoir on the story of the Queen's death, James' accession, and her relationship to the Queen and the Princess, the personal details—such as Clifford's account of suffering from "the green sickness" after eating too much fruit, or that she "used to wear my hair coloured velvet gown every day, and learned to sing and play on the bass viol of Jack Jenkins, my aunt's boy"—show that even in this more traditional memoir, she does not draw distinctions between the public and the private (1603 59). Rather, politics are part of her girlhood experience, and her experiences as a young aristocrat are part of politics. Interestingly, she links textually the account of her greensickness, an illness commonly associated in the Renaissance with adolescent female desire, to political scandal resulting from feminine frivolity among powerful women:

At this time I fell directly in to the green sickness. Now there was much talk of a masque which the Queen had at Winchester and how all the ladies about the court had gotten such ill-names that it was grown a scandalous place, and the Queen herself much fallen from her former greatness and reputation she had in the world.  
(1603 59)

In Clifford's historiography, these events are linked thematically and are of equal significance, even if they fall on opposite sides of the boundary between public and private history.



Women's writing, Cixous argues, "un-thinks the unifying, regulating history that homogenizes and channels forces, herding contradictions into a single battlefield. In woman, personal history blends together with the history of all women, as well as national and world history" (Cixous 352). Whether Clifford "blends" these various histories has been a matter of some contention. The diaries were copied out by a scribe, with a space to the side—more of a "double-column format" than what we would strictly consider a margin—in which Clifford recorded relevant observations in her own hand (Acheson qtd. in Kunin 600). Some of her marginalia concerned political events beyond the immediate scope of her circle, such as the foreign royal marriages noted above; some were events that she did not know about at the time they occurred, such as her mother's death; some do not differ in content from the entries of the diary proper.

Scholars have focused on the personal, domestic details and ignored content concerning "law, literature, genealogy, history, politics, and court life" (Kunin 598), arguing that "the personal narrative . . . holds the center while the public and social world are (quite literally) marginalized" (Lewalski 142). The text reveals no real consistency, however, as to what ends up on either side; the left-hand column simply "puts events in relation to other events [and] marks out significant events on a timeline" (Kunin 601). The margins do not reflect a division between public and private, for often they note "private" events (often recording pregnancies and childbirths among women in her social circle), or show both kinds of events in close proximity: "Upon the 18th, being Friday, died my Lady Margaret's [Clifford's young daughter] old beagle" (18 October 1616m 98) followed by "Upon the 4th Prince Charles was created Prince of Wales" (4 November 1616m 98).

As Kunin points out, the diary is not written in the present moment or meant to reflect the feelings of that moment: "Clifford's diary never allows us to entertain the fiction that an entry in

the diary is temporally continuous with the actions and events that it records” (Kunin 602). Rather, it records what *has* happened each day, with no indication of *when* she recorded it. That more content was added along the margins later, therefore, does not lessen the significance of those contents. Forming a complete history, as Clifford seeks to do, means including contextual material that wasn’t always apparent at the time the event happened. To claim that Clifford’s marginalia should be, so to speak, marginalized is to misunderstand the importance of the connections she makes between different kinds of events. The margins are not merely supplemental material to the “real” text; rather, the diary is centerless, inclusive of all experiences without boundaries or hierarchies.

It would be mistaken to take Clifford, an aristocrat with unusual access to male power, as an example of all Renaissance women's relationship to history. But although literary recovery of the last few decades has taught us that Renaissance women, taught by culture to be silent, were anything but, we have continued to neglect their historical discourses because they do not fit our accepted definitions of history. Examples such as Clifford can help us begin to understand early modern women's relationship to their communal and national pasts, and lead us towards creating a vision of history that not only accommodates but is truly inclusive of women's experiences in the future.

## Works Cited

- Acheson, Katherine Osler. "Introduction." *The Memoir of 1603 and the Diary of 1616-1619*. Toronto: Broadview Editions, 2007.
- . "The Modernity of the Early Modern: The Example of Anne Clifford." *Discontinuities: New Essays on Renaissance Literature and Criticism*. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1998. 27-51.
- Cixous, Hélène. "The Laugh of the Medusa." *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Robin R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997. 347-362.
- Clifford, Anne. *The Memoir of 1603 and the Diary of 1616-1619*. Toronto: Broadview Editions, 2007.
- . *A Summary of the Records and a True Memorial of the Life of Me the Lady Anne Clifford. The Memoir of 1603 and the Diary of 1616-1619*. Toronto: Broadview Editions, 2007.
- Coward, Rosalind. "Are Women's Novels Feminist Novels?" *The New Feminist Criticism: Essays of Women, Literature, and Theory*. Ed. Elaine Showalter. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985. 225-240.
- DuPlessis, Rachel Blau. "For the Etruscans." *The New Feminist Criticism: Essays of Women, Literature, and Theory*. Ed. Elaine Showalter. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985. 271-291.
- Elizabeth I. "Speech on Mary, Queen of Scots." *Women Writers of the Renaissance and Reformation*. Ed. Katharina M. Wilson. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987.
- Fetterley, Judith. "On the Politics of Literature." *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Ed. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan. Malden: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1998. 562- 569.
- Helgerson, Richard. *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Irigaray, Luce. "The Power of Discourse and the Subordination of the Feminine." *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Ed. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan. Malden: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 1998. 570-573.
- Jones, Ann Rosalind. "Writing the Body: Toward an Understanding of Écriture Féminine." *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Robin R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997. 370-383.
- Kunin, Aaron. "From the Desk of Anne Clifford." *ELH* 71 (2004) 587-608.

- Lamb, Mary Ellen. "The Agency of the Split Subject: Lady Anne Clifford and the Uses of Reading." *ELR* 22:3 (1992) 347-368.
- Lanser, Susan S. "Toward a Feminist Narratology." "Feminism, New Historicism, and the Reader." *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Robin R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997. 674-693.
- Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer. *Writing Women in Jacobean England*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- McDonald, Russ. *The Bedford Companion to Shakespeare: An Introduction with Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2001.
- Montrose, Louis. *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender, and Representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.
- Myers, Anne B. "Construction Sites: The Architecture of Anne Clifford's Diaries." *ELH* 73 (2006) 581-600.
- Rackin, Phyllis. *Stages of History: Shakespeare's English Chronicles*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Schweickart, Patrocínio P. "Reading Ourselves: Toward a Feminist Theory of Reading." *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Robin R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997. 609-634.
- Scott, Joan Wallach. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
- Showalter, Elaine. "Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness." *The New Feminist Criticism: Essays of Women, Literature, and Theory*. Ed. Elaine Showalter. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985. 243-270.
- . "Toward a Feminist Poetics." *The New Feminist Criticism: Essays of Women, Literature, and Theory*. Ed. Elaine Showalter. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985. 125-143.
- Shuger, Debora. "Life-Writing in Seventeenth-Century England." *Representations of the Self from the Renaissance to Romanticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 63-78.
- Suzuki, Mihoko. "Anne Clifford and the Gendering of History." *Clio* 30:2 (2001): 195- 230.
- Woolf, D.R. *The Idea of History in Early Stuart England: Erudition, Ideology, and "The Light of Truth" from the Accession of James I to the Civil War*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

## Chapter 4:

### “Loyalty beeing the principle”:

#### Divided Duty and Narrative Shaping in Anne Halkett's Memoirs

Anne Halkett's memoirs defy categorization. They could be described as a prototype of the Austenian romance narrative, a war memoir, a confessional, or a defense; a story of the journey from “love sought to love attained” or “cautionary tale about male duplicity and inconstancy” (Trill xxi). She reveals more of her private feelings than Clifford, Fanshawe, Hutchinson, or Cavendish; yet she is also the only one of them who directly shapes public history through her actions. Otten opines that “her motivation for writing her autobiography was partly to celebrate her public involvement in the Royalist struggle for power, and partly to vindicate herself from any possible slander concerning her private love affair with Bampfield” (140), while Seelig calls it “not confession of fault but rather justification of the author's actions” (113) and Wiseman describes it as both a “a confessional account of personal relationships” and “a story of her political activity and reflections” (29, 30). Halkett employs all these forms to create a history of public and private loyalties: to family, romantic love, politics, and religion. She records and reflects on the inevitable tensions and disasters that occur when these loyalties conflict, and attempts to reconcile them, both as a character within the narrative and an author shaping it.

Lady Halkett was born Anne Murray in 1623 to Thomas Murray, provost of Eton College. Her father died during her infancy, but “her family's court connections ensured her a comfortable childhood “ and she was well-educated (Stevenson). She had two elder brothers and

an elder sister; her mother was governess to Princess Mary and Prince Henry's, but whether Halkett spent any time with the King's children, who were eight and seventeen years younger than her respectively, is unknown. We know little about Halkett's life beside what she tells us in her memoir. In 1644 she began a relationship with Lord Howard, the son of a local aristocratic family, but "both her mother and his father forbade the match, as the Howard family needed to marry into money to restore its fortunes" (Stevenson). Despite his declarations of love, she soon learns that he has married another. In 1647, not long after her mother's death, Halkett met Royalist spy Colonel Joseph Bampfield; the pages recording the beginning of their relationship were torn out of her memoirs, although by whom is unknown. She began to work as a secret agent for the Royalist cause, helping to facilitate the young Duke of York's escape from London. Bampfield either believed or falsely claimed his wife was dead, the two agreed to marry; but soon after Halkett left London in 1649, she learned that "his wife was indeed living, that his loyalty to the royalists was suspect, and that her relationship with him was causing scandal as he was a married man" (Stevenson).

She joined the royal court in Scotland in 1650 and met Sir James Halkett in 1652. After learning definitively that Bampfield's wife was still living and, ending her relationship with Bampfield, she married James Halkett in 1656. She gave birth to four children in the following five years, only one of whom survived infancy. Halkett's husband died in 1670; she devoted much of her later years to writing devotions and practicing medicine. In 1677, she began work on her memoirs. Most scholars believe that she wrote them for her own edification or that of her descendants (Loftis x), although Margaret Ezell makes a convincing case for Halkett preparing the work to be published after her death: "the manuscripts show numerous indications that she was consciously shaping her own manuscript writings for a print readership rather than a

manuscript one” (217). She died in 1699; her religious writings were published two years later, along with an anonymous biography of her life. Her memoir was first printed in 1875.

Bampffield's involvement in politics late in life may have stirred up talk of their scandalous relationship once again, and so Halkett's intent in composing her memoirs may have been to defend herself against allegations of misconduct with the Colonel thirty years previously. She may have written to justify herself in the eyes of her stepson, Charles Halkett, with whom she had a troubled relationship, or she may have been compelled to explain her service to James II in the midst of the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis. The proliferation of possible motivations for Halkett's life writing highlights the anxieties that plagued her both in life, and in the writing of it. Halkett suffers from a “conflict betwixt love and honor was so great and prevalent that neither would yield to the other” (57). She finds herself devoted to multiple and often conflicting ideals, and the text, by celebrating her Royalism, justifying her actions to her mother, and excusing her affairs, serves to prove her loyalty to them all. Halkett does not wish simply to prove her chastity but, rather, preserve her honor in the masculine sense (much as Bampffield's own apology does) by proving her steadfast devotion to King, country, love, family, and religion. When loyalty to one ideal appears as a betrayal of another, she must reconcile them by bending the truth, appropriating a variety of literary genres, and manipulating language.

Royalist discourse, as Lois Potter's work has shown, was often associated with secrecy. Royalist newsbooks in the 1640s came from “concealed printing houses,” many Royalist works were “published illegally” during the war and Interregnum, and Royalist correspondence often employed secret code (Potter 17, 36, 41). Of the ciphers found in Charles I's letters, Purkiss argues:

The figure of the cipher itself becomes a code for monarchic illegitimacy; it is metonymically connected with a series of other figures which represent Charles's politics as secretive intrigues . . . . Republicanism in England, from its practical inception, thus grounded its legitimation of publicity in the figuration of a secret, coded, closed and artificial realm of femininity, a realm which both threatened and necessitated the public sphere itself. (Purkiss 75, 77).

At the height of Halkett's romantic and political intrigues, loyalty and truth came into direct conflict in the form of conspiracy, an action that not only prevents her from defending accusations of sexual misconduct in public (as she had fled London following her role in the rescue of the Duke of York to avoid suspicion) but also casts aspersions on her through the association between conspiracy and unchastity. The danger of conspiracy, of meeting men alone in rooms to discuss secret things, is frequently associated with sexual sin during this period; both conspiracy and unchastity are hidden, secret acts that threaten patriarchy. The enclosed space, rather than ensuring Halkett's chastity, hides her from a public gaze that could hold her accountable for her alleged misdeeds. To defend herself against the sin of sexual transgression, she must transgress by speaking of her involvement in public matters. By using her memoirs to confess everything about her political intrigues, down to the smallest details about secret meetings, infiltrated castles, and scarlet petticoats, Halkett frames her private dalliances with Bampffield as an act for the public good. In detailing her political actions, she hopes to remove the stain of secrecy from her political life and, by association, her sexual life as well.

Halkett's notion of "truth," however, is ambiguous. She frequently shapes her text according to the conventions of romance and seventeenth-century drama, so much so that her reactions may seem contrived. In a time when the "prototype of a maligned female figure protesting her



innocence and defending her reputation” was beginning to influence early forms of the novel, it was common for a female memoirist to “have constructed her life-history in part based on received literary prototypes” (Donovan 170, 176). Furthermore, Halkett's preoccupation with the idea of honesty, a persistent theme as she characterizes herself as a guardian of truth victimized by a line of male betrayers, does not correspond to her frequent willingness to bend the truth, adhering to the letter of her oaths rather than the spirit of them in an attempt to stay true to multiple and conflicting allegiances. Though Halkett, over the course of the narrative, learns to choose her loyalties better and value true oaths properly, her shaping of the narrative through her portrayal of herself as a passive participant in her doomed love affairs shows us how she continues to shape the truth to her own purposes.

This narrative shaping is particularly significant if we wish to understand the place of Halkett's text in the development of literature during the long eighteenth century, for the uneasy relationship between Halkett's urge to tell the truth and her willingness to bend it is a characteristic of the seventeenth-century biographical and autobiographical texts that anticipate the early novel. Like fiction, these forms “[require] sound construction and the sustained power of telling a story” (MacCarthy 56). Although “the biographer may not invent or adapt his material as the novelist does,” both forms require “selectivity, artistic emphasis and vivid presentation” (MacCarthy 56-57). The biographical or autobiographical subject is “just as much an artificial construction as any other kind of writing. The image produced through writing is a partial one, and 'partial' in more than one sense” (Hobby “Virtue” 78). As the biographies of the Civil War period gave way to the prose fiction of the eighteenth century, we find that in these early novels “the boundaries between the ordinary and everyday world of fact and fiction . . . and the fictional or sensational or even fantastic realm are fluid and uncertain” (Richetti 1). In order

to shape her narrative and tread the boundary between fact and fiction, Halkett appropriates contemporary literary forms such as romance and drama; moreover, her memoirs anticipate forms to come, for she transgresses the boundaries between public and private discourse in ways characteristic of the early novel.

Halkett's account of her romantic and political intrigues, at once a confessional and a defense, anticipates work such as Defoe's *Roxana* and *Moll Flanders*. Print culture, as Spencer argues, brought about a "new public dimension to domestic life" by bringing a "new evaluation of privacy and domesticity" to the public sphere (Spencer 217). The eighteenth-century sentimental novel "had an ambiguous role as the carrier of private concerns in public print" (Spencer 217). By discussing such private matters before a widespread audience, women authors "expressed their concerns about women's place in the power structures of society, examining the implications of domestic power and power in the state; and they suggested ways that an understanding of history would be modified by the inclusion of a perspective that saw female life as important" (Spencer 217). Decades before Richardson or Defoe, Halkett tackles these important matters passionately and expressively.

Halkett's first conflict among her various duties comes early in the narrative, when she becomes involved with Mr. Howard. Her mother disapproves of the match as Halkett, though gentry, would not bring a sufficient dowry to the marriage. Halkett wishes to obey her mother, but is drawn to Howard both out of romantic desire and, she claims, devotion to "relligion" (he threatens to become a monk if she will not marry him) (13). Her desire to reconcile these duties takes the form of two half-truths, oaths that she will honor in word but not in spirit. First, she swears to Howard that she will not marry until he does when, in fact, she has "noe inclination to marry any" (13), letting her rejection of appropriate female roles (the wish to avoid marriage) be

interpreted as adherence to them (the wish to remain chaste for her beloved). She then promises her mother that she will never see Howard again and consequently wears a blindfold when they meet. Her behavior during this affair shows parallels with popular drama of the time; she carefully orchestrates their secret meeting, and Potter suggests she takes the blindfolding trick from Cowley's 1641 comedy *The Guardian* (Potter 108).

Her appropriation of the conventions of drama and prose romance may be an indication of the young Halkett's Royalism, or the elderly Halkett's appeal to Royalist readers: both drama and prose romance, Potter argues, “belonged specifically to the royalists,” and “simply to write in either form was to make a statement about one's relation to the party in power“ (Potter 74). Royalists used conventions of romance to make political points, and royalist agents may have used conventions of romance as a cipher (Potter 73). Romances also accorded more power to women; Parliamentarians satirized the form as commentary on Charles I's relationship with Henrietta Maria (Potter 80), and Halkett may have been particularly drawn to the form because of its association with women's agency. This manipulation of language goes beyond the young Halkett's falsehoods and persists to the elderly Halkett's shaping of these events, in which she appears much like the passive, suffering heroine of a Restoration she-tragedy. The unwilling but helpless recipient of Howard's attentions, she “gave way to [his] adrese” (11) and “suffred him to kisse mee” (15). Her willfulness in meeting and corresponding with him against her mother's wishes belies the narrator's implication that she was not an active partner in their forbidden affair.

Despite her attempts to please her family without breaking her vows to her lover, the affair badly damages Halkett's relationship with her mother:

My mother's anger against mee increased to that height that for fourteene months shee never gave mee her blesing, nor never spoke to mee butt when itt was to reproach mee, and one day said with much bitternese shee did hate to see mee.

That word I confese strucke deepely to my hart and putt mee to my thoughts what way to dispose of my selfe to free my mother from such an object. (20)

She never condemns her mother's treatment of her and, indeed, portrays herself as the unlovable "object" from which her mother must be "free[d]"; yet her portrait of her mother is unsympathetic, sure to show Halkett as the wronged party. Although her mother forgives her after Halkett threatens to run away to an Anglican nunnery, her response to her daughter being betrayed by Howard's marriage to an earl's daughter is to laugh, suggesting that her affections for her daughter have not quite been restored. Unfortunately, by either Halkett's own self-censoring or that of her posterity, the pages in which her mother dies (in the midst of romantic intrigue, after Howard's betrayal and before her introduction to Bampfield) are lost. Here, as elsewhere in the text, whether Halkett suffers from private guilt or public shame is unclear. If she removed the pages herself, perhaps the older, intensely pious Halkett wishes to portray herself as consistently good rather than reformed in her later years: an adventurous Moll Flanders with the unjustly wronged innocence of a Clarissa. Whatever the reason for the missing pages, they are a great loss to readers not only for what they hide about Halkett's romantic exploits, but for the way they rob us of her reaction to her mother's passing. There can be, ultimately, no reconciliation of loyalties: Halkett's chastity can only be preserved in the manuscript at the expense of the woman who first taught her to value it.

Having lost both her parents, Halkett seeks an alternate family through her ties to Royalist intrigue. Unlike aristocratic narratives such as Lucy Hutchinson's and Margaret

Cavendish's, which include extensive genealogies, or even Anne Fanshawe's, which recounts as much as she can from family stories and inscriptions on gravestones, Halkett has little to tell us about her family lineage. The damaged pages at the beginning of the memoirs cut off what little information she had: "For my parentts I need nott say much, since they were . . ." (9). Both parents "claimed" descent from the families of Scottish earls, but neither they or Halkett provide no proof (10). We do know the Murrays had close ties to the royal family. Her father was Charles I's tutor:

Hee was thought a wise King who made choice of my f[ather] to bee tuter to the late King of blessed memory; and what the excellentt Prince learnt in his youth kept him stedfast in his relligion though under all the temptations of Spaine, temperate in all the exceses that attend a court, vertuous and constant to the only lawfull imbraces of the Queene, and [unmove]able and undisturbed under all his unparaleld sufferings. (10)

In Halkett's account, her father, in a sense, created Charles I (tellingly, in all the ideals that the libertine Charles II, the king who betrays her brother, cannot live up to). Halkett's mother, likewise, was governess to "the Duke of Gloucester and the Princese Elizabeth" (10)—a mother to royalty, perhaps, in a way that she was not an adequate mother to Anne herself. Again, the text's silences frustrate the reader, for she tells almost nothing about her childhood or any experiences she may have had with the royal family during that time. Her turn to Royalist intrigue directly following her mother's death, however, suggests she may have associated family ties with political loyalty. She takes a motherly attitude to the young Duke of York during the rescue, dressing him in his disguise and bringing him "a Woodstreet cake (which I knew hee loved) to take in the barge" (25).

Halkett similarly commits herself to Bampffield both as a lover and fellow patriot, reconciling the desires of heart and duty, seeking to protect her reputation with the insistence that she cannot be a bad woman if she is a good Royalist:

The earnest desire I had to serve the King made mee omitt noe oportunity wherin I could bee usefull, and the zeale I had for His Majesty made mee not see what inconveniencys I exposed my selfe to; for my intentions beeing just and innocent made mee nott reflect what conclusions might bee taken for the private visitts which I could nott butt nesesarily make to C.B. in order to the King's service. (27)

Political devotion replaces sexual surrender in Halkett's narrative: "For what ever might related to itt that came within my knowledge I gave him account of, and hee made such use of itt as might most advance his designe" (27). Sexual secrecy is replaced with the secrecy of patriotism under threat: "As long as there was any posibility of conveying letters secrettly to the King, hee frequently writt and received very kind letters from his Majesty with severall instructions and letters to persons of honour and loyalty" (27). She rewrites passion between lovers as passion among Royalists: "when all access was debarred by the strict guard placed aboutt the King, all hee could then doe was to *keepe warme those affections* in such as hee had influence in till a seasonable oportunity to evidence there *love and duty* to His Majesty" (27, italics mine). This complete devotion excuses not only her actions, but her failure to check her behavior: "United to C.B. in a cause much greater than themselves, how could [Halkett] concern herself with the risk to her reputation incurred in the service of God's own anointed king?" (Lamb 89)

Halkett's suspicion of Bampffield early in their relationship reveals her longing to believe in overreaching loyalty in the face of divided duties. Learning of his year-long separation from

his wife, Halkett feels “itt was impossible, in my opinion, for a good man to bee an ill husband” (23). He excuses his behavior on political grounds:

[H]ee beeig ingaged in the King's service, hee was oblied to bee att London, where itt was nott convenient for her to bee with him, his stay in any place beeig uncertaine. Besides, she lived amongst her friends, who though they were kind to her yett were nott so to him, for most of that country had declared for the Parleament and were enemys to all that had, or did, serve the King. (23)

The problem is not one of loyalty, but of the physical separation inevitably wrought by war; he is not inconstant in his marriage but, rather, constant in his patriotism. Halkett accepts this explanation: “This seeming reasonable, I did insist noe more upon that subject” (23). The ambiguity of her words, however—“this *seeming* reasonable”—makes it unclear whether Halkett, in years since, has come to doubt Bampffield.

Halkett carefully shapes herself as the innocent victim of male dishonesty; as with Howard, she characterizes her role in her relationship with Bampffield as utterly passive: “Hee so often insisted on this when I had occasion to bee with him that att last hee prevailed with mee, and I did consentt to his proposall” (28). Her priority, as she tells us, is the Crown: she “resolved to marry him as soone as itt apeared convenient; but wee delayed itt till wee saw how itt pleased God to determine of the King's affaires” (28). The only place she actively declares devotion, rather than passively accepting an oath forced on her, is in rescuing the Duke of York: “I told him I came there with a resolution to serve His Highnese and I was fully determined nott to leave that place till I was outt of hopes of doing what I came there for, and would take my hazard” (25). Her description of her political loyalties is, likewise, more impassioned than any she makes to her lovers:

The King's misfortune dayly increasing and his enemy's rage and malice, both were att last determined in that execrable murder, never to bee mentioned withoutt horror and detestation. This putt such a dampe upon all designes of the Royall Party that they were for a time like those that dreamed, butt they quickly roused up themselves and resolved to leave noe meanes unesayed that might evidence there loyalty. Many excellentt designes were laid, butt the Lord thought fitt to disapoint them all, that his owne power might bee the more magnified by bringing home the King in peace when all hostile attempts failed. (28)

That is not to suggest that Halkett did not have strong feelings for Bampfield; her willingness to believe that he is “unquestionably loyal” in the light of evidence that suggests otherwise shows the depth of her passion for him (28). In her memoirs, however, Halkett safely deflects all feelings of passion onto concerns of state, choosing to remember the affair as one of political devotion rather than romantic or sexual desire.

Throughout the text, Halkett associates Bampfield with his friend, her brother Will; after the missing pages, the relationship is one of the first things we learn about him, and when justifying her agreement to marry him, one of her reasons is that he “proffesed a great friendship to my beloved brother Will” (28). Her relationship with Bampfield seems to be, in part, a search not only for a supportive Royalist social structure but specifically for a brother-figure, which might explain why she refuses to implicate him, either as a liar in love or a traitor in politics, after losing her brother to the King's betrayal. Immediately after Bampfield tells her his wife may yet be living, her brother is banished from court and soon sickens and dies, throwing her carefully balanced loyalties crashing into conflict with one another. Despite her devotion to the



Crown, Halkett is unafraid to declare that “with great injustice and sevearity was my brother banished the three courts” (29):

Had not duty and former obligations beene a tye to all hee was capable to performe, itt was but an ill requitall for many years faithfull service and much hardship with hazard of his life, for none could brand him with disloyalty or cowardise. Nor did hee know how to refuse any imployment that was serviceable to the King, though never so dangerous to undertake. (30)

She daringly blames Charles II (only two years dead when Halkett composes her text) for her brother's death: “this injury contributed through the mercy of God to his eternall good” (30). Halkett asks her brother “if hee thought C.B. had any hand in such a designe,” clearly suspecting that the romantic and political ideals to which she is devoted cannot live up to their promises (30). Her brother's enigmatic response—“Hee said hee thought hee might say as much for him as for himselfe”—suggests her fears may be correct and that her brother, like her lover and her king, cannot be trusted (30).

Following Will's death, Halkett receives letters from her surviving siblings, condemning her for her relationship with Bampfield and revealing that his wife is still alive. She does not claim to feel guilt (according to her own moral code, seeking to keep her promises to everyone, she has done nothing wrong) but their disappointment has such a strong effect that she immediately falls ill. She characterizes her illness as one that renders her silent, yet compels her to express herself: “My distemper increased, and I grew so weake I could hardly speake. Aprehending the aproach of death, I desired my Lady H. to vindicate mee to my brother and sister, for as I was ignorant and ignorant and inocentt of the guilt they taxed mee with“ (33). Discourse has become so untrustworthy that she refuses to believe Bampfield's wife is alive: “I

gave nott the least creditt to itt because I though there information might come from such as might report itt outt of malice or designe“ (33).

Given the difficulties of communication during the war, Bampfield may well have believed his wife to be dead. Halkett's friends and family, however, certainly believed he was lying to take advantage of her. She declares, with the melodramatic flair of a Richardson heroine, that to be accused of such a crime as betraying the marriage bond is the worst fate anyone could suffer:

Itt is nott to bee imagined by any pious, vertuous person (whose charity leads them to judge of others by themselves) butt that I looked upon itt as an unpareld misfortune (how inocentt so ever I was) to have such an odium cast upon me as that I designed to marry a man that had a wife, and I am sure none could detest mee so much as I abhorred the thought of such a crime. I confese I looked upon itt as the greatest of afflictions. (35)

Soon after, she finds her reputation under threat once again. When Halkett is staying at the home of her friend Lady Howard, Mr. Nicholls, a preacher, spreads rumors of her vanity and sexual misconduct that threaten her relationship with the family. This section of Halkett's memoirs, a tragedy of manners that features neither romance nor politics, has received less attention from critics. Thematically, however, this chapter is significant in Halkett's life. Again, her depiction of events closely resembles literary conventions, but she is no longer the naive ingenue of a Restoration comedy or the passive victim of a she-tragedy. Instead, her tale now follows the form of the eighteenth-century courtship novel, which “focuses on the delaying actions that dot the road between a young woman's emergence from her father's protection and the subsumption of her identity into that of her husband“ (Epstein 199). In being systematically betrayed by all the

authority figures in her life—mother, king, lovers, clergy—she is as vulnerable as Richardson's underage serving-girl Pamela. Most significantly, Halkett walks the line between acceptable and unacceptable behavior in a way that closely resembles the behavior of Burney's protagonists:

[I]n the dark moments of Burney's narratives . . . her heroines reside on the cusp of a boundary and fail momentarily to locate themselves within an acceptable social construction of female behavior . . . . The defining characteristic of social liminality for young women in Burney's novels is the simultaneity of their sexual awakening and their need to hold their sexuality in abeyance until all the appropriate economic and social negotiations that will produce a husband for them may occur. (Epstein 201).

Despite her devotion to family, royalty, class, and love, all the authority figures associated with those ideals—a mother, a king; one aristocrat and one patriot, both potential husbands—have betrayed her. If God is the highest authority in Halkett's life (as the numerous meditations she composed over her lifetime would indicate), then the dishonesty of Nicholls, a Justice of the Peace and a preacher, represents the worst possible betrayal.

Halkett, however, does not respond passively. Although she claims she is “sory I cannott relate my owne misfortunes withoutt reflecting upon those who was the occation of them, especially beeing one of that profesion that I have ever looked upon with great respect” (35), she could have censored information that could damage the reputations of others, as Cavendish does in her biography of her husband. Halkett *wants* the guilty to be exposed; she does not want to “relate my owne misfortunes” so much as present herself as innocence maligned. Instead of hiding her actions, as with her rescue of the Duke of York and her affair with Bampffield, she publicly confronts Nicholls, worried that the Howards will condemn her but unafraid to defend

herself. Even when all is resolved, she is secure enough in her own self-worth to give up the comfort of this adoptive family: “I thought itt nott fitt to stay where I had beene so injuriously traduced. Therefore, to leave that family I was fully resolved” (47). This is a turning point in her development that will prepare her for the adventures to come; having crossed boundaries of speech, she crosses the boundaries of nation, going into Scotland to begin a new chapter of her life in medicine and meet her future husband.

As Halkett struggles to recover her reputation, she realizes that her loyalty to the Crown has contributed to the ruin of her reputation:

[M]y owne misfortune . . . possibly I might have avoided if I had not ingaged in serving His Highnese, the Duke of Yorke, in his escape, many circumstances attending that have contributed to my present suffering both as to my fame and fortune. For beeing nesesitate to leave London for my owne security, itt was easy for the malicious to deprive mee of both when I was nott in a capacity to speake in my owne defence. (53)

Although she fled London as part of her commitment to the Crown, she worries that her choice to do so now threatens her relationship with royalty; the rumors about Bampffield and herself “made mee apprehend mightt make mee nott bee so well looked upon by the King as otherways I might expect” (52). She writes to one of the Grooms of the Bedchamber with whom she shares a family connection, asking “whether I should goe to kisse the King's hands or forbear, for I had much rather wantt the honor then receive it with a frowne” (52).

Fortunately, the King graciously receives her and thanks her for her service to his brother. She likens her acceptance at court to a scene from Fletcher's tragicomedy:

As soone as the King parted from mee, there came two gentlemen to mee; one tooke me by one hand, the other by the other; to led me outt . . . with so many flattering expressions that I could nott butt with a litle disdaine tell them they acted that part very well in *The Humourous Lieutenant*, whene a stranger comming to see a solemnity was hardly admitted to looke on by those who affterwards troubled her with there civility when they saw the King take notice of her. (54)

She does not settle at court, however, for the invasion of Cromwell's army brings about the problem of displacement that plagues so many women during the Civil War. Halkett's situation is particularly fraught because she, though a member of the gentry, is "destitute of all meanes" (54) and worried about overstaying her welcome at any one place: "[o]ften she was dependent on the hospitality of others, and the hospitality could become strained" (Loftis xi). She is "perplexed . . . where to goe or what to doe"; luckily, "my Lady Dunfermline invited mee to goe north with her Ladyship, assuring mee of much wellcome," although "she could nott promise anything butt disorder from so sodaine a removall to a howse that had nott of a long time had an inhabitant" (54).

Despite the anxiety that the invasion and move must have caused Halkett, her trials lead to new chances at self-discovery. At Kinrose, she has "the opertunitty . . . of serving many poore wounded soldiers," demonstrating great courage and dedication in the face of terrible injury and using her medical knowledge to help victims of the war rather than lamenting her state as a victim of men's dishonesty (55). She learns soon after that "my name was offten before the Councell that day" for her good works, and "the King was pleased to give mee thankses for my charity" (56). The fact that she hastily justifies mentioning such recognition--"I have made this

relation because it was the occasion of bringing me much of the divertissements I had in a remoter place“ (56)--suggests that Halkett wishes to appear modest and still let her audience know that her reputation was always good, even in the midst of scandal.

Crisis provides an opportunity for self-expression and self-defense again when Cromwell's army marches on Fyvie, “beating all the men came in there way and frightening the weemen and threatening to pistoll who ever did nott give what they called for“ (58). Lady Dunfermline asks her to speak with them because she is English, although they have already sworn to “bee worse to her then any“ (59) because she, as a Royalist, has betrayed her country. They refer to her as “the English whore that came to meett the King, and all sett there pistolls just against mee“ (59). Her nationality, an identity that should bolster her, has betrayed her; however, she reclaims the definition of “Englishness,” replying that that “my comming to them was nott to dispute for my selfe, but to tell them I was sorry to heare that any of the English nation, who was generally assumed to be the most civill people in the world, should give so much occasion to bee thought barbarously rude as they had done“ (59). She appeals not to politics, but to a sense of fundamental Englishness that transcends Royalism or Parliamentarianism. Her next encounter with Parliamentarians further demonstrates her ability to manipulate meaning. Her argument with Colonel Overton starts off as an exercise in interpretation; he says “God had wonderfully evidenced his power in the great things hee had done,“ and she answers that “noe doupt butt God would evidence his power still in the great things hee designed to doe“ (60). He responds that she “speake[s] my words, but nott I thinke to my sence“ (60). Their problem is not of language but of interpretation; they are of the same nation and the same tongue, yet their words hold irreconcilable meanings. She deferentially claims that she would not have engaged him in conversation if he had not first addressed her, but

she does not hold back or lie to protect herself: “I can hold my tounge butt I cannott speake any thing contrary to what I thinke“ (61).

Though this part of the narrative lacks the political and romantic intrigue of earlier passages, here Halkett is more active, more independent, more fully engaged in the events around her than previously. She meets James Halkett who, like herself, is a Royalist hero appreciated by the king but wrongfully slandered by others. He informs her definitively that Bampffield's wife is living, effectively helping her sever her bond to that relationship. Although she initially refuses marriage, she offers another oath, promising him “any service that lay in my power” (75). He asks her to let his two daughters stay with her, and her maternal relationship to them helps strengthen her bond to James Halkett. In their relationship, therefore, the varying bonds whose irreconcilability once caused her such grief--romantic love, family support, and political loyalty--come together without conflict, to strengthen rather than fracture their bond. When Anne agrees to marriage, she asks to delay until her affairs are settled so as not to be a financial drain on her future husband. The young woman we saw earlier in the memoir would have used this promise as an excuse to put off marriage; here, it motivates the independent, self-assured Halkett to “putt a close to my law suite” and then “goe to London and vindicate my selfe from the suposed guilt I was charged with” (78). Settling her brother's debt and meeting with Bampffield for the last time, he cuts off her ties to the past. She does give one characteristic half-truth in their conversation, when he asks whether she is married: “I said nothing a litle while, for I hated lying and I saw there might bee some inconvenience to tell the truth, and (Lord pardon the equivocation) I said 'I am' (outt aloud, and secrettly said, 'nott')” (82). Here, however, the lie severs the bond between them rather than maintains it; she has learned not to rely on loyalties that will ultimately betray her.

While she is away, “I heard constantly once a fortnight from Sir James, with many renewed testimonys that neither time nor distance had power to change him” (81). Her feelings for him seem to be more respect, affection, and pragmatism than passion, but perhaps after being betrayed by her mother, Mr. Howard, Colonel Bampfield, King Charles II, and Mr. Nicolls, his devotion to her is enough. Although she initially characterizes her agreement as passive—“I could nott now in reason longer deferre; since the greatest objections I had made against itt was removed”—she finally makes a statement of active participation in the union: “I intended to give him my selfe” (83). Rather than identifying herself through partnerships, unions, or ideals, here she claims ownership of herself.

Despite the resolution we find in her memoirs, however, we find in Halkett's devotional writing a continued struggle with the issue of divided loyalty, now as a mother instead of a daughter. She feels tension between maternal and religious duties, writing at the death of her daughter Elizabeth that “amongst other things I must regrett my Sin of Louing her so well as oft times when I heard her Cry itt hath disturbed mee euen when I was offering up my prayers to God” (*Self-Writings* 19). She later writes that the death of her son, Robert, “free[s] me from all the care and anxiety I might haue beene in for what hee might haue been exposed to, had hee been Liuing. That so I might now bee withoutt carefullnesse my cheefe & only care beeing how I may please the Lord” (*Self-Writings* 172). She also finds conflict between maternity and royalism, secretly valuing the royal family over her own: “when the Duke of Gloucester died I secretly whispered to my owne hart that I could haue beene Content to haue redeemed his life with Bettys, wch certainly did exprese euen in my thoughts the zeale I had for the preseruacion of that Royall stocke” (*Self-Writings* 19). Finding herself once again without the supports of nation and family after her husband's death—“I am a stranger, borne & bred in another Country. [A]



Mother in Law wch allways hath a preiudice attending itt, & none hath found itt more than I” (*Self-Writings* 30)—she increasingly turns to religious devotion and political analyses: “The cultish aspect of Halkett's royalism allows her prayers and meditations on royalty to claim an intimacy with, even influence on, the lives of the Stuarts; once again her private actions are connected (in her imagination at least) to the public world” (*Wiseman* 37). Until the end of her life, she continues to seek out ideals to which she could commit herself. Early in her memoir, Halkett laments her inability to make herself understood:

I said I could not butt regret what ever had occasioned her displeasure of his punishmentt, butt I was guilty of noe unhandsome action to make mee ashamed; and therfore, what ever were my presentt misfortune, I was confident to evidence before I died that noe child shee had had greater love and respect to her, or more obedience.

To which shee replied, “Itt seemes you have a good opinion of your selfe.” (17)

Whatever her regrets, she does have a good opinion of herself: in her memoirs, at least, she stands by her choices on the grounds that, in trying to be loyal to all, she pleased none. That opinion, however, must be constantly negotiated, never resolved.

In closing, I wish to consider Halkett's text in comparison with Bampfield's 1685 apology. The differences between the two defenses highlight many of the challenges Halkett, like most women, faced in expressing herself and defending her actions. The text was “[p]ublished at the expense of Bampfield in his impoverished old age“ (*Loftis and Hardacre* 17); the publication may have been a financial hardship, but at least such public discourse was an option for him in a way that it was not for most women. Unlike Halkett, who must carefully walk the line between being thought improper for private sexual and political misconduct and being

thought improper for public speech, Bampfield need only speak out to save his “honor“ from accusations of “womanish modesty, timidity, and silence“ (Bampfield 38).

While Halkett's tone varies between righteous indignation and guilty anxiety, his tone is defensive and self-assured: “I shall endeavor to let some see demonstratively how far their credulity has been abused and my innocency wronged“ (Bampfield 38). Like Halkett, he has a powerful experience on what he believes to be his deathbed; but while she focuses on particular significant relationships in her life, asking Lady Howard to “vindicate mee to my brother and sister“ (33) and defend Bampfield, his comments are abstract and disconnected: “During my sickness, which was violent, I found myself sufficiently contented to die, for being ruined with all the world . . . I could better have submitted to a quiet death than to have suffered those bitter anxieties of a turbulent and afflicted life“ (Bampfield 86). He details his political and military exploits in great detail, but unlike the passionate Halkett, he is emotionally inexpressive for much of the text: “I had, apparently, been killed unless rescued by some officers of my Lord Bellasis' regiment“ (Bampfield 43).

The most significant difference between the two narratives is that Bampfield never mentions Halkett. He focuses chiefly on the closeness of his relationship with Charles I, who entrusts Bampfield with the delivery of his private letters and signs his missives “Your assured friend CHARLES R. (Bampfield 53, 47). He has no need to mention her, for his purpose is to defend his political behavior, while hers is to defend her chastity. Men can talk about public matters without talking about private, while women, their lives guided by the affairs of men, cannot do the reverse. Indeed, Bampfield, in his closing lines, hastens to distance himself from private, secretive discourse: “Nor have I had any other knowledge of those plots and practices during these last ten years (which have filled all Christendom with noise), saving what I have

seen in print, and not before it was public“ (Bampffield 95). They live under the same tensions, albeit with radically different expectations.

## Work Cited

- Bampffield, Joseph. *Colonel Joseph Bampffield's Apology*. Ed. John Loftis and Paul H. Hardacre. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1993.
- Donovan, Josephine. "'That All the World May Know': Women's 'Defense-Narratives' and the Early Novel." *Genre and Women's Life Writing in Early Modern England*. Ed. Michelle M. Dowd and Julie A. Eckerle. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- Epstein, Julia. "Marginality in Frances Burney's Novels." *The Cambridge Companion to the Eighteenth Century Novel*. ed. John Richetti. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Ezell, Margaret J.M. "Ann Halkett's Morning Devotions: Posthumous Publication and the Culture of Writing in Late Seventeenth-Century Britain." *Print, Manuscript, and Performance: The Changing Relations of the Media in Early Modern England*. Ed. Arthur F. Marotti and Michael D. Bristol. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2000.
- Halkett, Anne. *Lady Anne Halkett: Selected Self-Writings*. Ed. Suzanne Trill. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- . *Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett, and Ann, Lady Fanshawe*. Ed. John Loftis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979
- Lamb, Mary Ellen. "Merging the Secular and the Spiritual in Lady Anne Halkett's Memoirs." *Genre and Women's Life Writing in Early Modern England*. Ed. Michelle M. Dowd and Julie A. Eckerle. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- MacCarthy, B.G. *The Female Pen: Women Writers and Novelists, 1621-1818*. New York : New York University Press, 1994.
- Ottway, Sheila. "They Only Lived Twice: Public and Private Selfhood in the Autobiographies of Anne, Lady Halkett and Colonel Joseph Bampffield." *Betraying Our Selves: Forms of Self-Representation in Early Modern English Texts*. Ed. Henk Dragstra, Sheila Ottway, and Helen Wilcox. London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 2000.
- Potter, Lois. *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Purkiss, Diane. *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Richetti, John. "Introduction." *The Cambridge Companion to the Eighteenth Century Novel*. ed. John Richetti. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

- Rose, Mary Beth. *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Seelig, Sharon Cadman. *Autobiography and Gender in Early Modern Literature: Reading Women's Lives, 1600-1680*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Spencer, Jane. "Women Writers and the Eighteenth-Century Novel." *The Cambridge Companion to the Eighteenth Century Novel*. ed. John Richetti. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Wiseman, Susan. "The most considerable of my troubles: Anne Halkett and the Writing of Civil War Conspiracy." *Women Writing 1550-1750*. Ed. Jo Wallwork and Paul Salzman. Bundoora: Meridian, 2001.

## Chapter 5:

### Dead Mothers and Hoyting Girles:

#### Terror, Adventure, and Gender in Ann Fanshawe's Memoirs

Fanshawe was born Ann Harrison to a Royalist family in 1625; she was well-educated, although we know little about her upbringing other than her autobiography provides. In 1644 she married her second cousin, Richard Fanshawe, Charles II's Secretary of War. During the years of the war and Interregnum, the Fanshawe's followed Prince Charles' forces to France, Ireland, Spain, and Portugal. In 1666, shortly after having been recalled to England from Madrid, Richard Fanshawe died. In 1676, she composed a memoir of her travels with her husband for their only surviving son. She died in 1580.

Ann Fanshawe's account of her adventures as an English diplomat's wife during and after the Civil War is detailed and enlightening; her descriptions of marital bliss and grief over loss of her husband are moving, even poetic: he is “my North Starr, that only had the power to fix me” (122). Her writing, however, perhaps because of unfair comparison with Ann Halkett's more novelistic style, has come under criticism for her curious silence about the frequent births, deaths, and miscarriages of children and her detailed but often tiresome recounting of detail in foreign lands. These aspects of her narrative style are, as I will show, indicative of her anxieties about gender roles and the relationship between gender and politics. Mary Beth Rose argues that Fanshawe's avoidance of her experiences as a mother and her emphasis on her experiences as a diplomat's wife are a result of her valuing her role as a wife above all others: “in her selection of incidents and her choice of narrative strategies, she assigns of secondary value to those material

aspects of her experience that are uniquely female: namely, the capacity to conceive and give birth” (Rose 70). Yet there emerges, in the silences and asides of her text, a preoccupation with various sites of female experience: both a longing for the maternal and an anxiety prompted by her association of the maternal with death, both a fascination with and uneasiness towards images of the unruly feminine and, ultimately, a search for and fear of her mother and her own girlhood self. Throughout the course of the narrative, this anxiety seeks but, because of her husband's death, never finds resolution.

Fanshawe experiences a strange double loss as a young woman, that of both her mother and her own self. She describes herself, in youth, as a sort of tomboy: “I was that which we graver people call a hoyting girle . . . . skipping and activity was my delight” (110). But at fifteen, on the cusp of womanhood, in “an actively willed choice, undertaken in response to her mother's example and as an act of duty to her father” (Seelig 95), she consciously rejects role of “hoyting girl” in order to take on the role of dutiful daughter and, ultimately, wife:

But upon my mother's death I then begun to refflect, and as an offering to her memory, I flung away those little childnesses that had formerly possest me, and by my father's command took upon me the charge of his house and family, which I so ordered by my excellent mother's example, as found acceptance in his sight. (110)

Taking on this role, she loses both her connection to the maternal, and her unruly female self, and spends the rest of her autobiography searching for these lost figures of womanhood, perhaps unaware that she is doing so. Fanshawe's text is curiously silent, even emotionless, about her maternal experiences. Constantly on the move throughout the years of war and Restoration, she endures some twenty pregnancies, fourteen births, and nine childhood mortalities, bearing, raising, losing, and burying children along the way. Although she occasionally recounts

pregnancy- and birth-related illnesses, we learn little of her feelings about her experiences: the pains of childbirth, the grief at losing children, the experiences of her surviving children as they accompanied her on her travels, the terror that must have attended every pregnancy in a time of high mortality both for mothers and children.

Taking the text as a whole, however, rather than embracing that which fits into a recognizable narrative of life experiences and dismissing that which doesn't as unnecessary asides, a number of strange tales and adventures that she encounters in the course of her travels emerge. Examining these tales, we find in Fanshawe not a dismissal of the maternal role but, rather, a preoccupation with it that she cannot quite voice in her marriage narrative, but which emerges in the strange experiences and ghost stories that haunt her along the way. She is similarly haunted by a sort of doppelganger, the "hoyting girle" she had been in her youth. Rather than dismissing the "uniquely female" in her experiences or "gladly subduing her more active personality traits in order to assume with unbroken continuity her dead mother's passive domestic role" (78), as Rose argues, Fanshawe feels a real loss over these aspects of her identity, a loss that can only be expressed in the images of lost mothers, children, and dangerous women that haunt her.

A strange occurrence during Fanshawe's infancy sets the tone for the way she will perceive motherhood throughout the text. Her mother "beeing sick to death of a feavour 3 months after I was borne, which was the occasion she gave me suck no longer, her friends and servants thought to all outward appearance that she was dead" (108). Her doctor, unwilling to believe that anyone so beautiful could be dead, cuts her on the foot and finds it bleeds. Upon waking, she reports having seen "two by me cloathed in long white garments"; understanding that she was dead, she expressed grief at "leaving my girle" and begged "that I may live 15 years



to see my daughter a woman” (109). Her mother's death occurs, Fanshawe reports, “just 15 years from that time” (109). This tale is a moving story of a mother's devotion to her daughter, particularly affecting at a time when daughters were thought to be less valued than sons: “Like the prophetic dream of a star by Lucy Hutchinson's mother, the reawakening of Margaret Harrison to watch over her daughter marks not only providential beneficence toward the mother but a special care or concern for the daughter” (Seelig 94).

In the uncanny ghost tales that Fanshawe encounters along her travels and in the glimpses we see of her reactions to her children's death we find a recurrent theme of love between mothers and daughters, the wish to preserve, even prioritize, the maternal line and the hope for family bonds stronger than death itself. Yet the more unsettling aspects of the story of her mother's near-death experience will continue to haunt her as well: an association between birth and death (the phrase “sick to death of a feavour 3 months after I was borne” draws an implicit connection between the events), the loss of a nurturing mother (“she gave me suck no longer”), and patriarchal authority (here, in the form of the doctor) committing violence against the mother's dead body.

Not long after her mother's death, Fanshawe's father, a Royalist who helps finance the Crown, is imprisoned for a time and his property seized. He moves the family to Oxford, where the royal court has relocated. Separated from her mother by death and her girlhood home by war, the teenage Fanshawe is thrown into chaos:

[F]rom as good houses as any gentlemen of England had we came to a baker's house in an obscure street, and from roomes well furnished to lye in a very bad bed in a garrett, to one dish of meat and that not the best ordered; no mony, for we were as poor as Job, nor clothes more than a man or two brought in their cloak bags. We had the perpetuall discourse of losing and

gaining towns and men; at the windows the sad spectacle of war, sometimes plague, sometimes sicknesses of other kind, by reason of so many people being packt together, as I believe there never was before of that quality . . . . (111)

She can only react to the drastic new changes in her life by stepping into the role of subservient woman as completely as possible:

My father commanded my sister and myself to come to him to Oxford where the court then was; but we, that had till that hour lived in great plenty and great order, found ourselves like fishes out of water and *the sene so changed that we know not at all now to act any part but obedience.* (111; emphasis mine)

During this time, Fanshawe meets her husband, Richard. Having lost her home, mother, and the sense of safety to which she was accustomed before the war, she seeks security in her dual and mutually dependent identities as a wife and a Royalist. Fanshawe does not so much lose her identity in her husband as create a new identity of the two of them together: “*Glory be to God* we never had but one mind through out our lives, our soules were wrapped up in each other, our aims and designs one, our loves one, and our resentments one” (103). Despite the losses she has suffered, she finds completeness and safety in marriage.

She is similarly secure in her identity as a Royalist, devoted to the King as “the daughter to his servant and wife to his servant” and expressing daughterly grief at her last meeting with him:

The last time I ever saw him, when I took my leave, I could not refraine weeping. When he had saluted me, I prayd to God to preserve His Majesty with long life and happy years. He stroked me on my cheek and sayd, ‘Child, if God pleaseth, it

shall be so, but both you and I must submit to God's will, you and you in what hands I am in." (120)

Having sought "acceptance in [her father's] sight" (110), she embraces the role of wife; similarly, she seeks approval of the paternal/patriarchal through her devotion to the Crown. As a result, king and husband are often associated with one another throughout her text: "I did not goe abroad 7 times [in seven months], but spent my time in prayers to God for the deliverance of the King and my husband, whose danger was ever before my eyes" (133). The curious amalgamation of duty as a wife and as a subject emerges in her description of her visits to her imprisoned husband:

During the time of his imprisonment I failed not constantly to goe when the clock struck 4 in the morning, with a dark lanterne in my hand, all alone and on foot from my lodging in Chancery Lane at my cosin Yong's to White Hall in at the entry that went out of King's Street into the bowling ground. There I would goe under his window and softly call him. He, that after the first time expected me, never failed to put out his head at first call. Thus we talked together, and sometimes I was so wet with rane that it went in at my neck and out at my heels. *He directed how I should make my adresses, which I did ever to their Generall Cromwell, who had a great respect for your father and would have bought him off to his servise upon any termes.* (134-135, emphasis mine)

The description is a romantic one: the constant wife, the imprisoned husband, the lantern, the rain, the forbidden, whispered conversations. Yet the content of their speech—her steadfastness in delivering his messages, his steadfastness in refusing to be bought off by the enemy side—reflects the devotion to royalty that underscores their devotion to one another.

Fanshawe's description of their wedding, however, shows that the beginning of this new life as Richard's Fanshawe's wife does not represent a complete break with the losses of the past:

But as in a racke the turbulence of the waves disperses the splinters of the rock, so it was my lot; for having buried my dear brother Will Harrison in Exeter Colledge Chapell, I then married your dear father in [16]44 in Wolvercot Church, 2 miles from Oxford, upon the 18<sup>th</sup> of May. None was at our wedding but my dear father (who by my mother's desire gave me her wedding ring, with which I was married) . . . . (111)

The image of the dead brother's burial and the dead mother's ring is the first image of familial haunting in the text; she seeks security in marriage after the loss of family, yet the dead are in attendance at the wedding, metonymically and linguistically. Although she embraces her role as a wife and experiences the war as such, there is something in her experience as a mother that the text finds untouchable, something that is deeply felt and yet cannot be articulated, something that slips out at the edges, a wish or a nightmare. The crises of the civil war, which “shook the confidence of Englishmen in their control of the social and gender order to the roots” (Fletcher 283), will demand that she behave in ways not always appropriate for the submissive, dutiful wife, further troubling her retreat into conventional gender roles. Despite her attempts to grow up and leave both her dead mother and her girlish self behind, throughout her marriage, two images will haunt her: the Gothic horrors of the dead and desecrated mother, and the enticing but threatening image of her changeling self, the “hoyting girle.”

Among all the dangers and adventures of her travels, Fanshawe takes time to report two ghost stories—one experienced, one heard—along the way. In the first instance, she is staying in a castle in Ireland when she wakes in the night and

saw by the light of the moon a woman leaning into the window through the casement, in white, with red hair and pale, gastly complexion. She spake loud and in a tone I never heard, thrice, 'Ahone', and then with a sith more like wind than breath she vanished, and to me her body looked more like a thick cloud than substance. (125)

The next day, her hostess tells her that "a cousin O'Brien of hers, whose ancestors had own'd that house," had died the night before and that

when any dye of the family, there is the shape of a woman appears in this window every night untill they be dead. This woman was many ages agoe got with child by the owne of this place, and he in his garden murdered her and flung her into the river under your window. (125)

In the second ghost story, which Fanshawe hears upon returning to England from Portugal, a man and his sister, with whom he has an atheistic and possibly incestuous relationship, desecrate the tombs of their parents and take some of their hair (for a "frolick," it seems, more than for a keepsake). The sister sickens and dies soon after, and her brother "kept her body in a coffin sett up in his buttry, saying it would not be long before he dyed, and then they would be both buried together"; in the two months since, "a head as cold as death, with curled haire like his sister's, did ever lye by him where ever he slept, notwithstanding he removed to severall places and countrys to avoyd it" (151). Both these stories reveal particular anxieties about death and motherhood: an association between birth and death, fear of severing the maternal line, the repression of fear, and a preoccupation with sites of burial and desecration.

During one particularly difficult period, from February 1655 to November 1657, Fanshawe gives birth to two daughters, loses a third, and loses a son who is born ten weeks

prematurely. “[T]hence forward untill April [16]58,” she describes, “I had 2 fits everyday. That brought me so weake that I was like an anatomy. I never stirr'd out of my bed in 7 months” (137). The act of motherhood has reduced her to a sort of living death: not the active wife traveling the world with her husband, but an “anatomy”—a mother, like her own mother perhaps in that fifteen-year interval, waiting to die. Not long after, attempts to heal her son only result in child death and miscarriage: “Both my eldest daughters had the small pox att the same time, and though I neglected them, and day and night tended my dear son, yet it pleased God they recovered and he dyed, the grief of which made me miscary and caused a sickness of 3 weeks” (139). Further emphasizing the dichotomy of Ann Fanshawe as wife, whose only concern is husband and King, and Ann Fanshawe as mother, she suggests at one point that the business of politics is actually hazardous to private life:

[M]y daughter Mary dyed in Hartfordshire in August . . . In the latter end of this summer I miscarryed, when I was near half gone with child, of 3 sons, 2 houres one after the other. I think it was with the great hurry of business I then was in, and the perpetuall company that resorted to us of all qualitys, some for kindness and some for their own advantage. As that was a time of advantage, so it was of a vast expense, for in Aprill the 23 the King was crowned. (141)

There is a conflict of duty between her devotion to the maternal line—that is, the valuing of daughters—and her devotion to patriarchal lineage in which Royalism was based. Narratives of monstrous children, as Purkiss has shown, are associated with anxiety about patrilineal heritage: [P]atrilinearity means the tracing of descent through the male rather than the female line . . . . Primogeniture is the most evident instance of patrilinearity operating to construct a male identity of self-sameness. The descent of name, title and property *intact* (the same) from father to son

produced the son as the same as his father, having in every respect the same (social) identity.  
(Purkiss 166)

Fanshawe's association of children with fearful Gothic images, I would argue, reflects an anxiety about patriarchal lineage. The beginning of her narrative suggests a stronger association with her mother than her father, who does not appear for the first few pages of her life story; her mother's near-death experience and the first ghost story suggest fear of the severing of the bond between mother and child by death. Indeed, the only child death over whom she expresses grief is that of her nine-year-old daughter; the description of her death, though brief, is perhaps the most moving passage of the memoirs:

But God had ordered that it should not last, for upon the 20<sup>th</sup> of July, 1654, at 3 a clock in the afternoon, dyed our most dearly beloved daughter Ann Fanshawe, whose beauty and wit exceeded all that ever I saw of her age. She was between 9 and 10 years old, very tall, and the dear companion of our travells and sorrows; she lay sick but five dayes of the small pox, in which time she expressed so many wise and devout sayings as is a miracle from her years. We both wished to have gone into the grave with her. (136)

The strength of her feelings for her mother and daughter is potentially threatening to patriarchy and often emerges, in the Renaissance, in the image of monstrous children:

The story of patrilinearity cannot ever entirely displace the maternal body, since that body is only too clearly metonymically associated with offspring in a fashion which the paternal body cannot hope to emulate . . . . The monster is a disorderly birth, as opposed to an 'orderly' one; the woman is likewise a disorderly woman. A woman's attempt to shape her own life in defiance of paternal

authority is mis-shaping; female authority is disorder because it can only exist at the expense of paternal order. (Purkiss 168, 171)

This emphasis of the maternal line, from mother to daughter, runs counter to the Royalist emphasis on the divine right of kingship passed down from father to son. The terror she feels at the image of the dead mother suggests both a desire to emphasize the maternal line and, perhaps, a feeling that she is being transgressive for doing so. This feeling of transgression, I would argue, leads Fanshawe to neglect her two ill daughters in favor of caring for her ailing son. Of this neglect, Rose argues, “no unacknowledged emotional conflicts surface to disturb the author's untroubled identification with the gendered status quo” (Rose 67). Yet such conflict does surface again and again as Fanshawe embraces and explores matrilineal heritage in the only way she can: in fearful images of the uncanny. In doing so, she rejects the paternalism of both her marriage and her political loyalties. Her husband fulfills the role of loyal Royalist and paternalistic protector; the scene in which he refuses to give her information about the Prince, rather than indicating her oppression, is an example of his sense of loyalty to his ideals—a loyalty that he shows to her in marriage as well as to his master in his political life. Meeting and marrying in Oxford, traveling all over attending the King's business, their political allegiances are tied up with their devotion to one another, and she takes comfort in the paternalistic protection of the crown, speaking of Charles I as a father figure that she associates with her own father through his service to the king. Richard Fanshawe is loyal to “his two masters,” Charles I and Charles II, but he “would never be drawn to the faction of any party” (103, 102). This loyalty, taken with Ann Fanshawe's family association with service to the Stuart dynasty, suggests not a political duty to the abstract idea of monarchy so much as personal devotion to the Stuarts, father and son, in particular.



Fanshawe's narrative has been thought poorly written, in part, because of her difficulty in expressing the emotions that she wishes to repress. When she speaks of love or travel, her writing is often dynamic, engaging; yet in attempting to describe the experience of fear, she is curiously flat and distant:

But God knows how great a surprise this was to me, being great with child, and two children with me, not in the best condition to maintain them, and in dayly fear of your father's life upon the publick account of war and upon the private account of animositys amongst them selves in Scotland. But I did what I could to arme myself. (133)

She does, in some passages, find her voice:

[U]pon the 2 day of September following the Battle of Wolster, when the King being missed and nothing of your father being dead or alive for 3 days heard of, it is unexpressible what affliction I was in. I neither eat nor slept, but trembled at every motion I heard, expecting the fattal news which at last came in their newsbook, which mentioned your father a prisoner. (133-134)

But though her account here is quite expressive, her fear, she tells us, is “unexpressible.”

Through a series of life-threatening adventures, this passage is one of the few times that Fanshawe expresses fear; she is similarly silent concerning the fear she must have felt for her own life every time she carried or bore children. Such feelings, being “unexpressible,” can only emerge through a series of nightmare visions. The placement of the narrative's first ghost story, the incident of the woman appearing in the window in the castle of Ireland, indicates that her experience with the ghost reflects her inadequately expressed anxiety over her patriarchal supports, husband and King, being threatened by death.

In the pages before she recounts the ghost sighting, Fanshawe recounts her emotional farewell in 1647 to Charles I, “that glorious sun that within a few months after sett, to the grief of all Christians that were not forsaken by God” (120). The reference to his death comes more than a year, in the narrative, before it happens; and although Fanshawe's description of her last meeting with the King is moving, she never mentions learning of his death in early 1649 or his reaction to it. Fanshawe speaks of seeing the “Qween Mother” and sending letters to “the King then in Holland” (122) at Christmas 1648—although Charles I will not be dead for another month, she has already crowned Charles II in her narrative. Going into a silly narrative about Sir Kenelm Digby's tall tales (122), she skips over the king's execution altogether. In Ireland later that year when Cromwell's troops take the town, Fanshawe, with a broken wrist, goes through “an unruly tumult with their swords in the hands” to find “their chief commander, Jeffreys, who whilst he was loyall had received many civilitys from your father” (124). She gets a pass, “came through thousands of naked swords” (124), gets a cart and escapes with her sister and “little girle Nan” (124).

Although she does mention being “in perpetuall fear of being fetched back againe” (124), she never directly expresses the fear for her life that she must have felt. Nor does she express horror at an incident soon after, when Lord Roscomon falls and breaks his skull, dying five days later and “leaving the broad seal of Irland in your father's hands untill such time as he could acquaint His Majesty with this sad accident,” or the fear she must have felt as “Cromwell went through as bloodily as victoriously, many worthy persons being murdered in cold blood, and their familys quite ruined” (125). She clearly expresses the absolute terror she feels at the shade in the window: “I was so much affrighted that my hair stood an end and my night clothes fell off” (125)—but something in the experience, still, is unspeakable: the woman cries out “in a tone

I never heard,” and her husband will not wake to hear her story. Consumed with her wifely duties, she cannot consciously express fear over the loss of her father-figure, King Charles, and the threat to her husband and daughter's safety; yet those fears emerge in an image of primal terror of dead mothers, violent men, and lost children.

Similarly, the tale of the ghastly brother and sister occurs not long after another traumatic experience in her own life. In Portugal, Fanshawe gives birth to a son ten weeks premature; named for his father (the second of three to be so), he dies a few hours later. She reports that the Queen, many other nobles, and “severall good gentlewomen that were English merchants' wives” (148) came to express their condolences, but never expresses her own feelings over the child's death, soon returning to descriptions of feasts and court politics. Only when she returns to England, soon after, does her anxiety seep in through the form of a ghost story that proves characteristic of Fanshawe's unconscious association between travel and fleeing from ghosts. There emerges a dichotomy between the notion of the house, which Fanshawe associates not with security but with anxieties over with the maternal, death, burial, and the uncanny, and her travel experiences, which she associates with the safety of marriage, Royalism, and the paternal. This tension regarding enclosed spaces is characteristic of the female Gothic; if “[m]ale Gothic tends to represent the male protagonist's attempt to penetrate some encompassing interior,” Puntner and Byron argue, then “female Gothic more typically represents a female protagonist's attempt to escape from a confining interior” (278). These haunted spaces become “the site for the contestation of discourses of gender, a place where the ideological conflicts of the domestic sphere are enacted in a displaced form” (Puntner and Byron 280-281).

Her earliest account of her life draws an immediate association between the home, her connection to the maternal, and the loss of that connection: “In that house I lived in the

wintertime until I was fifteen years old three months, with my ever honoured and most dear mother, who departed this life on the 30<sup>th</sup> day of July, 1640” (108). Her father, indeed, is not mentioned (except to note how much he'd spent on her mother's funeral) until after she has praised her mother and told the story of her near-death experience. Her decision to leave behind her girlish ways after her mother's death occurs in the narrative at the same time as her move with her father to Oxford, where “[f]or my owne part I begun to thing we should all like Abraham live in tents all the days of our lives” (111) and where she starts her new life with her husband. After her experience with the ghost in Ireland, they “disposed ourselves to be gone suddenly” (125); similarly, the death of her beloved daughter “made us both desirous to quit that fatall place to us. And so, the week after her death, we did” (136). She is fascinated by the story of the man whose sister's spectre “did ever lye by him where ever he slept, notwithstanding he removed to severall places and countrys to avoyd it” (151). The dead are most unnerving when improperly cared for. Her stories reflect an anxiety over violence against the maternal body and desecration of the mother's corpse: the supposedly dead mother whose foot is cut to prove she is alive without any concern for the pain it would cause; the murdered mother carelessly flung into the river; the violated tomb of the mother and the unburied coffin of her daughter. As long as Fanshawe stays stays on the move, secure in her identity as a wife, she can escape the ghosts of the departed.

This is the reason, I would argue, for “nearly mind-numbing profusion” of minutiae which characterizes the later passages of the memoir (Seelig 101). Embracing fully her role as the Royalist diplomat's wife, Fanshawe concerns herself exclusively with tales of the public, the political, and the foreign, listing court gossip and details of the food, clothing, architecture, and people of Portugal and Spain with the exhaustive thoroughness of a travel writer. If such details

“all but crowd out personal feelings and leave no evidence of an inner life,” I would argue such avoidance of feeling is deliberate (if unconscious) on Fanshawe's part (Seelig 101). In these descriptions of strange and distant lands, England and its attendant anxieties—the dead she has left behind—could not be further away. What she seeks to escape, however, will follow her; when she finally returns to England, it will be with her husband's corpse. She repeatedly refers to him as “the body of my dear husband”—that both which is and is not, her dear husband and her dead husband's corpse (187, 188, 189). Critical of royalty for the only time in the narrative, she expresses betrayal:

How far this was from a reward, judge ye, for near 30 years suffering by land and sea, and the hasard of our lives over and over, with the many services of your father, and the expence of all the monyes we could procure, and 7 years' imprisonment, with the death and beggery of many eminent persons of our family.  
(189)

The fracturing of the boundary between her two identities—the devoted wife/subject who only cares for her husband's/king's safety and the mother-daughter who mourns the lost—results in linguistic breakdown. Even though the events are long past by the time of the writing, Fanshawe cannot continue the narrative, which breaks down into a prayer. Not only her sense of self but her sense of genre is interrupted by her husband's death. The Gothic romance, Wein argues, moves toward the resolution of family and political chaos through marriage and the stabilization of one's dynastic and political identity:

Thrust into these inaccessible and remote places, Gothic protagonists stumble upon the signs of familial disorder: putrefying corpses, disintegrating skeletons, immured prisoners long rumored to be dead or whose existence has been

concealed . . . . [T]he work of the plot is to both uncover that corruption and to cure it with the healing rod of justice . . . . The characters' recovery of their displaced origins has a dual function. Just as in the traditional romance formula, the discovery of one's identity permits marital union with the loved one. Furthermore, that discovery purges the polity of evil. By that means, Gothic novels both advocate domestic tranquillity and sanction such tranquillity as nationally valuable. (Wein 43, 46)

Fanshawe, however, is denied such resolution; both marriage and the return to England are marred by the dead. She takes their last journey home “with the body of my dear husband dayly in my sight for near 6 months together” (189). He has become that which she dreaded most, the unburied corpse which accompanies her in travel.

We find, however, a rather different sort of ghost that also haunts the text—less mournful, although arguably just as threatening to Fanshawe's sense of self. While Rose argues that “the perilous exigencies of civil war in no way compel the boldly and publicly active Fanshawe to feel conflict about her female identity,” the fact that she must create entire new identities, very different from herself in name, mAnnr, and appearance to act publicly, suggest a great sense of conflict indeed (Rose 68). Another repressed aspect of the feminine, the “hoiting girle” that Fanshawe left behind in youth, emerges in two tales not of passive experience (ghosts she has seen or heard of), but in active stories of daring adventures during which she embraces an alternate, changeling sort of persona. The first is during the encounter with the Turkish sailors, in which all the women are sent below to trick the potential aggressors into thinking they are a war ship. Fanshawe bribes a cabin boy to give her his clothes, and the crying wife oppressed by the patriarchal figure of “This beast captain [who] had locked me up in the cabine”

(127) becomes, with a simple change of clothing, the daring, seafaring transvestite heroine of a Shakespearean comedy:

[P]utting [the clothes] on and flinging away my night's clothes, I crept up softly and stood upon the deck by my husband's side as free from sickness and fear as, I confess, from discretion; but it was the effect of that passion which I could never master. By this time the 2 vessels were engaged in parley and so well satisfied with speech and sight of each other's forces that the Turk's man-of-war tacked about and we continued our course. But when your father saw it convenient to retreat, looking upon me he blessed himself he snatched me up in his armes, saying, "Good God, that love can make this change!" (128)

Her own husband does not even recognize the creature that she becomes while in the throes of "passion." Ironically, in order to be with him, she must take on a role that rejects her identity as his wife. She never explicitly states what drives her to deck: love for her husband, fear for his life, or perhaps a desire to see Turkish pirates? It seems to be a combination of the three; only in the disguise of a boy can she reconcile the devoted wife with the wild girl. Another such double appears when Fanshawe, needing a passport in order to visit her husband, impersonates a merchant's wife:

[W]ith as ill mine and tone as I could express, I told a fellow I found in the office that I desired a passe for Paris to goe to my husband. "Woman," says he, "what is your husband, and your name?" "Sir," sayd I, with many courtesys, "he is a young merchant, and my name is Ann Harrison." (138)

Receiving the pass, she takes it and carefully alters the letters of "Harrison" to "Fanshawe." There are probably easier surnames to turn into "Fanshawe," but she uses her maiden name,

becoming Ann Harrison, the fearless tomboy, once again. After the episode is over, she literally writes one name over the other, writing over her daring girlhood self to transform her identity into that of the loyal wife—much as the memoir itself seeks to do—“so compleately that none could find out the change” (138).

The mourning mother and the wild woman would seem to be contradictory figures; yet both stand as threats to Fanshawe's identity as wife, and figures of unruly women appear throughout Fanshawe's ghost experiences, representations of the transgression “across national boundaries, social boundaries, sexual boundaries, the boundaries of one's own identity” characteristic of the Gothic (Heiland 3). Lady O'Brien, at whose home Fanshawe's ghost sighting occurs, “went for a maid, but few believed it” (125). The unwed mother victimized by her child's father is another figure of female unchastity, with the Irishness of both women adding another level of threatening, feminized, uncivilized Otherness. The brother and sister of the second ghost story are suspected to be both atheists and incestuous, and just before she tells this story, Fanshawe inserts another tale of a girl, the product of a corrupted maternal line and almost the same age as Fanshawe when she lost her mother, who commits the ultimate rebellion against patriarchy:

At my coming away I visited severall nunneryes, in one wher'off I was told that the last year there was a girle of 14 years of age burned for a Jew. She was taken from her mother so soon as she was borne in prison (her mother being condemned) and brought up in the Esperance; [she] never heard, as they did not me afferme, what a Jew was, yett she did dayly scratch and whip the crucifixes and run pins into them in private, and when discovered confessed it and sayd she would never adore that God. (150)



The wild girl and the lost mother are therefore two sides of the same coin, the struggle against patriarchy that the Gothic frequently represents:

[G]othic novels are all about patriarchies, about how they function, what threatens them, what keeps them going. And what becomes ever clearer as one reads these novels is that patriarchy is not only the subject of gothic novels, but is itself a gothic structure. Patriarchy inevitably celebrates a male creative power that demands the suppression— and sometimes the outright sacrifice—of women.

(Heiland 10-11)

This fear of being “sacrificed”—thrown into the river or “burned for a Jew” if she gives into her passions—haunts Fanshawe. Both the Gothic nightmares and the unruly doppelgangers of Fanshawe's experience suggest a fear of opposite but related emotions—terror and daring—which she associates with the feminine and antipatriarchal and therefore tries to repress. This uneasiness with unruly aspects of femininity emerges in a certain inconsistency in her characterization of her husband. She tells us, at various points throughout the text, that Richard Fanshawe is of a stoic disposition: “passion was against his nature” (114). She recounts one tale of particularly dispassionate fearlessness:

[M]y husband and I went to France by the way of Portesmouth, where, walking by the sea side about a mile from our lodging, 2 ships of the Dutch then in war with England shott bullets at us so near that we heard them wiss by us, at which I called to my husband to make haste back, and began to run. But he altered not his pace, saying if we must be kill'd, it were as good to be kill'd walking as running.

(120-121)

He is similarly unshaken during the ghost episode in Ireland—literally so; for though she “pulled and pinched your father,” he “never awaked during this disorder I was in” (125). He is steadfast and rational when she is emotional or afraid, forever struggling with “that passion which I could never master” (128). Yet some places in the text describe a Richard Fanshawe who is emotionally expressive, at least where his family is concerned: “as for that it as the first time we had parted a day since wee married, he was extreemly afflicted even to tears” (114); “he with all expressions of joy received me in his arms” (115); “Then taking my hand in his, and kissing me, sayd, 'Cease weeping. No other thing upon earth can move me'” (134). Her characterization of her husband as an emotionless stoic, it seems, may be more a result of how she wants to see him—a safe port in her emotional storms—rather than a true portrait of his disposition.

In conclusion, I would like to consider what these observations might tell us about Fanshawe's motivation for writing this text. Fanshawe characterizes the tale from the beginning as her story as well as her husband's, and although certain aspects of her identity are repressed, she does not make an effort, as we see in Hutchinson and Cavendish, to erase herself from her husband's story. She is proud of her bravery, although too proper a wife to say so—and perhaps even ashamed. In describing her tomboy girlhood, Fanshawe is quick to point out, “*to be just to myself*, I never did mischief to myself or people, nor one immodest action or word in my life” (110, emphasis mine). As Josephine Donovan argues, “Nearly every piece of nonfictional prose writing by English women in the seventeenth century belongs wholly or in part to the defense-narrative tradition” (Donovan 169). Such texts were meant to justify one's actions (as Lady Ann Halkett does) or those of a loved one (as we see in Lucy Hutchinson's and Margaret Cavendish's biographies of their husbands). I would argue that Fanshawe's memoirs are, in their own way, a defense narrative. She has not always behaved properly: she has dressed as a boy, run across

raging battlefields, lied to authority figures. We cannot discount her involvement in the war simply because she never helped a royal prince escape to freedom as Halkett did; in her own way, Fanshawe involved herself in the world of war, politics, and the public sphere in ways that were not, strictly speaking, appropriate. The narrative seeks to convince us—or at least to convince Fanshawe's son and posterity—that she only did so to fulfill her proper role as a dutiful, devoted wife. But her tales of her girlhood, the relish with which she recounts her adventures, and her preoccupation with Gothic images of unruly womanhood indicate the thrill she may have gotten from these daring exploits.

An understanding of Fanshawe's maternal anxieties also better helps us understand her motivation in writing these memoirs for her son; ten months old when his father dies, he is part of this broken line between parent and child. Fanshawe writes out of the same anxiety for him that she doubtless experienced herself; she recreates herself and her husband linguistically for their son, so that they will not be lost to him as her own mother and children were lost to her. Although she rarely tells us how she feels about the loss of her children her careful recording of miscarriages, deaths, and burial locations is itself an act of love, the creation of a paper family, an effort to give them a place in history instead of being forgotten and to leave their legacy for her surviving son so that he will not experience the loss of heritage that she did.

## Works Cited

- Donovan, Josephine. "‘That All the World May Know’: Women's ‘Defense-Narratives’ and the Early Novel." *Genre and Women's Life Writing in Early Modern England*. Ed. Michelle M. Dowd and Julie A. Eckerle. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2007.
- Fanshawe, Ann. *Memoirs of Anne, Lady Halkett, and Ann, Lady Fanshawe*. Ed. John Loftis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Fletcher, Anthony. *Gender, Sex and Subordination in England, 1500-1800*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Heiland, Donna. *Gothic and Gender: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Puntner, David and Glennis Byron. *The Gothic*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004.
- Purkiss, Diane. *Literature, Gender and Politics During the English Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Rose, Mary Beth. *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Seelig, Sharon Cadman. *Autobiography and Gender in Early Modern Literature: Reading Women's Lives, 1600-1680*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Smith, Hilda L. *Reason's Disciples: Seventeenth-Century English Feminists*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1982.
- Wein, Toni. *British Identities, Heroic Nationalisms, and the Gothic Novel, 1764-1824*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.

## Chapter 6:

"Which is certainly true, but we knew not how to interpret it":

Making Sense of History and Place in Lucy Hutchinson's Life Writing

Lucy Hutchinson's autobiographical fragment and her biography of her husband, *Memoirs of the Life of Colonel Hutchinson*, more closely resemble traditional historiography than any of the other works examined here. This may be the case because Hutchinson, of all these subjects, interacted most closely with English politics over the course of her life (unlike, for example, Anne Halkett, whose encounters with royalty were intense but brief), and unlike the others experienced no physical displacement from her home. She was born Lucy Apsley in the Tower of London, where her father was lieutenant of the Tower, in 1620 to a strongly Royalist family. Unusually well-educated for a girl, she may have had more access to traditional historical texts than many other women life writers. In 1638 she married John Hutchinson; the two were united not only by a love of learning, but by a strong belief in Calvinism and Parliamentary politics. In 1643 he joined the Parliamentary army and became governor of Nottingham, and was one of the men who signed Charles I's death warrant in 1649.

Lucy Hutchinson devoted much of the relatively peaceful years of the Interregnum to writing, translating Lucretius's *De rerum natura* and possibly composing a reply to Edmund Waller's *A Panegyrick of my Lord Protector*. After the Restoration, however, John Hutchinson's status as a regicide endangered him, and despite the efforts of his wife and her Royalist family members (including her cousin, Anne Wilmot, mother of notorious Restoration poet John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester), he was arrested on suspicion of involvement in a local uprising in

1663 and died in prison the following year. Hutchinson probably began work on his biography soon after. In 1679, an anonymous poem appeared by the name of *Order and disorder, or, The world made and undone, being meditations upon the creation and fall, as it is recorded in the beginning of Genesis*. The work was initially attributed to Hutchinson's brother, Sir Allen Apsley, but the style, dedicatory preface, and "millennial radicalism" reveal it to be hers (Norbrook, DNB). She died in 1681.

A descendant of John Hutchinson's first published the *Memoirs* and Hutchinson's autobiographical fragment, in edited form, in 1806. Other nineteenth-century editions followed, and then a new edition based on the original manuscript of the *Memoirs* appeared in 1968 (Keeble xxx). The manuscript of her autobiographical fragment is lost, and we do not know whether it was written before or after the *Memoirs* or who removed the missing pages that seem to describe a love affair before her marriage. If we read the autobiographical fragment as a preface to Hutchinson's biography of her husband, however, we see a gradual and fascinating narrowing of historical scope as she traces history from the dawn of the English nation to her husband's death.

John Hutchinson's private martyrdom has its roots in a global conflict going back more than a century before the Civil War. Trying to make sense these events requires her "to interpret the defeat of the republic, to understand how the decadent Stuart monarchy might have been allowed to triumph, to shape her husband's image as a republican patriot, and to submit herself to God's incomprehensible providence" (Wiseman 217). In order to analyze these public and private matters, Hutchinson creates a narrative fracture between Lucy Hutchinson the historian and "Mrs Hutchinson," the deceptively passive figure who takes a background role to her husband's epic story. To uncover how the course of history disrupted their peaceful, private

domestic space, Hutchinson gradually narrows her focus, both thematically as well as spatially. She begins her autobiography with a broad, providential history of English Protestantism, analyzing the circumstances leading up to the English Civil War, and then examines the downfall of the Parliamentary party during and after the Interregnum, with particular attention to the effect that harmful kinds of discourse had on the cause and on her husband's fate. Throughout the progression of the *Life*, the security of the private, Puritan domestic space is threatened by outside forces until enclosed spaces become a symbol of oppression and death. Meanwhile, while Lucy Hutchinson's narrative of national conflict gradually focuses on the story of one man in an isolated room, the worldview of her textual counterpart, "Mrs Hutchinson," broadens as she becomes involved in political maneuvering in hopes of saving her husband's life.

The opening of Hutchinson's autobiographical fragment is broad in its scope, providential in its historiography, and abstract in its wording:

The Almighty Author of all beings in his various providences, whereby he conducts the lives of men from the cradle to the tomb, exercises no less wisdom and goodness than he manifests power and greatness in their creation; but such is the stupidity of blind mortals that, instead of employing their studies in these admirable books of providence wherein God daily exhibits to us glorious characters of his love, kindness, wisdom, and justice, they ungratefully regard them not, and call the most wonderful operations of the great God the common accidents of life. (Hutchinson 3)

Hutchinson's emphasis on providence is characteristic of Puritan biography, in which "greater prominence [is] given . . . to inner religious experience and conversion than is common in Anglican biography" (Pritchard 39). Halkett and Fanshawe, for instance, frequently speak of

piety or devotion, but less about providence or conversion experiences than Hutchinson. She seeks to "[recollect] as much as I have heard or can remember of the passages of my youth and the general and particular providences exercised to me" (Hutchinson 3) in order to understand how providence has shaped her life.

She notes that she was born in "the Tower of London, the principal city of the English isle," and a strong sense of national identity appears in her text as it does not in our other subjects (Hutchinson 4). She immediately places her birth in a national and religious context rather than the familial one common for female autobiographers: "The land was then at peace (it being towards the latter end of the reign of King James), if that quietness may be called a peace which was rather like the calm and smooth surface of the sea whose dark womb is already impregnated of a horrid tempest" (Hutchinson 4). She briefly lists her immediate family before returning to nationalistic discourses: "Whoever considers England will find it no small favour of God to have been made one of its natives, both upon spiritual and outward accounts" (4). Her nationalism shapes her path in life, for England's historical greatness inspires in her a sense of duty to do great things: "The celebrated glory of this isle's inhabitants, ever since they received a mention in history, confers some honour upon every one of her children, and with it an obligation to continue in that magnanimity and virtue which hath framed this island" (Hutchinson 4).

Like many Parliamentarians, Hutchinson associates monarchical tyranny with the "Norman yoke" dating from 1066: "the Norman usurper . . . partly by violence, partly by falsehood, laid here the foundation of his monarchy in the people's blood, in which it hath swam about five hundred years" (Hutchinson 5). As her father is descended from the English Saxons of the period, her mother from the Normans, she embodies a sense of historical English unity, as the two groups had "such affinity by mutual marriages that the distinctions remained but a short



space; Normans and Saxons becoming one people” (Hutchinson 5). At the same time, however, because of the associations of the Norman Conquest with Stuart tyranny, she also embodies the conflicting principles that divide the nation.

She characterizes England as the birthplace of true Christianity, thereby aligning Puritanism to true Englishness through the figures of Saint Lucius, "one of the first monarchs on earth that received the faith of Christ into his heart and kingdom," and Henry VIII, "the first prince that broke the antichristian yoke off from his own and his subject's necks" (Hutchinson 6). She places her birth at the crux of a holy battle for England's soul by expressing her fears that the war between Satan and Christ "will never happily be decided, till the Prince of Peace come to conclude the controversy, which at the time of my birth was working up into that tempest wherein I have shared many perils, many fears and many sorrows" (Hutchinson 7). Her birth coincides not with the "midnight of popery, nor in the dawn of the gospel's restored day, when light and shades were blended and almost undistinguished," but in the glorious noon of Protestantism, "when the Sun of truth was exalted in his progress and hastening toward a meridian glory" (Hutchinson 7). She thanks God for the "wonders of power and goodness, wisdom and truth, which have been manifested in *this my time*" (Hutchinson 7, emphasis mine). With the words "my time," she defines and lays claim to the age in which she lives. As Seelig argues, "God's mercy to her in particular is only part of a grand design that includes all of England and all of history . . . . In constructing a story of herself, she places her life within a far larger context; her particular existence is part of a divine plan" (Seelig 77).

Only after this history of English Protestantism does she discuss her own birth, which is usually the first subject in most early modern women's autobiography. Like godliness in England, she is ordained:

My mother, while she was with child of me, dreamed that she was walking in the garden with my father and that a star came down into her hand, with other circumstances which, though I have often heard, I minded not enough to remember perfectly; only my father told her, her dream signified she should have a daughter of some extraordinary eminency; which thing, like such vain prophecies, wrought as far as it could its own accomplishment: for my father and mother fancying me then beautiful, and more than ordinarily apprehensive, applied all their cares, and spared no cost to improve me in my education, which procured me the admiration of those that flattered my parents. (Hutchinson 14)

Here she exhibits an uneasiness that has not been seen in the text up until this point. She does not want to appear immodest, and as a Puritan, she is uneasy with prognostication. Yet she also does not wish to omit the story of her exceptional birth and childhood. She describes her birth as a “significant event” in which the “quasi-mythic form of a star . . . portray[s] a particularly blessed individual” (Seelig 79). Despite her efforts at self-deprecation, this “is an act of considerable audacity. In the process of awakening her own gratitude, she marks herself as someone particularly singled out for favor” (Seelig 80).

Hutchinson portrays herself as committed scholar who, like many learned women before her, encounters difficulty reconciling proper womanly behavior with scholarship. She expresses a distaste for feminine accomplishments such as music, dancing, and needlepoint, and reacts almost violently to maternal roles: “Play among other children I despised, and when I was forced to entertain such as came to visit me, I tired them with more grave instructions than their mothers, and plucked all their babies to pieces, and kept the children in such awe that they were glad when I entertained myself with elder company” (Hutchinson 15). As Hutchinson's narrative

progresses, however, it is unclear to what extent her edification results from a private love of learning or a desire to be praised by her community. On one hand, she persists in reading even when her mother fears it "prejudiced my health"; stubbornly independent, she finds being forbidden to read "rather animated me than kept me back," and she retreats from familial community to private spaces to indulge her love of books: "every moment I could steal from my play I would employ in any book I could find, when my own were locked up from me. After dinner and supper I still had an hour allowed me to play, and then I would steal into some hole or other to read" (Hutchinson 14).

On the other hand, she attributes her religious knowledge to the fact that "while I was very young could remember and repeat [sermons] so exactly, and being caressed, the love of praise tickled me and made me attend more heedfully" (Hutchinson 14). She frequently attributes her talent for memorization, which must have contributed to her skill as a historian, to her desire for praise, dismissing her intelligence as mere mimicry: "living in the house with many persons that had a great deal of wit . . . I was very attentive to all, and gathered up things that I would utter again, to great admiration of many that took my memory and imitation for wit" (Hutchinson 15). The question of whether she composes her husband's memoir out of wifely devotion, personal desire to try her hand at history, or longing for public recognition of her intellectual talents will create tension throughout the *Memoir* as she seeks the appropriate balance between public and private content.

From the beginning of her account, Hutchinson shows a keen awareness of the importance of recording the lives of the dead and the empty space left behind when they are not remembered; of John Hutchinson's mother, she writes that "death veiled all her mortal glories in the twenty-sixth year of her age, and the stories I received of her have been but scanty epitaphs

of those things which were worthy of a large chronicle and a better recorder than I can be” (Hutchinson 34). Her account of her own husband's life is, in some way, incomplete because we cannot fully understand his origins, and her aim will be to re-create him textually, for “[h]is memory will never perish while there are any good men surviving who desire to preserve one of the fairest copies in the exemplary book of honour and virtue” (Hutchinson 337). She seeks to “moderate my woe” with “preservation of his memory” by telling a “naked, undressed narrative” (Hutchinson 16, 17). She worries that historiography is inadequate for this task, as “[w]hat I shall I write of him is but a copy of [him]” (Hutchinson 17). She metaphorically associates herself with historiography, however, by describing herself as another copy of her husband: “he was the author of that virtue he doted on, while she only reflected his own glories upon him” (Hutchinson 26). Hutchinson's work shows an “awareness . . . of the way in which women's words have the power of memorialization rather than desired political influence” (Wiseman 233). She was not able to save him, but she can resurrect him: “Colonel Hutchinson may no longer have a life, but he has a biography. Lucy Hutchinson herself claims to have had a life thanks to him; and he has one thanks to her” (Goldberg 285).

While Hutchinson ultimately creates her husband through text, in her history of his life, he creates *her*. The story of their romance begins with a strange act of creating the beloved out of thin air: the tale of the young man who fell in love with the description of the dead woman and pinned away at her footprint (Hutchinson 45). Soon after, John Hutchinson falls in love with Lucy Apsley's book collection, and “grew to love to hear mention of her, and the other gentlewomen who had been her companions used to talk much to him of her, telling how reserved and studious she was . . . [I]t so much enflamed Mr. Hutchinson's desire of seeing her that he began to wonder at himself” (Hutchinson 47). When “all the company believed she had been married,” he

behaves much like an overcome lover in a romance: “Mr Hutchinson immediately turned pale as ashes and felt a fainting to seize his spirits” (Hutchinson 48). He creates love out of texts—her books, her sonnet, the conventions of romance—just as she, ultimately, will recreate her love textually.

The newly married Mrs Hutchinson seems to desire self-erasure as much Margaret Cavendish dreads it. Her physicality and even her own claim to her personality are obliterated and replaced by John Hutchinson's image: “'Twas not her face he loved, her honour and her virtue were his mistresses; and these (like Pygmalion's) images of his own making, for he polished and gave form to what he found with all the roughness of the quarry about it” (Hutchinson 52). If history is a mirror, then she is history embodied, a “very faithful mirror, reflecting truly, though but dimly, his own glories upon him, so long as he was present” (Hutchinson 51). Mrs Hutchinson, the subject, only remembers and reflects, while Lucy Hutchinson the author will analyze and argue.

Hutchinson's analysis of political events, however, is fraught with anxiety. If her history is the most traditional of the texts examined here, it is also the most anxious about her use of traditional historiography. She begins with an analysis of the relationship between politics and religion that encompasses the whole nation: “When the dawn of the Gospel began to break upon this isle, after the dark midnight of Papacy, the morning was more cloudy here than in other places by reason of the state interest, which was mixing and working itself into the interest of religion, and which in the end quite wrought it out” (Hutchinson 57). Despite her enthusiasm for analysis, however, Hutchinson betrays an acute awareness of, and sometimes an anxiety towards, the perceived division between public and private matters. The origins of such tension are unclear. As this dissertation's second chapter has shown, commenting on public and political

matters was more acceptable for women during and after the Civil War than it had been previously, but they were still open to censure. This was particularly true of Puritan women, especially those of independent sects. The Hutchinsons were associated with groups such as the Baptists, Seekers, Muggletonians, Levellers, and Fifth Monarchists, who “were known collectively as Independents (and sometimes as Congregationalists or Separatists) because of their belief that each congregation should be free to establish its own beliefs about God's will” (Hobby 13). Women “played a particularly active role” in such sects (Norbrook *Writing* 21), and although Puritan doctrine “persuad[ed] women to conform to the ideal of female silence and obedience,” it also “paradoxically encouraged them to form habits of independent thought and self-expression” (Kusunoki 188).

As a result, many women of various Independent sects published and preached in the mid-seventeenth century. They justified such transgression as the will of God:

The precedent, the authority, for spirituality . . . was not fixed, formalised or institutionalised, but as fluid as the consciousness of the individual concerned. Consequently it was difficult, if not impossible, to define boundaries beyond which writers should not go; if God called, a writer could not refuse to follow . . . . [C]ritics must return to the lack of boundaries, in several senses, as a crucial feature of these writings. In writing at all, women such as Anna Trapnel were believed to be overstepping the limit; in the writings themselves, the only boundary is the one imposed by God through the consciousness of the writer. (Hinds 220).

At the same time, “The Puritan notion of partnership . . . concealed the repressive aspect of the power relations in patriarchal marriage,” and “Puritan divines persuaded female congregations to

accept their subjection in the household” (Kusunoki 187). Puritans justified women's unacceptable public speech not by denying its existence or arguing for its acceptability, but by excusing their transgression on the grounds of women's transgressive nature. Radical sectarians maintained that “women were suited to be prophets because of their essence, which was irrational, emotional, and unusually receptive to outside influences” (Mack 23). The very “passivity, irrationality, and passion” that had kept them from the public space now “justif[ied] their prophetic activities during the civil war” (Mack 35). Such beliefs did not, however, increase women's credibility as public speakers; instead, it “reinforced the negative notion that women were irrational and hysterical” (Mack 35). Even the “mother of Quakerism,” Margaret Fell, “defended the right of women to preach on the grounds of weakness, not talent” (Mack 29). These discourses led to Royalists satirizing Parliamentary women as “sexually voracious,” as “evil witches, anti-social and disruptive” (de Groot 196); they were attacked as drunken, sexually loose moral hypocrites (de Groot 196-197). Hutchinson was anxious about Puritan stereotypes; she “hated the idea that as a Calvinist she might be satirized as a ‘Puritan.’” (Wiseman 210). This may well have been the reason for her hesitation to publish and her anxiety about writing on public matters.

Certainly John Hutchinson admonished her for speaking out on his behalf in an attempt to save him, and she may feel some lingering guilt for going against his wishes now that he was dead. We also know that it was dangerous, post-Restoration, for the widow of a regicide to say too much about politics; “[b]iographies of Puritan nonconformists who suffered Anglican persecution could not be published free of censorship before 1640 or for much of the period after 1660” (Pritchard 39). Whatever the reason, these anxieties have a profound effect on the text's structure. She cannot escape discussing matters that do not relate directly to John Hutchinson's

life, for at the core of the *Life* is an exploration of how private discourse can greatly affect public politics and how public matters can invade and disrupt the private space. But rather than integrating the two in her text to show how they are interrelated, she constantly disrupts the narrative by drawing attention to the shift between public and private.

Hutchinson is acutely aware when she has wandered from her intended subject: “But not to confound stories and finish the memorial of this here”; “And now to return to his story where I left it” (Hutchinson 244, 245). She shifts uneasily between the proper female memoirist who merely recalls and the potentially subversive historian who analyzes, sometimes with multiple shifts within a sentence. For instance, in the early pages of the text, when she realizes “I have been too long for that I intended, a bare summary, and too short to give a clear understanding of the righteousness of the Parliament's cause,” she defers to other voices, only to qualify the value of their accounts:

which I shall desire you to inform yourselves better of by their own printed papers, and Mr May's history, which I find to be impartially true so far as he hath carried it on, saving some little mistakes in his own judgment, and misinformations which some vain people have of themselves, and more indulgence to the King's guilt than can justly be allowed. (Hutchinson 75)

In some places, she apologizes for her shifts in focus. Regarding the shortcomings of the Puritan party, she fears that “[i]nstead of digressing, I shall ramble into an inextricable wilderness, if I pursue this sad remembrance: to return therefore to his actions at that time” (Hutchinson 87). Here, in the earlier chapters of the *Life*, she is more engaged in writing a religious and political history of the English Civil War than of writing her husband's life story. Such engagement, of course, is necessary; we cannot understand the fate John Hutchinson met if we do not understand



the political circumstances surrounding it. Yet she fears she might wander into forbidden territory—an “inextricable wilderness”—and never find her way out again. Elsewhere she apologizes not for the sin of discussing public matters, but for her limited ability to do so: “here I must make a short digression from our particular actions to sum up the state of the kingdom at that time, which though I cannot do exactly, yet I can truly relate what I was then able to take notice of” (Hutchinson 57).

In other places she is defensive, assuring the reader that “[i]t will not be amiss in this place to carry on the Parliament story, that we may the better judge of things at home when we know the condition of affairs abroad” and explaining that a particular piece of information is necessary for “the better carrying on of [John Hutchinson's] story” or “for the better understanding of the motion of those lesser wheels that moved within the great orb” (Hutchinson 160, 99, 104). In one telling passage, she recounts and analyzes events even as she distances herself from doing so by claiming she will leave them to proper historians:

But how the public business went on, how Cromwell finished the conquest of Ireland; how the angry Presbyterians spit fire out of their pulpits and endeavoured to blow up the people against Parliament; how they entered into a treasonable conspiracy with Scotland, who had now received and crowned the son of the late king, who led them in hither with a great army, which the Lord of hosts discomfited; how our public ministers were assassinated and murdered in Spain and Holland; and how the Dutch, in this unsettlement of affairs, hoped to gain by making war, wherein they were beaten and brought to sue for peace, I shall leave to the stories that were then written; and only I general say that the hand of God

was mightily seen in prospering and preserving the Parliament, till Cromwell's ambition unhappily interrupted them. (Hutchinson 236)

The concluding lines of this passage are of particular interest. Like a good Puritan woman, she shies away from analyzing history by reverting to the interpretation that providence, the “hand of God,” guides events. Yet second causes, the acts of men, “interrupt” God's control of the proceedings.

Hutchinson's urge to record and analyze stems from her mistrust of existing narratives, which she criticizes even as she defers to them:

[I]f any one have a desire of more particular information, there were so many books then written as will sufficiently give it to them. And although those of our enemies 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. (Hutchinson 57)

She shows both an acute awareness of the superfluity of public discourse and a faith that truth will out. Discourse is untrustworthy, a weapon that can be aimed at the godly with fatal results: Not long after one Walters was brought prisoner out of Yorkshire, a fellow of a timorous spirit who, being taken, was in so great a fear that he accused many, guilty or not guilty, to save himself, cause his own wife to be put in prison, and hanged the dearest friend he had in the world. (Hutchinson 305)

In order to reclaim the historical narrative from a Parliamentary and Puritan point of view, she must analyze and subvert a variety of harmful discourses surrounding the Civil War and Restoration, including naming, hypocrisy, and falsehood. Of particular importance is Hutchinson's reclamation of the meaning of the word “Puritan.” In her analysis of the

foundations of the religious conflict, she divides English Christianity into “the Papist, the State Protestant, and the more religious zealots who afterward were branded with the name of Puritan” (Hutchinson 58). She explains the origin of the term:

whoever was zealous for God's glory or worship, could not endure blasphemous oaths, ribald conversation, profane scoffs, sabbath breach, derision of the word of God, and the like, whoever could endure a sermon, modest habit or conversation, or anything that was good, all these were Puritans; and if Puritans, then enemies to the King and his government, seditious, factious hypocrites, ambitious disturbers of the public peace, and finally, the pest of [the] kingdom, enemies of God and good men, according to the court account. (Hutchinson 65)

Puritanism, in the popular view, is not an identity but rather lack of one, a political designation that denigrates those who bear it as anti-English: “when they had once given them a name, whatever was odious or dreadful to the King, fixed that upon the *Puritan*, which, according to their character, was nothing but a factious hypocrite” (Hutchinson 64). Those who asserted that “common justice” should “equally belong to the poorest as well as the mighty . . . were nicknamed Levellers,” she explains, but “as all virtues have their mediums and have their extremes,” the “sober Levellers were never guilty of desiring” the “levelling of all estates and qualities” (Hutchinson 222).

She takes great pains to distance her husband from Puritan stereotypes. When he advises a parson to “blot out all the superstitious paintings and break the images in the glass” of his church,” the parson “brand[s] Mr Hutchinson with the name of Puritan” (Hutchinson 76). Explaining that the nickname “Roundhead” originated with a few Puritan “zealots,” she hastens to assert that “Mr Hutchinson, who having a very fine thickset head of hair, kept it clean and

handsome without any affectation” (Hutchinson 87). She also aligns him with the educated, cultured upper class more associated with Royalism, who takes advantage of Royalist exile to “[seek] out all the rare artists he could hear of” and buy up “paintings, sculptures, engravings, and all other such curiosities” from “the King's and divers noblemen's collections” (Hutchinson 255).

In her analysis of the effect of discourse on the fate of Parliamentarianism, Hutchinson is particularly obsessed with hypocrisy and falsehood as the cause of the Parliamentarian party's downfall. This focus is significant to her desire to understand and analyze the meaning of events and take control over the meanings of words, for the danger of false discourse lies in the inability to interpret correctly a hypocrite or a liar, a failure of true meaning to match readable actions or words. Despite her biased account of the war, she shows more sympathy for overt Royalists like the wounded soldiers she attends than for false Puritans. She accuses the Pope of “fraud, false doctrine, lies and hypocrisies” in her analysis of the Reformation (Hutchinson 58). When John Hutchinson is made governor of Nottingham, he is troubled not by “open, professed enemies” but by the “secret heart-boilings” of “close, hypocritical, false-hearted people among whom were some leading eminent men, so subtle in their malignity that though their actions were most prejudicial to the public service, yet did they cast such cunning, specious pretences over them of public good that even the most upright men of the garrison were often seduced by their fair colors” (Hutchinson 139, 137). Cromwell's soldiers, she claims, used “a thousand slanderous criminations and untruths” against Parliament, making “false criminations of the Parliament men . . . which time manifested to be false, and truth retorted all upon themselves that they had injuriously cast at them” (Hutchinson 263, 253).

She seeks to understand how discourse can be used to cause harm, going into increased detail about particular cases of falsehood as the text continues, such as that of Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, who “insinuated himself into a particular friendship with the Colonel, and made him all the honourable pretences that can be imagined and called him his *dear friend*, and caressed him with such embraces as none but a traitor as vile as himself could have suspected,” or her brother's dealings with “one wicked woman, who had the worst and the smoothest tongue that ever her sex made use of to mischief. She was handsome in her youth and had very pretty girls to her daughters, whom, when they grew up, she prostituted to her revenge and malice against Sir Allen Apsley” (Hutchinson 273 , 247).

Of particular concern is the duplicity of Oliver Cromwell, who “made mighty profession of a sincere heart to [John Hutchinson]” but whose “court was full of sin and vanity” (Hutchinson 223, 257). Cromwell's hypocrisy, according to Hutchinson, is so great that he fears honesty; because of John Hutchinson's “plain dealing with him he dreaded the Colonel, and made it his particular business to keep him out of the army” (Hutchinson 223). John Hutchinson does not seem to perceive this abuse, for Cromwell uses “all his arts” to “draw in the Colonel” (Hutchinson 260). Hutchinson goes on to argue that Cromwell's ambition brings about the destruction of the cause and the Restoration of the monarchy, for supporters of the king, finding “a door opened for the restoring of their party, fell much in with Cromwell, and heightened all his disorders” (Hutchinson 257).

She also demonstrates a concern about spectacle and performance as a particular type of discourse that threatens Puritans. They are made the “sport of the pulpit”; the theater “belched forth profane scoffs upon them,” “drunkards made them their songs,” and “fiddlers and mimics learned to abuse them” (Hutchinson 65). Parliamentarians themselves, Hutchinson argues,

likewise hurt their cause through performance. Puritan “zealots,” she explains, acquired the nickname “roundheads” by

several affectations of habit, looks, and words, which, had it been a real declension of vanity and embracing of sobriety in all those things, had been most commendable in them; but their quick forsaking of those things when they were where they would be, showed that they either never took them up for conscience, or were corrupted by their prosperity to take up those vain things they durst not practise under persecution. Among other affected habits, few of the Puritans, what degree soever the were of, wore their hair long enough to cover their ears, and the ministers and many others cut it close round their heads, with so many little peaks as was something ridiculous to behold. (Hutchinson 86-87)

On the other side of Parliamentarianism's internal fracture are the “officers of the army” who have “made themselves as fine as the courtiers, and everyone hoped in this change to change their condition, and disowned all things they had before adored” (Hutchinson 278). As a result, Parliamentarians develop a reputation for hypocrisy that is itself propagated through spectacle as “every ballad singer sung up and down the streets ribald rhymes made in reproach of the late commonwealth and of all those worthies that therein endeavoured the people's freedom and happiness” (Hutchinson 278).

In the center of all these lies stands John Hutchinson, a perfect center of truth. Yet despite her emphasis on John Hutchinson's unshakeable honesty, the Hutchinsons show themselves willing to make use of spectacle, doublespeak, and even outright falsehood when it serves the cause—or their own interests. In his early days in politics, John Hutchinson shows an acute awareness of the need to perform virtue, keeping “strict . . . watch over all his actions, because

he knew how all his enemies watched for his fall” (Hutchinson 152). Later he responds to rumors spread by Cromwell's followers with a similar use of spectacle, appearing at a funeral in “a scarlet cloak, very richly laced” to demonstrate the hypocrisy of the false mourning of “gentleman parasites” (250). He gets vital information from a “foot-boy” by “making him believe he should be hanged immediately for changing his party (Hutchinson 201).

There is a fundamental inconsistency in Hutchinson's own account of the regicide, an event that lies at the core of John Hutchinson's fate. She asserts that he was nominated “very much against his own will” but felt himself “obliged by the covenant of God and the public trust of his country reposed in him” (Hutchinson 233-234). But although John Hutchinson is helpless before God's will, the other regicides bear personal responsibility: “although some of them after, for excuse, belied themselves, and said they were under the awe of the army and overpersuaded by Cromwell, and the like, yet it is certain that all men herein were left to their free liberty of acting, neither persuaded nor compelled” (Hutchinson 234). While the other regicides respond to questioning with “false tale[s],” John Hutchinson makes an eloquent but indirect response which was “so very handsomely delivered that it generally took the whole House” (Hutchinson 280).

John Hutchinson's family also employs falsehood for his benefit. Mrs Hutchinson's brother, “with all the kindest zeal of friendship that can be imagined, endeavoured to bring off the Colonel, had used some artifice in engaging his friends for him” (Hutchinson 282). Mrs Hutchinson herself pretends to Royalist soldiers that her brother is her husband and “tricked him into recanting his republicanism by a forged letter ” by writing to Parliament in his name (DNB). She performs effectively when questioned about the letter, claiming that “she could not absolutely say that was her writing, though it had some resemblance” (Hutchinson 309). These

events underscore the ambiguous nature of “truth” in Hutchinson's text, for she reshapes events in her husband's favor in the biography just as she resorts to falsehood to protect him.

As the Hutchinsons ally themselves against John Hutchinson's enemies, they increasingly draw away from the world of public politics and into the security and seclusion of the domestic space. A sense of isolation characterizes the relationship even before they meet, for what John Hutchinson knows first of Lucy Apsley is that she does not wish to know anyone: “she is of an humour she will not be acquainted with any of mankind . . . [S]he shuns the converse of men as the plague, she only lives in the enjoyment of herself, and hath not the humanity to communicate that happiness to any of our sex” (Hutchinson 48). Her reserve attracts rather than repulses John Hutchinson, for “the information of this reserved humour pleased him more than all else he had heard” (Hutchinson 48). Their acquaintances respond, inexplicably, by blocking the relationship:

the young men and women who saw them allow each other that kindness which they did not commonly afford to others, first began to grow jealous and envious at it, and after use all the malicious practices they could invent to break the friendship. Among the rest, that gentleman who at the first had so highly commended her to Mr Hutchinson now began to caution him against her and to disparage her, which such subtle insinuations as would have ruined any love less constant and honourable than his. (Hutchinson 50-51)

This is the first time that malevolent rumors and hypocrisy will threaten their happiness together, but certainly not the last. The opposition only seems to tighten their bond; like the Lucases and the Cavendishes, as the next chapter will show, they are a closed system, complete and isolated. In verses “most probably composed by her during her husband's retirement from public business,” Hutchinson celebrates domestic life:



sweet repose

But seldom to the splendid palace goes  
 A troop of restless passions wander there,  
 And private lives are only free from care.

(Hutchinson 339; 9-12)

Such peace, however, cannot last. After “a few months peaceful and happy in their own house . . . the kingdom began to blaze out with the long-conceived flame of civil war” (Hutchinson 57).

Unlike Margaret Cavendish, Lucy Hutchinson expresses little concern about the physical state of their home, although she mentions in passing that “[John Hutchinson's] house had been so ruined by the war that he could no longer live in it” (Hutchinson 230). The psychological safety of their home, however, soon comes under attack, beginning with an accusation not of a grand conspiracy that could affect the nation, but that John Hutchinson “had betrayed the town and castle and [was] ready to surrender them to the enemy” (Hutchinson 180).

The household is then betrayed from within when “my Lord Biron then corrupted a general who waited then on the Colonel” and the gentleman, Ivie, “came to a singing-boy who kept the Colonel's clothes, and commanded him to deliver him the Colonel's own arms and buff coat” (Hutchinson 266). As “although he had been bred a Cavalier he abhorred to betray or be unfaithful to those he served,” the boy reports Ivie's actions to Mrs. Hutchinson who, “ashamed to complain of her own family,” fails to take immediate action (Hutchinson 266-267). Not realizing that her gentlewoman has betrayed her, she enlists her to help hide the Hutchinsons' valuables “while the false and base dissembler went smiling up and down at her mistress' simplicity” (Hutchinson 267). When Ivie then gets involved in a duel, she continues to protect

the traitor, constrained and silenced by her desire to protect her domestic space against public censure:

Mrs Hutchinson, not willing to take for all this such public notice of his treason as to cast him into prison, took him immediately to London with her, and said nothing till he came there, and then told him how base and treacherous he had been; but to save her own shame at having entertained so false a person . . . she was willing to dismiss him privately, without acquainting the Colonel, who could not know but he was engaged to punish him. (Hutchinson 267)

Soon after, Hutchinson describes how she interrupted a fight in which John Hutchinson was involved, refusing to let violence enter her private space even at the expense of her and her husband's own safety: "the Colonel drew a sword which was in the room to have chastized them. But . . . his wife, not willing to have them killed in her presence, opened the door and let them out, who presently run and fetched in their companions in the yard with cocked pistols" (Hutchinson 270). After narrowly escaping imprisonment, John Hutchinson is forced to reduce his family staff. In spite of his "bountiful rewards," "some of them soon after betrayed him as much as was in their their power, whose prudence had so lived with them that they knew nothing that could hurt his person" (Hutchinson 285-286). Even when no actual betrayal has taken place, nothing to contribute to the narrative of her husband's life, Hutchinson feels compelled to record all threats to the sanctity of their private space.

The growing sense of danger associated with the private space corresponds to significant changes in the Hutchinsons' feelings towards involvement in public and private affairs. At the beginning of the *Life*, the young John Hutchinson is engaged with political discourse; he "applied himself to understand the things then in dispute, and read all the public papers that came

forth between the King and Parliament, besides many other private treatises, both concerning the present and foregoing times” (Hutchinson 75). He assesses his position within a wide context and becomes “convinced in his conscience of the righteousness of the Parliament's cause in point of civil right” (Hutchinson 75). In a choice that foreshadows the changes to come in his attitude toward political affairs, however, he responds with abstract, private faith rather than public action: “thinking he had not warrantable call to do anything more at that time, contented himself to pray for peace” (Hutchinson 75).

Hutchinson asserts that her husband believes strongly in the public good and that “[i]f the greatest enemy he had in the world had propounded anything profitable to the public, he would promote it” (Hutchinson 208). The only public space that concerns him, however, is his immediate surroundings with whose care he has been entrusted. He is passionate about promoting the good of his local community, asserting that

as he never engaged himself in this service with respect to the success or actions of other places, so though the whole kingdom were quit besides this town, he would yet maintain it so long as he was able, and he trusted that God would preserve it in his hands; but if it perished, he was resolved to bury himself in the ruins of it, being confident that God would after vindicate him to have been a defender and not a destroyer of his county. (Hutchinson 159)

As Parliamentary tensions mount, John Hutchinson increasingly applies himself “to the administration of justice in the county, and to the putting in execution of those wholesome laws and statutes of the land provided for the orderly regulation of the people” (Hutchinson 253). As a result of his devotion to the area, “there was very suddenly not a beggar left in the county, and all the poor in every town were so maintained and provided for as they never were so liberally

maintained and relieved before nor since” (Hutchinson 253). He reacts to his growing displeasure with Cromwell by retreating, refusing to “act in any office under the Protector's power and “confin[ing] himself to his own, which the whole county about him were very much grieved at, and would rather come to him for counsel as a private neighbor than to any of the men in power for greater help” (Hutchinson 255-256). The ideal statesman, John Hutchinson is powerful enough to affect, yet uncorrupted by, the public space. Hutchinson describes this time as a happy one in which he “pleased himself with music, and again fell to the practice of his viol, on which he played excellently well, and entertaining tutors for the diversion and education of his children in all sorts of music, thus pleased himself with these innocent recreations during Oliver's mutable reign” (Hutchinson 255). Unable to reform the state, he reforms and literally reshapes the spaces surrounding him:

[B]ecause his active spirit could not be idle nor very sordidly employed, he took up his time in opening springs and planting trees and dressing his plantations; and these were his recreations, wherein he relieved many poor labourers who wanted work, which was a very comfortable charity to them and their families: with these he would entertain himself, giving them much encouragement in their honest labours so that they delighted to be employed by him. (Hutchinson 292).

As he retreats from the public space, his wife begins to move about in the world on his behalf, leading to an interest in public discourse that will culminate in an analysis of their experiences within the broad context of English religious history. She goes “out soliciting for her husband” and then “[seeks] out my Lord [of Portland], knowing that he had professed much kindness and obligation to her husband and thinking he might have some design now to acknowledge it by some real assistance” (Hutchinson 245). When he responds by proposing a

real estate deal instead of any concrete support, “she, being vexed that my Lord should interrupt her with this frivolous proposition, told my Lord that she would hazard it with the rest of her estate, rather than make up such desperate bargains” (Hutchinson 245). Unlike her trusting husband, Mrs Hutchinson shows herself to be shrewd in public discourse.

As her understanding of the threats surrounding her husband grows, she becomes “awakened, and saw that he was ambitious of being a public sacrifice” (Hutchinson 280). This realization will lead to tension between them throughout the remainder of the text. As the Hutchinsons begin to move in opposite directions on a continuum of public and private life, John Hutchinson forbids his wife to speak out on his behalf. Having “resolved to disobey him, and to improve all the affection he had to her for his safety,” she writes a letter of appeal to the Speaker of the House (Hutchinson 280). Finding that “the House was that day in a most excellent temper towards her husband,” she “writ her husband's name to the letter and ventured to send it in, being used sometimes to write the letters he dictated, and her character not much different from his” (Hutchinson 281). By signing his name as her own, embodying him through text as she will later by writing his biography, she temporarily saves him from arrest and imprisonment. He is ultimately taken into custody, and concluding that the Crown's treatment of him “utterly disobliged him from all ties either of honour or conscience,” he instructs his wife that she will “not make applications to any person whatsoever, and made it his earnest request to Sir Allen Apsley to let him stand and fall by his own innocency” (Hutchinson 311). Fearful of “displeas[ing]” him again, she “submitted now to suffer with him, according to his own will, who as he would do nothing that might entangle him for his freedom, so he patiently suffered their unjust bondage” (Hutchinson 311).

From the beginning of the *Life*, Hutchinson characterizes her husband as an epic hero who “began to apprehend, even before he could read, something of eternity and sin” (Hutchinson 38). The “principle of love and life in God . . . had from a child preserved him from fleshly lusts and pollutions”; she compares his calling to that of Moses (Hutchinson 54). Her hatred of hypocrisy helps to underscore John Hutchinson's chief virtue, a childlike sense of trust in a world full of liars. This virtue is also, Hutchinson argues, “the greatest of the Governor's defects: that through the candidness and sincerity of his own nature, he was more unsuspecting of others and more credulous of fair pretenders than suited with so great a prudence as he testified in all things else” (Hutchinson 169). By emphasizing a characteristic that makes him at once virtuous and vulnerable, Hutchinson constructs a martyr narrative in which Hutchinson is good enough to die a saint's death but not strong enough to prevent it. Gradually, however, tension arises between Mrs Hutchinson's desire to save her husband and Lucy's Hutchinson's reliance on the martyr narrative. When others are condemned and John Hutchinson goes free, “although he was most thankful to God, yet he was not very well satisfied in himself for accepting the deliverance” (Hutchinson 286). Mrs Hutchinson, who “never deserved so well of him as in the endeavours and labours she exercised to bring him off,” finds that she “never displeased him more in her life, and had much ado to persuade him to be contented with his deliverance” (Hutchinson 286). Lucy Hutchinson the author celebrates John Hutchinson for criticizing her textual counterpart: Mrs Hutchinson was exceedingly sad, but he encouraged and kindly chid her out of it, and told her it would blemish his innocence for her to appear afflicted, and told her if she had but patience to wait the event, she would see it all for the best and bade her be thankful for the mercy that she was permitted this comfort to accompany him in the journey. (Hutchinson 303)

As John Hutchinson retreats into private space and eventually into the confines of his prison cell, his language becomes broader, more abstract. No longer concerning himself with the everyday matters of local government, he speaks of events within the scope of Providential history as befitting a Puritan martyr. Because of Cromwell's abuses of power, he

believed himself wholly disengaged from all ties but those which God and Nature, or rather God by Nature, obliges every man of honour and honesty in to his country, which is to defend or relieve it from invading tyrants, as far as he may by a lawful call and means, and to suffer patiently that yoke which God submits him to, till the Lord shall take it off. (Hutchinson 265)

He asserts that his "conscience . . . would not permit him in any way to assist any tyrant or invader of the people's rights, nor to rise up against them without a manifest call from God" (Hutchinson 265). Any involvement with the public sphere would now come not for the sake of the public good, but because God had commanded it. When Hutchinson inquires as to why "he should make himself a martyr for people that had been so censorious of him," he responds that "he did it not for them but for the cause they owned" (Hutchinson 322). As Mrs Hutchinson becomes more involved in the minutiae of politics, learning which people have betrayed them and who can be trusted and appealed to for help, one can see the beginnings of the historian who will analyze national politics as the actions of actual people, actions that can be recounted and dissected. For John Hutchinson, however, politics have been reduced to an abstract "cause." The young woman who once spurned discourse with men now engages with the public space, while the young man who once worried about how his actions would be perceived by those around him now fantasizes about a life of complete retreat that can defend him against all threats:

Sometimes he would say that if ever he should live to see the Parliament power up again, that he would never meddle any more either in councils or armies; and then sometimes again, when he saw or heard of any of the debaucheries of the times, he would say, he would act only as a Justice of the Peace in the country . . . . Oftentimes he would say, if ever he were at liberty in the world he would flee the conversation of all the Cavaliers, and would write upon his doors, *procul hinc procul este, profani* [away, keep far off, you profane people] and that . . . . henceforth he would never, either in one kind or another, have any commerce at all with them. (Hutchinson 322)

While imprisonment might appear similar to John Hutchinson's self-imposed isolation, it holds the opposite meaning. His retreat to the domestic space had been a rejection of the corrupt public sphere, a statement of disdain; now he is removed from the public space he shunned because he is considered a threat to it, his powers of discourse and self-definition stripped from him. As John Hutchinson's situation becomes more fraught, enclosed spaces come to represent danger rather than safety. Fear of enclosure colors her commentary on the death of Oliver Cromwell, who "was resolved not to let him [John Hutchinson] longer be at liberty, yet before his guards apprehended the Colonel, death imprisoned himself, and confined all his vast ambition and all his cruel designs into the narrow compass of a grave" (Hutchinson 261). Hutchinson describes the claustrophobia-inducing atmosphere of her husband's prison with a level of visual detail that she had not used since her descriptions of John Hutchinson's physical appearance in the early pages of the text: "he was kept close prisoner, and had no air allowed him but a pair of leads over his chamber, which were so high and cold he had no benefit by them; and every night he had three doors shut upon him, and a sentinel at the outmost" (Hutchinson 306). When he attempts to



assert his rights and demands to know by whom and of what he has been accused, his enclosure increases beyond what he had believed possible: the jailer

said he would lock him up close, and let nobody come to him. Mr Hutchinson told he, he could be locked no closer than he had been all this time . . . . He, in fury, commanded to take away Mr Hutchinson, and lock him up that no person might come at him, and gave order at the Tower gates to keep out his children and all his relations. (Hutchinson 313-314)

Hutchinson suggests a connection between enclosed spaces and the traumatized past of English politics long before John Hutchinson's imprisonment, when he comes into possession of a “ruinous and uninhabitable” castle haunted by the spirits of history. There Edward II's traitorous queen, Isabel, was “surprised with her paramour Mortimer, who, by secret windings and hollows in the rock, came up into her chamber from the meadows lying low under it” (Hutchinson 110). Unlike the fruitful safety of the Hutchinson estate, here nature is stunted and deformed, associated with corruption, usurpation, and political imprisonment:

Behind it was a place called the Park, that belonged to the castle, but then had neither deer nor trees in it, except one growing under the castle, which was almost a prodigy, for, from the root to the top, there was not one straight twig or branch of it; some say it was planted by King Richard III and resembled him that set it . . . . In one of [the caverns], it is reported that one David, a Scotch king, was kept in cruel durance, and with his nails had scratched the story of Christ and his twelve apostles on the wall. (Hutchinson 111)

Richard III is analogous here to Cromwell, whose ascension Hutchinson describes as a usurpation (Hutchinson 256). John Hutchinson, fearing Cromwell's ambition, destroys the castle to keep it from the Protector's grasp (Hutchinson 249-250).

Richard III makes a reappearance when Hutchinson is imprisoned in "a room where it is said the two young princes, King Edward the Fifth and his brother, were murdered in former days" (Hutchinson 306). Next to it lies the room where "Duke of Clarence was drowned in a butt of malmsey," which she describes with intensely claustrophobic imagery as "a dark great room that had no window in it, where the portcullis to one of the inward Tower gates was drawn up and let down, under which there sat every night a court of guard" (Hutchinson 306). The connection Hutchinson draws between English history, her personal history, and the Tower of London here is significant. It had first appeared in her personal history, in which her father's position of a lieutenant of the Tower had linked her to the span of English history just as her Anglo-Norman ancestry had. The metaphorical significance of the Tower, once so broad in scope, has become uncomfortably narrow, and the sense of suffocation is overwhelming. From her all-encompassing history of English Protestantism we have come here to a tiny space, to one man and one historical analogue: a room without windows with a closely guarded door, smothered children, a drowned nobleman in a small barrel. The building had once been "bound up with the happy memories of her childhood" (MacCarthy 88) as a place where her own father was "father to all his prisoners, sweetening with such compassionate kindness their restraint that the affliction of a prison was not felt in his days" (Hutchinson 12); a place where her own mother was "to all the . . . prisoners that came into the Tower, as a mother" (Hutchinson 13). The fond memory of hiding in "some hole or other" with her books has been replaced by a horror of enclosed spaces.

Unlike the tales of her exiled Royalist counterparts Anne Halkett, Anne Fanshawe, and Margaret Cavendish, Lucy Hutchinson's history of her husband ends as the story of an exile within his own nation's borders, sent "to a distant place to be starved" (Hutchinson 319). His seaside prison, Sandown Castle in Kent, is terrifyingly liminal, both open and closed. His room has five doors that open out to emptiness, "a platform that had nothing but the bleak air of the sea"; the sea air makes

the chamber so unwholesome and damp that even in the summer time the Colonel's hat-case and trunks, 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; and although the walls were four yards thick, yet it rained in through cracks in them, and then one might sweep off a peck of saltpetre off of them every day, which stood in perpetual sweat upon them.

(Hutchinson 320)

The sea would seem to suggest openness, freedom, after the confines of his prison; instead, it will suffocate him to death, drown him in open air like the Duke of Clarence. Hutchinson asserts twice that she has it on the authority of John Hutchinson's doctors that "that chamber had killed [him]" (Hutchinson 329).

Hutchinson's ability to speak for himself is cut off even before his death: "yet I should utter more, but that the soreness of my mouth makes it difficult for me to speak" (Hutchinson 329-330). He is not able to speak to his wife and son, which he considers "the will of God"; no one knows what he would have said, but Hutchinson appropriates his voice with the assertion that "I am confident was some advice to his son how to demean himself in public concernments" (Hutchinson 330). John Hutchinson, of course, had been utterly disdainful of "public

concernments” in his final days; the sentiment is more Mrs Hutchinson's than his. John Hutchinson's penultimate words, ironically, express the control over narrative and space that he has lost: "'Tis as I would have it. 'Tis where I would have it" (Hutchinson 330). Equally ironic are his last words, which are of Mrs Hutchinson: "Alas, how she will be surprised!", for she had predicted his martyrdom all along (Hutchinson 331).

In the choice of John Hutchinson's burial place, his biographer exerts control over both space and meaning. He had “use to say that wherever he died he would there be buried,” but in his final days he “very earnestly enjoined them to carry him home, though it was eight score miles distant from the place where he died” (Hutchinson 333). Although she admits she does not know why he made this choice, she is “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”--that is, the reading of the Prayer Book burial service (Hutchinson 334). By defining the meaning of his final resting place, Hutchinson reasserts the connection between good Puritanism and private spaces that had been threatened.

Hutchinson's text returns to the room in which her husband died, this time analyzing the room's meaning in terms of money and class:

I have often admired, when I have considered the abounding 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 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. (Hutchinson 334)

Despite the association of Republicanism with Levelling, Hutchinson's text betrays an acute consciousness of class status. While Cromwell, she claims, "had much natural greatness in him, and well became the place he had usurped," his wife and children's new status "suited no better with any of them than scarlet on the ape" (Hutchinson 256). Her biography of her husband begins with an assurance that "though none of [the Hutchinsons] before Sir Thomas Hutchinson advanced beyond an esquire, yet they successively matched into all the most eminent and noble families in the country; which shows that it was the unambitious genius of the family rather than their want of merit, which make them keep upon so even a ground" (Hutchinson 31). This exalted position could not save them, however, from the internal threat created by untrustworthy servants. There is a certain symmetry, therefore, with her return to class when analyzing John Hutchinson's end; she concludes his death was "rather occasioned by some cold he got, [having] by the Lieutenant's barbarism been deprived of the assistance of his servant to wait on him at his rising and going to bed, which was a thing he had never been without in his life" (Hutchinson 335).

Mrs Hutchinson, however, never really leaves the room in which her husband has died, for in the year following his death

there came an apparition of a gentlewoman in mourning in such a habit as Mrs Hutchinson used to wear there, and affrighted the guards mightily at first; but after a while grew familiar to them and was often seen walking in the Colonels' chamber and on the platform and came somethings into the guard among them.

Which is certainly true, but we knew not how to interpret it. (Hutchinson 336)

It is as if Mrs Hutchinson the wife dies with her husband, and Lucy Hutchinson, the historian and hagiographer, the one who seeks to "interpret" this story, is born. But then, for the first time in

the the text, the two Lucy Hutchinsons become one: "Yet after all this he is gone hence and I remain, an airy phantasm walking about his sepulchre and waiting for the harbinger of day to summon me out of these midnight shakes to my desired rest" (Hutchinson 337). Like the unnamed lover of the legend, she is in love with the footprint left behind by the dead, the imprinted remainder of the absent, with only her inscription of his life to cling to as a memorial. But however insubstantial her presence, Lucy Hutchinson, who suffered betrayal silently for fear of public censure and quieted her complaints at her husband's behest, finally gives herself space to speak.

## Works Cited

- de Groot, Jerome. "Mothers, Lovers and Others: Royalist Women." *Women and Politics in Early Modern England, 1450-1700*. Ed. James Daybell. Ashgate Publishing Limited: Aldershot, 2004.
- Hinds, Hilary. "'Who May Binde Where God Hath Loosed?' Responses to Sectarian Women's Writing in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century." *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance*. Ed. S.P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.
- Hobby, Elaine. *Virtue of Necessity: English Women's Writing, 1646-1688*. London: Virago Press, 1988.
- Hutchinson, Lucy. *Memoirs of the life of Colonel Hutchinson*. London, Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner & co., 1904.
- Kusunoki, Akiko. "'Their Testament at Their Apron-Strings': The Representation of Puritan Women in Early-Seventeenth-Century England." *Gloriana's Face: Women, Public and Private, in the English Renaissance*. Ed. S.P. Cerasano and Marion Wynne-Davies. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.
- Mack, Phyllis. "Women as Prophets During the English Civil War." *Feminist Studies* 8:1 Spring 1982 19-45.
- MacCarthy, B.G. *The Female Pen: Women Writers and Novelists, 1621-1818*. New York : New York University Press, 1994.
- Norbrook, David. "Lucy Hutchinson." Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. Accessed through GALILEO.
- Norbrook, David. *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric, and Politics, 1627-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Pritchard, Allan. *English Biography in the Seventeenth Century: A Critical Survey*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005.
- Seelig, Sharon Cadman. *Autobiography and Gender in Early Modern Literature: Reading Women's Lives, 1600-1680*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Wiseman, Susan. *Conspiracy and Virtue: Women, Writing, and Politics in Seventeenth Century England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

## Chapter 7:

"If you be killed, you die unconquered":

### Fear and Fame in Margaret Cavendish's Work

Margaret Lucas, the future Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle, was born around 1623. Her father, an untitled gentleman, died when she was very young. Her family, strongly Royalist, lived in peace until the Civil War, experiencing their first raid on the Lucas estate in 1642 (resulting in the loss of Margaret's birth records; hence the uncertainty as to her birth date). In 1643 Cavendish left home to become a maid of honor to Henrietta Maria in Oxford and, in 1644, was exiled with the Queen's court to Paris, where she met her future husband, William Cavendish, a Royalist commander thirty years her senior. They married in 1645 and continued their exile in Rotterdam and then Antwerp.

In the next few years, in quick succession, Margaret suffered financial ruination; the deaths of her mother, sister, and brothers; and the destruction of her childhood home. This period corresponded with and, as I shall show below, was a catalyst for her publishing career, which began with the publication of *Poems and Fancies* in 1651. She continued to publish in exile and after she retired to the country with her husband upon the Restoration. She died in 1673.

Cavendish's work varies widely in style, genre, and quality, and her assertions are frequently contradictory. MacCarthy calls her a "dear, delightful, opinionated, child-like, fantastic genius": Her genius was so productive and so various, her ideas so original and so ill-regulated, her vision so exalted, her ignorance so profound, her style alternately so preposterous and so perfect, that



one despairs of ever reducing to the cold canons of criticism the inspired confusion of her works.  
(MacCarthy 66)

For my purposes here, a particularly fascinating paradox of Cavendish's work is the way in which it "implodes inward, creating an absolute, private self with no cultural memory, while she would also lodge herself *in* cultural memory, and so mitigate death" (Sherman 203).

Autobiography is "intrinsic to the whole project of her writing" not simply because her literature often reflects her life experiences, but because everything she writes is an attempt both to inscribe herself on and escape from the threat of history (Graham 133). Cavendish experiences history not as an Englishwoman but as a member of a family torn apart by the Civil War. As Heng argues, the nation and the family share similar discourses:

Nations are, of course, abstract entities that are notoriously difficult, if not impossible, to imagine *ex nihilo*, without exemplars; and the emotions and ideas that must collect, in order that the imagined community might be generated, require for their organization models of interrelationship and meaning of widespread familiarity and immediacy. A family, by the very nature of its existence as the first society into which the human subject enters, serviceably provides a ready-made cluster of associations, memories, roles, and affects that can be usefully channeled by social discourses on behalf of larger formations. Symbolic identities, positions, and roles from family life mediate, then, the emergence of a consciousness that can be mustered for national impulses; often the symbols appear at a formative stage, and are periodically resorted to thereafter when the nation's collective identity needs to be recalled, freshened, or redirected.  
(Heng 208)

Although Cavendish writes before Hutchinson and probably inspired her work, as MacCarthy argues, I have placed Cavendish at the end of this text in order to explore her as a contrast to, and reaction against, the work of the women this dissertation has examined thus far. Clifford, Halkett, Fanshawe, and Hutchinson understood themselves as members of their own historical and national contexts, however fraught that relationship may have been due to issues of gender, politics, and religion; they found biography, if not traditional history, a useful medium for exploring that relationship. Margaret Cavendish, despite being the first woman to publish her autobiography, displays a more complex, and difficult, relationship with her own personal history. She lacks a strong sense of religious or national history, and the Civil War strips her of social class and family, her refuges for a sense of communal identity. Consequently, her 1656 autobiography, *A True Relation of My Birth, Breeding, and Life*, collapses into a series of contradictions and negations; she ultimately turns instead to literary forms such as drama, poetry, oration, and prose fiction as means for self-expression. In particular, the closet drama *Bell in Campo* (1662), *Orations of Divers Sorts* (1662), the *Sociable Letters* (1664), and her science fiction novel *The Description Of A New World, Called The Blazing World* (1667) show evidence of Cavendish seeking to negotiate issues of war, history, death, grief, and location that the autobiography represses. Not only do these forms help her understand her experiences by setting them in new contexts under her control—the new worlds of her creation—but literary production also aids her chief goal, to establish “fame,” a safe space in the future for when the past and present have failed her.

Like the other women this work has explored thus far, Cavendish asserts herself, at the opening of her text, as a member of her family and her class. An immediate tension emerges,

however, between familial and class identity. Her family, the Lucases, was wealthy but not noble—a shortcoming that Cavendish interprets as an honor:

My father was a gentleman, which title is grounded and given by merit, not by princes; and it is the act of time, not favour: and though my father was not a peer of the realm, yet there were few peers who had much greater estates, or lived more noble therewith . . . . [A]t that time great titles were to be sold, and not at so high rates, but that his estate might have easily purchased, and was pressed for to take; but my father did not esteem titles, unless they were gained by heroic actions. (*True Relation* 155)

The Lucases and the crown differ, however, in their definition of “heroic actions.” Before her birth, she reveals, her father was exiled for killing a favorite of Elizabeth I's in a duel, delaying his marriage to Margaret's mother and rendering their first son illegitimate (Whitaker 9). Their aristocratic identity and high Anglican religious beliefs also resulted in tension between the Lucases and their tenants, and the family “would become the prime focus for local discontent with the court regime,” especially after entertaining the queen's mother, Marie de' Medici (Whitaker 35). From birth, therefore, Cavendish's relationship with her class identity is vexed. The Lucases are well-off, well-known, in many ways well-respected, but never quite get along with others; Cavendish, as her autobiography will show, forever finds herself seeking to negotiate her place within and without aristocratic circles.

The limits of her education also compromise her sense of identity; she lacks a solid grounding in either stereotypically masculine education or feminine virtues, being taught singing, dancing, playing on music, reading, writing, working, and the like, yet we were not kept strictly thereto, they were rather for formality than benefit; for my mother cared not so much for

our dancing and fiddling, singing and prating of several languages, as that we should be bred virtuously, modestly, civilly, honourably, and on honest principles. (*True Relation* 157-158)

Without a strong structure for public behavior, Cavendish seeks stability in her familial identity. As the *True Relation* progresses, Cavendish does not go on to explore her identity as a member of a nation, as Hutchinson does; a devoted member of a political party, as Fanshawe and Halkett do; or a member of an aristocratic community, as Clifford does. Rather, her sense of identity remains firmly focused on her family circle, with the Lucas home resembling a small, self-contained, self-governing nation. From Cavendish's earliest years, she conceives of her family as a community threatened by outside forces, particularly those that would deny women autonomy. When her father dies “before Margaret was out of leading strings,” her mother finds herself threatened with loss of both the estate and the guardianship of her children; she saves the family by transferring her children's wardship to an influential family with connections at court” (Jones 8). Margaret, therefore, would have grown up acutely aware of how easily property could slip from women's hands in the absence of men and the anxiety that attended trying to retain it. Perhaps in response to these emotional and financial tensions, Elizabeth Lucas counteracted loss by keeping her husband's memory alive through tales of his heroism (*True Relation* 24-25), creating a space to preserve his memory:

[Elizabeth Lucas] lived a widow many years; for she never forgot my father so as to marry again. Indeed, he remained so lively in her memory, and her grief was so lasting, as she never mentioned 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 cloister, inclosing herself, as it were, therein, for she seldom went abroad, unless to church. (*Cavendish True Relation* 163)

This recreation of the absent dead through language, which Lucy Hutchinson turned to for comfort, seems to have traumatized the young Margaret Lucas, who "worried incessantly that those she loved might be snatched away from her" (Whitaker 28). She was squeamish, easily startled, and terrified of danger befalling her family (Whitaker 28).

Within their small, self-created nation, the Lucases emphasized their selfhood through tight boundaries without and no boundaries within—a strong sense of unity within the family against the world outside. Within the family circle, Cavendish is free of many of the the anxieties that would haunt her later in life; money, love, and power flow freely. Her mother spends generously on her children's "breeding, honest pleasures, and harmless delights" so they will not have to know the "needy necessity" that will become all too familiar during and after the war (*True Relation* 156, 157). Elizabeth Lucas sought "to please and delight her children," appealing to them through "reason" rather than fear (*True Relation* 157). Each child was given his or her own servant; their mother "suffered not her servants, either to be rude before us, or to domineer over us" (*True Relation* 157). A young empress in a magical kingdom, the young Margaret Lucas has no experience with want, loneliness, or powerlessness; her family has created a world in which they are a complete unit, safe and self-sufficient, without rifts or need for anything external. The Lucases are, in Margaret's memory at least, the very antithesis of Civil War, agreeing so well that there seemed but one mind amongst them. And not only my own brothers and sisters agreed so, but my brothers and sisters in law, and their children, although but young, had the like agreeable natures and affectionable dispositions. For to my best remembrance I do not know that ever they did fall out, or had any angry or unkind disputes. (160-161)

They can only achieve this sense of completeness, however, by continued protection against the outside world. Cavendish remembers that her siblings

did seldom make visits, nor never went abroad with strangers in their company, but only themselves in a flock together . . . I did observe that my sisters were so far from mingling themselves with any other company, that they had no familiar conversation or intimate acquaintance with the families to which each other were linked by marriage. (160,161)

The family "rarely mixed with strangers, keeping themselves very much to themselves," (Jones 9). Such a "preference of isolation was almost aberrant, and by the 1640s "Sir John [Lucas] and his mother had alienated every sector of the Colchester populace" (Mendelson *Mental World* 14, 16). This sense of enclosure would affect Margaret negatively when it came time to leave the household; she would be "painfully shy in the company of strangers"(Jones 9).

When Cavendish arrived in Oxford to begin service in Henrietta Maria's court, the town was "crowded with Royalist supporters and refugees who, like the Lucas family, had lost everything," and "[c]ompetition for lodgings was fierce" (Jones 21). Instead of finding the security of the Lucas estate, Margaret now experiences enclosure as oppression and danger as she struggles with others for privacy and physical space. A city once "renowned for its health and beauty" had become filthy, overpopulated, and diseased; those who died were buried with haste and without ceremony (Whitaker 49). Once part of a "loving, protective family," Cavendish finds herself "just a tiny cog in the large, busy, expensive machine of the court, expected to fit into a culture that was completely alien to her" (Whitaker 53). She finds Henrietta Maria's court hypocritical, superficial, and unpleasant but was not allowed to return home (Whitaker 55). Given her difficulty adjusting to this new world, one can understand Cavendish's "natural stupidity towards the learning of any other language than my native tongue," her "great delight in attiring, fine dressing, and fashions especially such fashions as I did invent myself, and

her distaste that “any should follow my fashions, for I always took delight in a singularity, even in accoutrements of habits” (*True Relation* 175). Stripped of familiar contexts, Cavendish speaks in a language and dresses in a style entirely her own, the singular inhabitant of a country of one.

By the fall of 1643 "strongholds around Oxford began to fall" and she was soon forced into exile with the Queen in France (Jones 28). Their ship was shot at as they left England, and the "journey gave Margaret a horror of sea travel which lasted all her life. Of the whole experience, she declared that she had lived in such fear that she wished only to forget" (Jones 36). Then they were “scattered by one of the capricious Channel storms and blown westwards along the coast of France” (Jones 36). Cavendish's autobiography reflects her anxiety about her separation from her family during this period and her dependence on them for her own self-definition. She knows they would "gently reform" her behavior if she went "amiss," but without them, "I was like one that had no foundation to stand, or guide to direct me, which made me afraid, lest I should wander with ignorance out of the ways of honour, so that I knew not how to behave myself" (*True Relation* 161). She is lost, unmoored, with no sense of her own self. Even as Margaret longs for the safe enclosure of the Lucas estate, the Civil War begins to destroy that security. Despite their withdrawal from the outside world, the Lucases cannot protect themselves, for the threat comes not from without but from within: “The household was not uniformly Royalist in its sentiments, and it was a servant who eventually betrayed them to the Parliamentary Militia” (Jones 16). Riots began to break out around the Lucas estate. In 1642 a “rioting mob attacked Margaret's home, broke down enclosures and scattered cattle” (Jones 18); two months later, a mob of between two and five thousand attacked the house (Whitaker 40-41). The Lucases spent three days locked up in the town jail for their own safety while

the rioters tore up the Lucases' deeds and legal papers, broke the windows, beat down the doors, spoiled the gardens and walks, and even demolished walls, attempting to pull down the house. At St. Giles's Church, just outside the great gatehouse, they opened the Lucas family vault and stabbed through the coffins with their swords and halberds. (Whitaker 41) This attack on their walls, livestock enclosures, and graves breaches every possible barrier: between inside and outside, human and animal, living and dead. The transgression of physical and psychological boundaries only worsens as the war persists.

While exiled in France, Margaret Lucas meets her future husband, William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle. He is instantly attracted to her. While John Hutchinson had fallen in love with Lucy Apsley from hearing tales of her and reading her poetry before he even meets her, however, William Cavendish falls in love not with Margaret Lucas's speech, but with her silence: he “approve[s] of those bashful fears which many condemned” (Cavendish 162). Having “discovered the worth that lay behind her shy exterior,” William Cavendish seems to have been attracted to Margaret's potential to be shaped (Mendelson 21). Their courtship was “thoroughly literary. It was acted out through exchanges of letters and poems containing self-conscious reference to love traditions and infused with . . . courtly values and neoplatonic ideas and forms” (Graham 137), and “[j]udging from Cavendish's extremely halting letters to William and her own account of her early years, much of her education began when she met him” (Wiseman 257). Their relationship is born in text, and she grows as a writer through her relationship with him; unlike the case of the two Lucy Hutchinsons, there is no division between Margaret Cavendish the wife and Margaret Cavendish the writer.

Henrietta Maria and many of Newcastle's acquaintances disapproved of the match; “[a]lready in exile as a member of Henrietta Maria's court, Margaret Lucas's relationship with



William Cavendish reinforces her status as banished” (Graham 141). This opposition only brought them closer, and in their courtship letters Newcastle “embodies an alternate world for her to inhabit which provides locating form for her own dislocated sense of self” (Graham 138); wherever the winds of Fortune drive her, she has a home with him. The early years of their marriage were marked with difficulty. In June 1646, the royalist headquarters at Oxford surrendered and the exiles “could foresee no return home” (Whitaker 99). The Cavendishes were beset with money problems and frustrated by Margaret's inability to conceive; she “lived in continual fear that the marquis would be carted off the prison for debt” (Mendelson 25). “[D]eeply affected by her separation from Newcastle,” anxious and unable to sleep, she took to “occup[ying] the long hours before dawn in her room above the perpetually noisy streets of Convent Garden writing poetry by candlelight” (Jones 80).

Soon after, Margaret's sister Mary, Mary's daughter, and Margaret's mother died (Whitaker 99). Then, 1647, her childhood home, now abandoned, “became the scene of a fierce battle for possession” (Jones 68). A royalist powder magazine blew up half the house and parliamentary soldiers pulled down the rest; then, “[i]n a final act of barbarity the vaults of St Giles' church were broken open and the bodies of Elizabeth Lucas and Mary Killigrew dismembered and scattered around the church” (Jones 68). Cavendish's mother and sister “were so recently buried that their hair remained undecayed” (Whitaker 108); the soldiers stole jewelry from their bodies and wore the dead women's hair in their hats (Jones 68). Soon after, Margaret, exiled in Rotterdam, was informed of the desecration of her mother's and sister's tombs and of the capture and execution of her brother, Sir Charles Lucas (Jones 70, Whitaker 108). The following year, her brother Thomas also died (Whitaker 109). The remaining Lucases, “once so tightly knit that they thought and acted almost as one person, was now scattered,” dismembered

and strewn about like their matriarch's body; “[d]enied the comforts of family mourning and oppressed by problems her her own, Margaret became the victim of deep depression” (Jones 62). Many such estates became "sites of conflict and destruction" during the Civil War, and Cavendish's experience" is here representative of the widespread disruption experienced by many Royalist households” (Wynne-Davies 41). We do not know if she was at her family estate when it was first attacked in 1642, and "there is no record that she ever visited Colchester again to see her mother's . . . desecrated [grave]” (Jones 77). We know, however, that these events affected Cavendish profoundly and would shape her writing career. Her fixation on death and desecration of the dead, Whitaker argues, "would become the driving motivation behind Margaret's ambition to write" (109). Terrified of death, Cavendish began to inscribe "a series of melancholy poems dedicated to her dead relatives” (Jones 70). She composed “verse stories of war and ruin . . . ending with scenes of horror and carnage and the pathos of the dying left on the battlefield . . . . The tone was one of loss and futility: men's hopes for conquest and glory in war were nothing but vanity” (Whitaker 149). Her friends suggested that she “take more exercise and spend less time bent over her books” as it was “was widely believed that the source of female creativity, both physical and mental, was the womb” (Jones 63), but Cavendish “must have suspected that she would never bear children. There are strong hints that her books served as a substitute” (Mendelson 29).

A few years after the publication of her first collection of poems, Cavendish published the *True Relation*, making her the first Englishwoman to publish her autobiography. Rather than an expression of her experiences, however, the text is an exercise in unspeakability. Cavendish is compelled to tell her story, but in omitting everything that she finds frightening or discomfoting, she consequently finds very little to talk about. The result is a series of "fractures, strains, and

omissions” (Williams 173-174) "painful impasse[s]" (Rose 62), "contradictions and inconsistencies” (Walker 341). (While I confess the number of block quotations given here is cumbersome, they are necessary to demonstrate her style; one of the quirks of the *True Relation* is Cavendish's inability to say anything concisely.) She avoids exploring political contexts; therefore, “[m]ajor and decisive political events” such as Charles I's execution "are either omitted or registered with surprising brevity” (Williams 170). Instead of attempting to analyze events using "the organizing principle of hindsight," like Lucy Hutchinson, she writes "from the eye of the storm” (Rose 61). Her vision of history is localized, unable to see beyond the borders of her family estate; she “describe[s] the war in terms of its impact on the Lucas and Cavendish family fortunes” (Williams 172).

In some cases, she writes in spite of a lack of information, as when she attempts to describe her brothers, inventing information she cannot substantiate: “As for my brothers, I know not how they were bred . . . . But this I know, that they loved virtue, endeavoured merit, practised justice, and spoke truth” (Cavendish 158). Her attempt to clarify herself collapses into negations: Neither had they skill, or did use to play, *for aught I could hear*, at cards or dice, or the like games, nor given to any vice, *as I did know*, unless to love a mistress were a crime, *not that I knew any they had*, but what report did say, and *usually reports are false*, at least exceed the truth. (Cavendish 159, emphases mine)

Her description of her sisters similarly devolves into rambling contradictions that reflect both a compulsion to record detail combined, paradoxically, with a terror of making assertions: “I hope this truth will not offend my readers, and lest they should think I am a partial register, I dare not commend my sisters, as to say they were handsome; although many would say they were very handsome” (Cavendish 164). She speaks in circles, desperately trying to justify herself

and yet saying nothing, as if she can reign in a disorderly world through language, as in her attempt to explain her lifelong fear of “foolish or unworthy” people:

[T]hough I never met such sorts of ill-bred creatures, yet naturally I have such an aversion to such kind of people, as I am afraid to meet them, as children are afraid of spirits, or those that are afraid to see or meet devils; which makes me think this natural defect in me, if it be a defect, is rather a fear than a bashfulness, but whatsoever it is, I find it troublesome, for it hath many times obstructed the passage of my speech, and perturbed my natural action, forcing a constrainedness or unusual motions. However, since it is rather a fear of others than a bashful distrust of myself, I despair of a perfect cure, unless nature as well as human governments could be civilized and brought into a methodical order. (Cavendish 169)

Hints of her suffering during the war emerge rarely. The warm description of the enclosed, affectionate unity of her family (quoted above, "For to my best remembrance I do not know that ever they did fall out, or had any angry or unkind disputes"), breaks off abruptly: "But sometime after this war began, I knew not how they lived" (Cavendish 161). Her diction is suddenly clear, concise, devastatingly simple, with none of the flourishes or contradictions that characterize the rest of her autobiography. Her attempts to make sense of the trauma the Lucases have suffered are also cut off abruptly in this fascinating shift:

But when [Cavendish's brothers] were at London, they were dispersed into several houses of their own, yet for the most part they met every day, feasting each other like Job's children. But this unnatural war came down like a whirlwind, which felled down their houses, where some in the wars were crushed to death, as

my youngest brother Sir Charles Lucas, and my brother Sir Thomas Lucas. And though my brother Sir Thomas Lucas died not immediately of his wounds, yet a wound he received on his head in Ireland shortened his life.

But to rehearse their recreations . . . . (Cavendish 160).

During the period of her life referenced here, Cavendish had been separated from her family in Henrietta Maria's service, and then exiled from England altogether, surviving a perilous sea voyage. Her family home had been pulled to the ground and her family's graves desecrated, and she had fallen victim to depression and anxiety. For a moment the extent of her suffering shines through in her language, clear and almost poetic: " feasting each other like Job's children," " this unnatural war came down like a whirlwind." As soon as her trauma surfaces, however, she represses it again: "But to rehearse their recreations . . ." When she speaks of the deaths of her mother, sister, and niece, she focuses on the empty spaces left behind by the dead, on her struggle against decay, forgetting, annihilation:

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 find the natural 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, also the loss of my Lord's noble brother, which died not long after I returned from England, he being sick of an ague, whose favours and my thankfulness ingratitude shall never disjoin. For I will build his monument of truth, though I cannot of marble, and hang my tears and scutcheons on his tomb. (Cavendish 165-166).

Particular anxiety emerges in Cavendish's self-defense against rumors that she had petitioned Parliament on her husband's behalf:

Indeed, I did not stand as a beggar at the Parliament door, for I never was at the Parliament House, nor stood I ever at the door, as I do know, or can remember, I am sure, not as a petitioner. Neither did I haunt the committees, for I never was at any, as a petitioner, but once in my life, which was called Goldsmiths' Hall, but I received neither gold nor silver from them, only an absolute refusal, I should have no share of my Lord's estate . . . . I whisperingly spoke to my brother to conduct me out of that ungentlemanly place, so without speaking to them one word good or bad, I returned to my lodgings, and as that committee was the first, so was it was the last, I ever was at as a petitioner. (Cavendish 167).

Cavendish, torn between a longing for self-expression and a terror of inappropriate discourse, goes to great lengths to inform us, paradoxically, of her silence; the more she tries to convince her readers, the more unsure and self-contradictory she sounds. She worries that her voice will be co-opted by others: “although some reported I was at the Parliament House, and at this committee and at that committee, and what I should say, and how I was answered” (Cavendish 167). Further contradicting her proliferation of speech, she then criticizes women for speaking at all:

[W]omen become pleaders, attornies, petitioners, and the like, running about with their several causes, complaining of their several grievances, exclaiming against their several enemies, bragging of their several favours they receive from the powerful, thus trafficking with idle words bring in false reports and vain discourse. For the truth is, our sex doth nothing but jostle for the pre-eminence of words (I mean not for speaking well, but speaking much) as they do for the pre-eminence of place, words rushing against words, thwarting and crossing each

other, and pulling with reproaches, striving to throw each other down with disgrace, thinking to advance themselves thereby. But if our sex would but well consider, and rationally ponder, they will perceive and find, that it is neither words nor place that can advance them, but worth and merit. (Cavendish 168)

The passage reveals a clear contraction between form and content; she could certainly be accused of "speaking much," "words rushing against words, thwarting and crossing each other" here. Her attempts to describe herself in the closing pages of her memoir are perhaps the most scattered and contradictory of the text, as fear of the emotions she has suppressed throughout demand to be spoken of and yet prove inarticulate:

I love extraordinarily and constantly, *yet* not fondly, *but* soberly and observingly, *not* to hang about them as a trouble, *but* to wait upon them as a servant; *but* this affection will take no root, *but* where I think or find merit, and have leave both from devine and moral laws. *Yet* I find this passion so troublesome, as it is the only torment of my life, for fear any evil misfortune or accident, or sickness, or death, should come unto them, insomuch as I am never freely at rest. (*True Relation* 176, emphases mine)

In the closing pages, Cavendish attempts once and for all to explain her purpose. She claims that the autobiography is not an attempt to communicate her experiences to others, but to process them for herself:

I verily believe some censuring readers will scornfully say, why hath this Lady writ her own life? since none cares to know whose daughter she was or whose wife she is, or how she was bred, or what fortunes she had, or how she lived, or what humour or disposition she was of. I answer that it is true, that 'tis to no

purpose to the readers, but it is to the authoress, because I write it for my own sake, not theirs. (*True Relation* 178)

What exactly she hopes to achieve by writing for her own sake, however, is never clearly articulated; instead, the text breaks down into the “fear of erasure from history” (Graham 141) that will mark much of her work:

Neither did I intend this piece for to delight, but to divulge; not to please the fancy, but to tell the truth, lest after-ages should mistake, in not knowing I was daughter to one Master Lucas of St. Johns, near 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 die and my Lord marry again. (Cavendish 178)

While the *True Relation* "has often been treated critically as Cavendish's sole idiosyncratic autobiographical work[,] . . . life-writing in different genres is an extensive and persistent feature of her *oeuvre*" (Williams 174). By examining how Cavendish fashioned herself as an author, constructed imaginative worlds, and used literature to negotiate issues of politics, history, and loss, we can see articulation of the silences found in the *True Relation*.

Cavendish was "arguably the first Englishwoman to fashion herself as an author," and her "pursuit of literary fame and reputation was vigorous and startlingly self-conscious" (Clucas 1). She faced difficulties in carving a unique space for herself as a writer, for her ability to write depended on male structures. She "had gained all her knowledge from her husband and brothers" (James xii), and her political position as Newcastle's wife "normaliz[es] the publication of her texts" (Graham 137). She "negotiate[s] acceptance of herself as a writer" by turning "her independence from men's schooling in the classics" into an advantage: "she is not a scholar but a



philosopher” (Hobby 195). Through her fictional self in *The Blazing World*, Cavendish differentially claims that her work cannot compare to that of great male thinkers:

Then, said she, I'll have the soul of one of the most famous modern writers, as either of Galileo, Gassendus, Descartes, Helmont, Hobbes, H. More, etc. The spirit answered, that they were fine ingenious writers, but yet so self-conceited, that they would scorn to be scribes to a woman. But, said he, there's a lady, the Duchess of Newcastle, which although she is not one of the most learned, eloquent, witty and ingenious, yet is she a plain and rational writer, for the principle of her writings, is sense and reason. (Cavendish *Blazing World* 67-68).

Yet by linguistically placing herself alongside Descartes or Hobbes, Cavendish infers that her work is superior because of, not in spite of, her lack of eloquence and education. She fashions herself as an outlier, a pioneer forging new literary territory. She demonstrates a “passion for original composition” that reveals her understanding of “the emerging relationship between authorship and ownership” (Rosenthal 64): through her self-fashioning and literary construction of new worlds, she lays claim to property that cannot be pulled down or burned away.

Despite her status as Newcastle's wife, “Margaret Cavendish enjoyed neither her ancestral nor her marital estates for much of her life, living in the isolation and uncertainty of exile” (Rosenthal 72). Her only home was “now too ruined to be rebuilt” (Jones 70). Instead she builds imaginative worlds, finding “the Minds Architecture

more lasting than Castles of Wood, Brick, or Stone, and their Architecture, if well Designed and Built, will be more Famous, and their Fame spread farther than those of Stone . . . neither is the Minds Architecture and Castles subject to Ruin, as Castles of Stone, which are subject to Time, Accidents, and the Rage of Wars,

by which they are Destroyed, or Moulder to Dust, and are Buried in Oblivion.

(*Sociable Letters* 113 121)

The *Blazing World* emerges *ex nihilo*, from “a wintry polar landscape . . . . A blank white space, largely uninhabited in history or fiction, seems an apt location for the inscription of new dreams” (Khanna 16). Because this is a woman's story, Cavendish quickly removes the focus from men by killing off her male characters “in order to create . . . . [H]er brief, if shocking, elimination of the men at the beginning of her text seems . . . to represent the deconstruction of discursive patterns that limit women to roles as simple objects of men's desire” (Khanna 30). Her land is a woman's realm; she “locates her heroic agency very precisely in the fact that she is not—nor can she ever be—an anointed queen. While she struggles with fantasies of royalty and absolutism, she recognizes that her subjectivity must be self-created and exist apart from the public realm” (Rose *Gender and Heroism* 55). In order to rule, she must write the history of a land that never was, exerting control over its contours:

[A]lthough I have neither power, time nor occasion to conquer the world as *Alexander* and *Caesar* did; yet rather than not to be mistress of one, since Fortune and the Fates would give me none, I have made a world of my own: for which nobody, I hope, will blame me, since it is in every one's power to do the like.

(*Blazing World* 6)

The “Duchess of Newcastle” character of *The Blazing World* speaks of desire to “make her world, because she had none at present” ( *Blazing World* 73). Cavendish declares, in the text's epilogue, that her “ambition is not only to be Empress, but Authoress of a whole world” (*Blazing World* 109). The construction of such linguistic lands is more peaceful than conquests of real worlds, and she “take[s] more delight and glory” in them than any conqueror ever did

(Cavendish *Blazing World* 109). She invites readers to inhabit her imaginary realm; “if they cannot endure to be subjects, they may create worlds of their own, and govern themselves as they please” (*Blazing World* 109). She warns others, however, from treading on her intellectual property: “but yet let them have a care, not to prove unjust usurpers, and to rob me of mine” (*Blazing World* 109).

Elsewhere, however, the imaginative landscape is more threatening. Cavendish uses language of wilderness and exile to describe her earliest writing, her “Baby-Books.” They are the “Dry, Deep, Sandy, Barren Deserts of Arabia” (Cavendish *Sociable Letters* 131 140), their geography marked with

huge Blots, as I may Similize them to Broad Seas, or Vast Mountains, which in a Similizing Line will Tire your Eyes to Spread to the Circumference, like as for the Feet to Walk to the Top of the Alps; Also there are Long, Hard Scratches, which will be as Bad for your Eyes, as Long Stony Lanes would be to your Feet.

(*Sociable Letters* 131 141)

She likens reading her early work to “enter[ing] a Vast Wilderness, and Intricate Labyrinth, wherein you will Lose your Patience” (*Sociable Letters* 131 140).

Cavendish's construction of other worlds stems from her desire to be remembered as their ruler. In the wake of family tragedy, Cavendish becomes increasingly afraid of death, of exhumation, of being scattered, erased, forgotten. As the “fate of her mother and sister had persuaded her of the vanity of earthly memorials,” she becomes captivated by the idea of a memorial that will outlast the ravages of war and time (Whitaker 109). Her anxiety over closed and open spaces—the claustrophobic constraints of Henrietta Maria's court, the easily desecrated nature of the burial space, the wild openness of exile—drives her to carve out a unique space for

herself in the annals of history. She desires fame, which she conceives of as "the opposite of oblivion . . . . It can be achieved in a number of ways, but for a woman excluded from heroic actions, public employments, or eloquent pleadings it is most readily attained through authorship" (James xviii). Her discourses of fame do not suggest a hunger for power but, rather, a yearning for immortality and a terror of annihilation.

This desire for fame marks much of her literary output. Cavendish insists that not only is she ambitious, but she is more ambitious than any woman in history: "I am not covetous, but as ambitious as ever any of my sex was, is, or can be; which makes, that though I cannot be *Henry the Fifth*, or *Charles the Second*, yet I endeavour to be *Margaret the First*" (*Blazing World* 6). Even given her intense fear of death, she would face a terrible demise for the chance at fame: "when I read of Julius Caesar, I cannot but wish that Nature and Fate had made me such a one as he was; and sometimes I have that Courage, as to think I should not be afraid of his Destiny, so I might have so great a Fame" (*Sociable Letters* 27-38). Like her creator and namesake, the "Duchess of Newcastle" of *The Blazing World* suffers from a gnawing, all-consuming desire for power:

Truly said the Duchess to the Empress . . . my melancholy proceeds from an extreme ambition. The Empress asked, what the height of her ambition was? The Duchess answered, that neither she herself, nor no creature in the world was able to know either the height, depth or breadth of her ambition; but said she, my present desire is, that I would be a great princess. . . . I would fain be as you are, that is, an Empress of | a world, and I shall never be at quiet until I be one. (*Blazing World* 70-71).

The desire for fame, which is "a double life, as infamy is a double death," is also the driving force behind Lady Victoria's military exploits in *Bell in Campo* ( I.I.ii). As fame is an incredibly valuable commodity, the play suggests it may be in limited supply: Lady Victoria asserts that men "hath separated us, and cast us out of their companies . . . it must be out of jealousy we should eclipse the fame of their valours with the splendour of our constancy" (*Bell in Campo* I.2.9). The "heroicesses," upon their triumphant return, are presented with rewards that reflect the value of fame:

Recorder: First: all poets shall strive to set forth your praise.

Secondly: that all your gallant acts shall be recorded in story and put in the chief library of the kingdom.

Thirdly: that your arms you fought in shall be set in the King's armoury.

Fourthly: that you shall always wear a laurel garland.

Fifthly: you shall have place next to the King's children.

Sixthly: that all those women that have committed such faults as is a dishonour to the female sex shall be more severely punished than heretofore, in not following your exemplary virtues and all those that have followed your example shall have respective honour done to them by the state.

Seventhly and lastly: your figure shall be cast in brass and then set in the midst of the city armed as it was in the day of battle. (Cavendish *Bel in Campo* II.5.20)

None of their prizes are material; rather, they are rewarded by the knowledge that the memory of their exploits shall be preserved; that they shall be recognized as equivalent to the King's progeny, the rulers of the future; and that others will be punished for not realizing their value as exemplars.

The *Oration*s frequently make the case for fame's ability to preserve one's place in history. Those who perform well in battle will find "their posterity will glory in their valours, poets will sing their praises, historians write their acts, and fame keep their records, that after ages may know that heroic men they were" (Cavendish *Oration*s 131). Through fame, one can cheat death itself, living forever in discourse:

[I]f you be killed, you die unconquered; for courage is never overcome nor gallant heroic actions never die, and their fames will be their perpetual triumphs, which may last eternally . . . . I hate infamy worse than oblivion; for oblivion is the hell of meritorious and gallant men; and as I prefer after-memory, which is fame, before present life, which fame is the heaven wherein worthy and honourable men and actions are glorified and live to all eternity . . . . [A]ll worthy men desire and endeavour to live in the minds of their own kind, and to be praised, at least spoken of; for they desire and endeavour to live both in the thoughts and words of men, in all ages, and in all nations, and by all men, if it were possible . . . . [T]his noble person was remembered and spoken often of by his absent friends, and did remember and spoke often of his friends in their absence whilst he was living, and his worthy and valiant actions will be remembered and spoken of now he is dead, in which remembrance and words he may live so long as the world lasts . . . .  
(*Oration*s 146, 150, 210 ).

The *Oration*s also draw parallels between soldiers and poets, both of whom battle the forces of oblivion in search of eternal remembrance:

Our brother, whose body is dead and is brought to this place to be inurned, was the most fearful man that ever nature made, not to die, but to be forgotten; also he

was the most ambitious man, not for wealth, title, or power, but for fame . . . those men resemble the Gods most that desire fame, which fame is to be remembered and praised by all men in all ages throughout the world. . . . (*Orations* 214)

Cavendish's writing posits several figures as the enemy of fame. The most frequently cited is oblivion, a malicious force aided by its ally, time. Those that dread death fear not "Death's dart, but Death's oblivion" (*Orations* 210). In order to preserve their memories against such erasure, the good must

be remembered in the minds of men, mentioned by the tongues of men, and figured by the hands of art, so as to live in the minds, ears, and eyes of living men; as for their merits to be praised, their acts recorded and their bodies figured to the life, not only pencilled, but carved, or cast in moulds, as carved in stone, or cast in metal. (*Orations* "An Oration persuading the Citizens to erect a Statue in Honour of a Dead Magistrate" 160).

To be forgotten is to suffer a double death, whereas to be remembered is to cheat death, as the speaker of "A Husbands Dying Speech to his Wife" argues:

if you marry a second husband, you separate our loves as Death will separate our bodies, for in that marriage bed you will bury all remembrance of me; and so shall I doubly die, and doubly be buried; for your second husband will be my second death; but if you live a widow you will keep me still alive, both in your name and memory. (*Orations* 205)

Another enemy of fame, the force that ensures the safety of one's memory in the future, is fortune, the uncontrollable force that troubles the present. The "Duchess of Newcastle" character in *Blazing World* calls Fortune her husband's enemy, who "overcame him, and cast him into banishment, where she kept him in great misery, ruined his estate, and took away from him most

of his friends” and “hath crossed him in all things ever since he could remember” (Cavendish *Blazing World* 84, 82). Fortune is a malicious, petty figure who has mistreated the Duke because “he has preferred Honesty and Prudence before me, and slighted all my favours” (*Blazing World* 83). Seigneur Valeroso in *Bell in Campo* describes Fortune as a shipwreck:

I am loath to venture all my wealth and happiness in Fortune's unconstant barque, suffering thy tender youth and sex to float on the rough waves of chance, where dangers like Northern winds blow high, and who can know but that fatal gusts may come, and overwhelm thee, and drown all my joys? (*Bell in Campo* I.2.7)

Even the wisest cannot “avoid Fortune's malice, unless men could divine what would fall out against all reason or probability” (*Orations* “A Generals Oration to his Mutinous Soldiers” 151). In matters of marriage, a woman “must take her fortune, whether none or any, bad or good; but many a good Batchelour makes an ill Husband, and many a wild deboyst Batchelour makes a good Husband . . . so as none can make a wise choice in hap-hazard” (*Sociable Letters* 13 22). In war, Fortune decides the fate of soldiers and civilians both. In an oration to “a dejected People, ruined by War,” the speaker urges the listeners to “defy Fortune's malice” (*Orations* 157). “An Oration to Soldiers after the Loss of Battle” declares “it neither for want of conduct or valour that we won not the victory, but heaven and earth was against us:

for the sun, wind, and dust beat on our faces; for your endeavouring to get the side of the wind went against the sun-beams, so that with the sun- beams and the glittering dust that flew up by the motion of the wind, we could not see, neither to assault our enemies nor to defend our selves, nay, we were so blinded as to mistake our friends for our foes, and our foes for our friends. (*Orations* 144-145)



In spite of her determination to secure fame for herself after her death, Cavendish perhaps fears that fortune will take it away from her, for "it is neither courage nor conduct that gets fame in the wars, but fortune that gives it, and she many times gives glorious fame to cowards and fools, and blemishes, at least obscures the worth and merit, of wise and valiant men" (*Orations* 132).

Cavendish also battles mightily against the last of fame's enemies, infamy. As a result of her terror of speaking in public and her awareness that she is the constant subject of gossip, Cavendish seeks to reclaim power over discourses surrounding her to ensure that she will not only be remembered, but remembered positively; fearing the criticism of "foolish, censorious and unjust judges," she hopes that her *Orations* will only be read "by the just and wise" (*Orations* 117). Her experiences in war, however, have left her feeling powerless over the past and the present; and so she turns again and again to fame to secure her place in the future. As Cavendish wrestles with her fear of oblivion, she begins to try to make sense of her experiences through literature. Her *Sociable Letters* and *Orations* convey her traumatic experiences more clearly than the *True Relation*. "A Cause Pleaded before Judges between an Husband and his Wife": suggests the pain she must have felt in exile:

A wife is bound both by the law of Nature and God to hazard her life, not only for her husband's safety, honour, and pleasure, but for his humour; for a wife is bound to leave her parents, country, and what else soever, to go with her husband wheresoever he goes and will have her go with him, were it on the dangerous seas, or into barren deserts, or perpetual banishments, or bloody wars, besides child-birth; all which is more dangerous and painful than blows. (*Orations* 179)

Much of her commentary on war experiences, however, relies on negations and displacements. She declares that she has "Suffered so much in [the war], as the Loss of some of my Nearest, and

Dearest Friends, and the Ruin of those that did Remain, that I may desire to Forget it” (*Sociable Letters* 120 128). Her “Oration for Peace” characterizes war not by what happens, but by the emptiness it leaves behind: “war is a great devourer, for it consumes almost all that is consumable” (*Orations* 132). Her “An Oration to a Dejected People, ruined by War,” similarly, is constructed as an *ubi sunt*:

Your far-fetched curiosities, and your curious rarities? Your numerous varieties and rich treasures? All plundered and gone. Where are your chargeable buildings, your stately palaces, your delightful theatres, your pleasant bowers? All burnt to ashes . . . . All ruined and gone . . . . All spoiled . . . . All ceased. Your ancestors' monuments? All pulled down, and your fathers' bones and ashes dispersed. Where are your comrades, companions, and acquaintance? Most of them killed.

(*Orations* 156).

She most clearly articulates the sufferings of war not from the perspective of those who have suffered, but from the perspective of “[y]ouths” who have *not* experienced war:

[N]either have they felt the heavy burthens of Cares, nor oppressions of Sorrows for Losses and Crosses; they have not been pitched with Necessity, nor pained with long Sickness, nor stung with Remorse; They have not been terrified with bloody Wars, nor forsaken of Natural Friends, nor betrayed by feigned Friendships; they have not been robbed of all their Maintenance, nor been banished their Countrey. (*Sociable Letters* 20 29-30)

Through the figure of the Blazing World's Empress, Cavendish creates an alternate self who is better able to handle the challenges of war. The tale begins with a tumultuous sea-voyage not unlike, perhaps, the one Cavendish survived in Henrietta Maria's service. The force of the storm carries them to the remotest

point of dislocation imaginable: “Heaven . . . raised such a tempest, as they knew not what to do, or whither to steer their course; so that the vessel, both by its own lightness, and the violent motion of the wind, was carried as swift as an arrow out of a box, towards the North Pole” (*Blazing World* 7). The men aboard the ship “were all frozen to death, the young Lady only, by the light of her beauty, the heat of her youth, and protection of the gods remaining alive,” as if by being beautiful enough, good enough, favored enough, one can outface fate (*Blazing World* 8).

Although the heroine “first fancied herself in a very sad condition, and her mind was much tormented with doubts and fears,” she faces the challenge bravely:

yet she being withal of a generous spirit, and ready wit, considering what dangers she had passed, and finding those sorts of men civil and diligent attendants to her, took courage, and endeavoured to learn their language; which after she had obtained so far, that partly by some words and signs she was able to apprehend their meaning, she was so far from being afraid of them that she thought her self not only safe but very happy in their company. (*Blazing World* 12)

The Empress is everything that Cavendish, according to her own autobiography, is not: courageous in the face of death; comfortable with strangers; good at foreign languages.

In Cavendish's work we see a longing to preserve connections to the dead. The *Blazing World* is haunted by “immaterial spirits, which had a great affinity with non-beings” (*Blazing World* 38). The Empress turns to these spirits to learn the “condition of the world she came from, her request to the spirits was, to give her some information thereof, especially of those parts of the world where she was born, bred, and educated, as also of her particular friends and acquaintance” (*Blazing World* 52). Her home, her origins, her contexts can only be understood through communication with these creatures. Their knowledge is not all-encompassing, however;

“for what is past, is only kept in memory, if it be not recorded” (*Blazing World* 53). If what happens is not written down, it disappears, and the Empress will lose all possible connection to her home, just as Cavendish has lost hers.

In *Bell in Campo*, the death of husbands makes Madam Passionate vulnerable to a disastrous marriage with a fortune-seeker, while Madam Jantil responds by enclosing herself in a state of living death. Lady Victoria's heroicesses respond not with mourning, but with revenge: “tears nor lamentations cannot call them out of the grave . . . study and be industrious to revenge their quarrels upon their enemies' lives . . . cast off your black veil of sorrow, and take up the firematch of rage” (*Bell in Campo* I.4.16). They can only perform this heroic behavior, however, by becoming “men.” Cavendish does not, in this text, conceive of a response to mourning that does not in some way result in self-annihilation.

The story of Madam Jantil in particular reflects Cavendish's own struggle with how to cope with loss and anxiety about spaces associated with the dead. Just as Cavendish's vision of the Civil War draws away from national contexts to the safety of her immediate experiences, the play “narrow[s in] scope in relation to the preceding action” from Lady Victoria's valiant actions in war to Madame Jantil's decision to “[withdraw] into [her husband's] mausoleum and [stage] her own prolonged self-extinction” (Tomlinson 149). Madam Jantil carefully constructs a new home for herself that will serve as a physical manifestation of her grief:

my chamber and the bed therein to be hung with white, to signify the purity of chastity, wherein is no colours made by false lights; the gallery with several colours intermixed, to signify the varieties, changes, and encumbrances of life; my closet to be hung with black, to signify the darkness of death, wherein all things are forgotten and buried in oblivion. (*Bell in Campo* I.4.21)

Between this house, “which shall be my living tomb,” and her husband's tomb she builds a cloister decorated with “my husband's pictures drawn to the life by the best painters, and all the several accidents, studies and exercise of his life; thus will I have the story of his life drawn to the life” (*Bell in Campo* I.4.21). Her world now comprised of images of the life that has been lost and the emptiness remains, Jantil now resolves to live “a signification, not as a real substance but as a shadow made betwixt life and death” (*Bell in Campo* I.4.21). Rather than simply writing history, or living during history, she *becomes* it, physically and linguistically embodying that which has been lost:

*She lays herself down upon the ground on one side of her arm bowing, leaning upon her elbow, her forehead upon the palm of her head bowing forwards, her face towards the ground; but her grief elevating her passion, thus speaks.*

Madam Jantil. Weep cold earth, through your pores weep,  
 Or in your bowels my salt tears fast keep;  
 Inurn my sighs which from my grief is sent,  
 With my hard groans build up a monument;  
 My tongue like as a pen shall write his name,  
 My words as letters to divulge his fame;  
 My life like to an arch over his ashes bend,  
 And my desires to his grave descend . . .

*(Bell in Campo I.4.21)*

As her mourning intensifies, Madame Jantil regresses to a state of infancy, losing all sense of her identity as a grown woman as she becomes a mere receptacle for the past:

Nell Careless. Why, as soon as she rises she goeth to my Lord's tomb, and says her prayers, then she returns and eats some little breakfast, as a crust of bread and a draught of water, then she goeth to her gallery and walks and contemplates all the forenoon, then about twelve a clock at noon she goeth to the tomb again and says more prayers, then returns and eats a small dinner of some spoon-meats, and most of the afternoon she sits by the tomb and reads, or walks in the cloister, and views the pictures of my Lord that are placed upon the walls . . . (*Bell in Campo* II.3.10)

Her actions recall this passage from Cavendish's *Sociable Letters*:

You were pleas'd to invite me unto a Ball, to divert my Melancholy Thoughts, but they are not capable of your Charity, for they are in too deep a Melancholy to be diverted; like as bodies that are starved, and almost dying for hunger, so weak as they cannot feed . . . a grieved heart, weeping eyes, sad countenance, and black mourning garments, will not be suitable with dancing legs . . . I am fitter to sit upon a Grave, than to tread measures on a Carpet . . . indeed my Senses are as closed or shut from the world, and my Mind is benighted in Sorrow, insomuch as I have not one lighted thought, they are all put out with the memory of my Loss. (*Sociable Letters* 8 17-18)

Given Cavendish's experiences, she may have felt a similar urge to enclose herself in a state of grief, becoming a "signification" of her loss. The extremity with which Jantil responds to her husband's death, however, and its close resemblance to Cavendish's description of her own mother's mourning suggests her fear of taking grief too far.

Commenting on her observations of the “sorrow in my lady [Madame Jantil], and so much folly in your lady [Madame Passionate], concerning husbands,” Nell Careless declares that she will not marry. Fortunately, Madame Jantil has “provide[d] for my bodily life and for my plentiful living” so that Nell could live single, “for which I am trebly obliged to reverence her memory (*Cavendish Bell in Campo* II.5.21). That a woman so devoted to her husband would help her maid live without marriage suggests that Jantil considers unending mourning and complete loss of self the inevitable result of love; that Cavendish offers no viable options in response to death for any of the women in *Bell in Campo* suggests that she may have felt the same way.

Cavendish's preoccupation with death extends to internment; many of her texts convey her belief in the importance of a decent burial. Churches, she argues, “ought to be built not only for the souls of the living but for the bodies of the dead, wherein they may be inurned decently, humanely, and religiously” (*Orations* 159). The mourning wives of *Bell in Canto* express anxiety towards desecration of the grave and disrespect of the dead; Madame Jantil worries that a statue of her late husband will be destroyed as “the wars ruin tombs before time doth” because they're stolen for their metals (I.4.21), while Madame Passionate's suitor contemplates whether it would be “uncivil to go [wooing] so soon after their husbands' death, for their husbands are not yet laid in their graves” (I.5.24).

Burial has the power to return one to the safety of the family, or to preserve one forever in the memories of those who survive; conversely, burial has the power to obliterate the dead. In her *Orations*, Cavendish links burial with everlasting fame and a return to the family line: “they have the happiness to be inurned with their forefathers, where by a natural instinct or sympathy they may mutually intermix

and perchance transmigrate together; and since they fought valiantly and died honourably, they shall be buried happily and will be remembered eternally, and have an everlasting fame” (*Orations* “An Oration for those that are Slain in the Wars and brought home to be Buried” 141). Elsewhere, rather than arguing that death in war leads to glorious fame, she posits eternal rest with one's family as a safe retreat from the horrors of war: “It were more peaceable to lie in the grave with our forefathers than to live in the turmoils of war with our enemies” (*Orations* “An Oration against War” 133).

Although Cavendish wishes to set herself apart through her unusual dress and eccentric demeanor, she does not wish for physical isolation in the grave, but reunion with her family's remains. Yet she is haunted by the certainty that they would not be allowed even that measure of peace and togetherness, but rather would be scattered in death as they were in life:

I do not much Care, nor Trouble my Thoughts to think where I shall be Buried, when Dead, or into what part of the Earth I shall be Thrown; but if I could have my Wish, I Would my Dust might be Inurned, and mix't with the Dust of those I Love Best, although I think they would not Remain Long together, for I did observe, that in this last War the Urns of the Dead were Digged up, their Dust Dispersed, and the Bones Thrown About, and I suppose that in all Civil or Home-wars such Inhuman Acts are Committed; wherefore is it but a Folly to be Troubled and Concerned, where they shall be Buried, or for their Graves, or to Bestow much Cost on their Tombes, since not only Time, but Wars will Ruin them. (*Sociable Letters* 119 127)



When Cavendish speaks abstractly of the experiences of men in war, the grave serves as a place that preserves memories of the dead. When speaking of her own experiences, however (albeit with a marked distance: “I did observe”), the grave, like the family home or the queen's court, is just another ostensibly safe space that proves all too vulnerable to the ravages of war. When speaking of foolish gallants in her *Sociable Letters*, Cavendish directly associates indecent burial with being forgotten: “when they Die there is a good riddance, for they were but as Rubbish in the World, which Death, like as an honest painful Labourer, takes up like as Dunghils, and throws them into the Grave, and buries them in Oblivion, not being worthy of a monument of Remembrance” (Cavendish *Sociable Letters* 22 32). Because monuments to the dead must fall with the ravages of war and time, Cavendish knows she will be forgotten after death unless her memory is preserved in the annals of literature. Death and burial emerge as a metaphor for such oblivion in the *Female Orations*:

I wish I were so fortunate as to persuade you to make a frequentation, association, and combination amongst our sex, that we may unite in prudent counsels to make ourselves as free, happy, and famous as men . . . women are restless with labour, easeless with pain, melancholy for want of pleasures, helpless for want of power, and die in oblivion for want of fame . . . [men] would fain bury us in their house or beds, as in a grave. (Cavendish *Orations* 248)

Anxiety about exile and the unburied body emerges in the opening passages of *The Blazing World*. The heroine, helpless against the inevitability of death and decay, can only find safety by displacing herself: “their bodies which were preserved all that while from putrefaction and stench, by the extremity of cold, began now to thaw, and corrupt; whereupon she having not strength enough to fling them over-board, was forced to remove out of her small cabin, upon the

deck, to avoid that nauseous smell” (*Blazing World* 9). Being forced to leave her cabin reflects not a fear of enclosure but of openness, of uncharted space, that recalls Cavendish's experience of being forced from the security of her home into the wilds of Royalist exile.

Fear of dismemberment—of the rending of the family, the home, the body, the state—would mark Cavendish's political discourses. Her politics “largely [consist] of her commitment to absolute monarchy, but most of her defenses of this form of government turn into defenses of singularity itself. The monarch becomes a figure for the self-enclosed, autonomous nature of any person” (Gallagher 26). Of the subjects studied here, her work offers the most political commentary besides perhaps Lucy Hutchinson; but instead of a close analysis of events we find a dogged insistence on the importance of unity under the Crown. She is “less concerned than some of her contemporaries with constitutional questions or with the nature of legitimacy” and more concerned with “identifying policies that will enable absolute monarchs to rule successfully and consolidate their power” (James xxiv). Her ideal nation is “free from the rancorous envy between citizens that leads to rebellion and civil war, and sustain[s] a social climate in which individuals devote themselves to the collective pursuit of glory and prosperity” (James xxiv).

Cavendish “avoids discussing political issues in her own voice,” but her strong belief in political unity emerges in how she constructs the *Blazing World* (James xix). Her utopia reflects her “aristocratic nostalgia for what could be called a 'magical' past, for an idealized pre-Civil War England unrooted from actual history, in which the mystical sovereignty of monarchy prevailed over an undivided nation and when custom, tradition, and other rationally irreducible supports for social hierarchy were embraced by all classes” (Trubowitz 231). The *Blazing World* has “but one language . . . nor no more than one Emperor, to whom they all submitted with the greatest duty and obedience, which made them live in a continued peace and happiness, not

acquainted with other foreign wars or home-bred insurrections” (*Blazing World* 13). Cavendish' utopia has few laws because “many laws made many divisions, which most commonly did breed factions, and at last break out into open wars”; it is a monarchical state because, as a body has only one head, “so it was also natural for a politic body to have but one governor; and that a commonwealth, which had many governors was like a monster with many heads” (*Blazing World* 18). There is only one religion, “nor no diversity of opinions in that same religion; for though there were several sorts of men, yet had they all but one opinion concerning the worship and adoration of God” (*Blazing World* 19). Cavendish can conceive of a world that contains purple spider-men covered in multicolored diamonds, but her imagination cannot conceive of a working democracy or religious tolerance.

Because it is unified, the *Blazing World* is peaceful; the Empress, “by art, and her own ingenuity,” converts its inhabitants “without enforcement or blood-shed; for she knew well, that belief was a thing not to be forced or pressed upon the people, but to be instilled into their minds by gentle persuasions” (*Blazing World* 51). The “Duchess of Newcastle” character advises the Empress to “dissolve all their societies, for 'tis better to be without their intelligences, than to have an unquiet and disorderly government” (*Blazing World* 88). The *Orationes* express similar sentiments: “without strict and severe laws, wise government cannot be” (“An Oration to Prevent Civil War” 135) “absolute power cannot be divided amongst many; for if every one hath liberty to do what he list, not any man will have power to do what he would; for liberty will be lost if every man will take upon him to rule” (“A Kings Speech to his Rebellious Rout” 196); “to have a body without a head is against nature, and your reason and sense shows you that if you take off or divide the head from the body, both will die, rot, and consume: so if you take a sovereign

power from the commonwealth, it dies, dissolves and consumes with disorder, war, and ruin” (“An Oration contrary to the Former” 263).

The heroicesses of *Bell in Campo* are similarly unified under Lady Victoria's rule, so much so that they speak in a single voice:

Lady Victoria. Then worthy heroicesses, give me leave to set the laws and rules I would have you keep and observe, in a brass tablet.

All. We agree and consent to whatsoever you please. (*Bell in Campo* I.2.9)

However, Cavendish is quick to make clear that Lady Victoria's rule is not arbitrary or tyrannical: “Give me leave, noble heroics, to declare the reason of this law or command” (*Bell in Campo* I.3.11). She explains that “all affairs be ordered and judged by the Generalless herself” because “everyone thinking themselves wisest, cause a division, and wheresoever a division is, there can be no final conclusion” (*Bell in Campo* I.3.11). Absolutism is crucial if a state is to avoid factionalism. However, she gives her soldiers a chance to vote on whether they will subject themselves to her absolute rule: “now you have heard these laws or orders, you may assent or dissent therefrom as you please; if you assent, declare it by setting your hands thereto, if you dissent, declare it by word of mouth, and the tables shall be broken” (*Bell in Campo* I.3.11). Because of the strength and competence of her rule, the women in her care realize their worth as warriors:

Lady Victoria. [W]e were as ignorant of ourselves as men were of us, thinking ourselves shiftless, weak, and unprofitable creatures, but by our actions of war we have proved ourselves to be every way equal with men; for what we want of strength, we have supplied by industry, and had we not done what we have done, we should have lived in ignorance and slavery.

All the female commanders. All the knowledge of ourselves, the honour of renown, the freedom from slavery and the submission of men, we acknowledge from you, for you advised us, counselled us, instructed us, and encouraged us to those actions of war, wherefore to you we owe our thanks, and to you we give our thanks. (*Bell in Campo* II.3.8)

As the greatest harm done by war, as Cavendish claims, is that it “doth Unknit the Knot of Friendship, and Dissolve Natural Affections, for in Civil War, Brothers against Brothers, Fathers against Sons, and Sons against Fathers, become Enemies,” the heroicesses represent a new paradigm of war, an ideal community founded on female friendship, superior to the male military unit (*Sociable Letters* 120 127-128). The same sentiment emerges in her assertion that “the disturbance in this Countrey hath made no breach of Friendship betwixt us for though there hath been a Civil War in the Kingdom, and a general War amongst the Men, yet there hath been none amongst the Women” (Cavendish *Sociable Letters* 16 26). Yet elsewhere Cavendish demonstrates her characteristic inconsistency when it comes to the question of women, asserting that “[w]omen in State-affairs can do as they do with themselves, they can, and do often make themselves sick, but when they are sick, not well again: So they disorder a State, as they do their Bodies” (Cavendish *Sociable Letters* 9 18-19).

Images of safe enclosure accompany Cavendish's discourses of unity. In her *Sociable Letters*, Cavendish defends her right to seclusion: “for my Pleasure and Delight, my Ease and Peace, I live a Retired Life, a Home Life, free from the Intanglements, confused Clamours, and rumbling Noise of the World, for I by this Retirement live in a calm Silence” (*Sociable Letters* 29 40). She associates going out among society with inevitable conflict, as “in much Company are many Exceptions, much Envy, much Suspicion, much Detraction, much Faction, much

Noise, and much Non-sense, and it is impossible, at least improbably, for any particular Person to please all the several Companies they come into” (*Sociable Letters* 29 41). Cavendish's literature similarly conveys a desire to protect herself through enclosure. The Blazing World is “secure from all foreign invasions, by reason there was but one way to enter and that like a labyrinth” (*Blazing World* 13). She likens the world's physical enclosure to the political unity that protects it from conflict: “as their Blazing World had but one Emperor, one government, one religion, and one language, so there was but one passage into that world, which was so little, that no vessel bigger than a packet-boat could go through; neither was that passage always open, but sometimes quite frozen up” (*Blazing World* 91-92).

The “differences and divisions” that result when the bear men, the Blazing Worlds “experimental philosophers,” present the Empress with microscopes (here called “telescopes”) reveal Cavendish's uneasiness with examining contexts too closely and her belief in the inevitability of tension and chaos (*Blazing World* 26). When conflict over interpreting the results of the telescopes' findings breaks out, the Empress claims that the telescopes are “false informers” that “deluded your senses” (*Blazing World* 27). The bear-men defend the telescopes, saying that the differences in results are because the “sensitive motions in their optic organs did not move alike, nor were their rational judgements always regular” (*Blazing World* 27). The Empress demands that the telescopes be broken, and the bear-men

kneeled down, and in the humblest manner petitioned that they might not be broken; for, said they, we take more delight in artificial delusions, than in natural truths. Besides, we shall want employments for our sense, and subjects for arguments; for were there nothing but truth, and no falsehood, there would be no

occasion for to dispute, and by this means we should want the aim and pleasure of our endeavours in confuting and contradicting each other. (*Blazing World* 28)

The Empress relents only when the bear-men agree that “their disputes and quarrels should remain within their schools, and cause no factions or disturbances in state, or government” (*Blazing World* 28).

The closely magnified object, which Cavendish calls “artificial delusion” here, is actually the very opposite: heightened truth, a closer view, a better perspective. Looking closely and seeking to understand an issue, however, only reveals its complexity. The closer the bear-men look in search of truth, therefore, the more it eludes them, leading to inevitable dissent. The Empress would rather rely on her “natural” vision, incomplete though it is, than look to closely at matters and complicate them. Even the philosophers themselves agree that their findings are “delusions,” good only for providing an opportunity for debate, which the Empress views as unpleasant conflict; no party suggests that some good may come out of better understanding the objects. The “Oration against some Historians or Writers of State Affairs or Policy” similarly associates learning with conflict, warning that literature can “teach men to be politick against the state; and it is to be observed that much writing of that nature makes much trouble . . . for the more ignorant a people are, the more devout and obedient they are to god and his deputies” (*Orations* 163).

When an attempt to view a whale through the telescope proves overwhelming, its “shape . . . so big, that its circumference went beyond the magnifying quality of the glass,” the Empress requests “glasses of a contrary nature to those they had showed her, to wit, such as instead of enlarging or magnifying the shape or figure of an object, could contract it beneath its natural proportion” (*Blazing World* 30). Much like Cavendish, who focuses on small corners of her

experience in her *True Relation* rather than seeking to understand the contexts that surround her, the Empress cannot cope with the sight of large objects viewed up close and instead wishes to reduce them to a manageable size. The Empress's fear of debate suggests that Cavendish feels that closely examining the events that shaped her life can only serve to stir up the conflict and violence she fears.

Discourses of the diseased state, as Mark Thornton Burnett's work has shown, often emerged in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as images of deformity or monstrosity. When the Empress requests that her “ anatomists . . . dissect such kinds of creatures as are called monsters,” they reply that it would be “unprofitable and useless work,” for understanding the “defects or distempers they had” cannot “[prevent] the errors of nature's irregular actions; for by dissecting some, we cannot prevent the production of others” (*Blazing World* 43). If we take the figure of the monster here as a metaphor for the state, the passage suggests that as political chaos is inevitable, there is no point in seeking to understand how or why it happens.

Despite this hesitation to explore other contexts, *The Blazing World* and *Bell in Campo* both reflect Cavendish's awareness of the importance of history and the need for useful female exemplars. When the Empress undertakes it to write “the Jews' Cabbala,” the Duchess suggests, as guidance, “the soul of some famous Jew; nay, if your Majesty please, I scruple not, but you may as easily have the soul of Moses, as any other” (*Blazing World* 68). Unfortunately, he is nowhere to be found: “no mortal knows where Moses is” (*Blazing World* 68). Without a patriarch to lead her, the Empress chooses instead to be “instructed by spirits” (*Blazing World* 69). When the Duchess tries to create her world “according to [Aristotle's, Descartes', Hobbes'] opinion,” she finds that “no patterns would do her any good in the framing of her world” and makes one “of her own invention” instead (*Blazing World* 74, 75).



In *Bell in Campo*, the marching female soldiers “sing in their march the heroic actions done in former times by heroic woman,” for no other reason than because “we are women ourselves (*Bell in Campo* I.3.11). Yet the tales of woman warriors past, however inspiring, do not prove practical exemplars. Lady Victoria decrees that “there shall be chosen some of the most inferior of this female army, to go into the masculine army, to learn their designs, and give us intelligence of their removals, that we may order our encampings and removings according as we shall think best (*Bell in Campo* I.3.11). In the play's subplot concerning Madam Jantil's loss of and mourning for her husband, the recently departed, rather than distant historical figures or living examples, provide inspiration for good living; of her husband's funeral oration, Madam Jantil declares that “the bare truth of his worthy virtues and heroic actions will be sufficient to make the story both profitable, delightful, and famous (*Bell in Campo* I.4.21).

Unsurprisingly, given the relative dearth of female exemplars, her own lack of education, and her insistence on individuality, Cavendish demonstrates a confused and contradictory attitude towards inspirational historical figures. She demonstrates wariness towards the “Old Historical, or Heroick Poets,” maintaining that they “Writ Unreasonably, not only of their Feigned Gods, but of their Feigned Fights, and of their Feigned Fortunes or Successes; the truth is, they are for the most part Romances, containing more Lies than Truth” (*Sociable Letters* 127-135). There are resonances of female heroism from the recent past in her work; her description of the Empress of the Blazing World “bears a resemblance to iconographic representations for a real-life female leader, Elizabeth I,” and Lady Victoria's entrance “carried resonances of Henrietta Maria's reception in Oxford in 1643” (D'Monté 115); Lady Victoria's “desire to participate in her husband's actions seems . . . to be modelled on the conjugal team of Henrietta Maria and Charles” (Tomlinson 148). In constructing the heroiness of *Bell in Campo* Cavendish

drew upon the *femmes fortes* tradition, a “contemporary lexicon of female heroism” that originates in France and was brought to England by Henrietta Maria (Tomlinson 147-148). She “would have had ample chance to come into contact with the ideal of the *femme forte*” during her time at Henrietta Maria's court (Chalmers 332). Most of her “catalog of admired heroes,” however, “is composed . . . of male sovereigns and military conquerors” (Rose 56). She wishes to be “Margaret the First,” she claims, because she cannot be Henry V, Charles II, Alexander, or Caesar; she does not express a desire to have been a historic queen. In order to construct herself as a figure of history, therefore, Cavendish is “compelled to engage in constant improvisation. This tendency to fluctuate between a masculine and feminine point of view is . . . noticeable in her writings” (Mendelson 57).

Despite Cavendish's retreat from political contexts in the *True Relation* and again, metaphorically, through the image of the telescope in *The Blazing World*, her characterization of the powerful “heroicesses” of *Bell in Campo* suggest her belief that women could find a place for themselves in major political events. Women can be not only “spectators, but actors, leading armies, and directing battles with good success, and there have been so many of these heroics, as it would be tedious at this time to recount; besides the examples of women's courage in death, as also their wise conduct, and valiant actions in wars are many” (*Bell in Campo* I.I.iv). Lady Victoria rejects the notion that those who “increase the commonwealth by our breed” also “encumber it by our weakness” (*Bell in Campo* I.2.9). The female soldiers prove to be just as good as men, only better; their actions demonstrate a combination of feminine virtue and masculine courage. Their laws, for instance, forbid gambling for anything other than food, and in order to maintain morale, “no captains or colonels, shall advance beyond their company, troop, regiment, or brigade, but keep the middle of the first rank, and the lieutenant, or lieutenant

colonel to come behind in the last rank (*Bell in Campo* I.3.11). *Bell in Campo* demonstrates how the Civil War may have gone more smoothly if women's perspectives had had some input in affairs. Yet they can only achieve such power by, like Lady Macbeth, unsexing themselves; Lady Victoria frequently refers to her soldiers as “men,” to their activities as “masculine action” (*Bell in Campo* I.3.11). Cavendish's words in the *Sociable Letters* convey her belief that women are not truly capable of “masculine” courage:

Yesterday I employed my time in reading History, and I find in my self an Envy, or rather an Emulation towards Men, for their Courage, Prudence, Wit, and Eloquence, as not to Fear Death, or Rule Commonwealths, and to Speak in a Friend's behalf, or to Pacifie a Friend's Grief, to Plead for his own Right, or to Defend his own Cause by the Eloquence of Speech . . . . to Fight Valiantly, to Suffer Patiently, to Govern Justly, and to Speak Rationally, Movingly, Timely and Properly, as to the purpose, all which I fear Women are not Capable of, and the Despair thereof makes me Envy or Emulate Men. (Cavendish *Sociable Letters* 27 37-38).

Ultimately, we find no resolution, in Cavendish's work, of the question of whether women can find a place for themselves in history. Her work tends to frustrate readers, not least of all because of its inconsistency of views. While this characteristic could fairly be called a flaw in Cavendish's writing, it also can be read as an accurate reflection of the thought patterns of a woman seeking answers in a world that does not provide them.

## Work Cited

- Cavendish, Margaret. *Bell in Campo. Early Modern Women's Writing: An Anthology 1560-1700*. Ed. Paul Salzman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . *The Blazing World and Other Writings*. Ed. Kate Lilley. London: Penguin, 1994.
- . *The Life of William Cavendish Duke of Newcastle, To Which is Added the True Relation of My Birth Breeding and Life*. London: George Routledge and Sons Ltd.
- . *Orations of Divers Sorts Accommodated to Divers Places. Political Writings*. ed. Susan James. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.
- . *Sociable Letters*. Ed. James Fitzmaurice. New York: Garland Pub., 1997.
- Chalmers, Hero. "Dismantling the Myth of 'Mad Madge': The Cultural Context of Margaret Cavendish's Authorial Self-Preservation." *Women's Writing* 4:3 (1997) 323-339.
- Clucas, Stephen. "Introduction." *A Princely Brave Woman: Essays on Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle*. Ed. Stephen Clucas. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2003.
- D'Monté, Rebecca. "Making a Spectacle;: Margaret Cavendish and the Staging of the Self." *A Princely Brave Woman: Essays on Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle*. Ed. Stephen Clucas. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2003.
- Gallagher, Catherine. "Embracing the Absolute: The Politics of the Female Subject in Seventeenth-Century England." *Genders*, 1988 Mar.; 1: 24-29.
- Graham, Elspeth. "Intersubjectivity, Intertextuality, and Form in the Self-Writings of Margaret Cavendish." *Genre and Women's Life Writing in Early Modern England*. Ed. Michelle M. Dowd and Julie A. Eckerle. Aldershot,:Ashgate, 2007.
- Heng, Geraldine. *Empire of Magic: Medieval Romance and the Politics of Cultural Fantasy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.
- Hobby, Elaine. *Virtue of Necessity: English Women's Writing, 1646-1688*. London: Virago Press, 1988.
- James, Susan. "Introduction." *Political Writings*. ed. Susan James. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.
- Jones, Kathleen. *A Glorious Fame: The Life of Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle, 1623-1673*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Ltd, 1988.

- Khanna, Lee Cullen. "The Subject of Utopia: Margaret Cavendish and Her *Blazing-World*." *Utopian and Science Fiction by Women: Worlds of Difference*. Ed. Jane L. Donawerth and Carol A. Kolmerten. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1994.
- MacCarthy, B.G. *The Female Pen: Women Writers and Novelists, 1621-1818*. New York : New York University Press, 1994.
- Mendelson, Sara Heller. *The Mental World of Stuart Women: Three Studies*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987.
- Rose, Mary Beth. *Gender and Heroism in Early Modern English Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- Rosenthal, Laura J. *Playwrights and Plagiarists in Early Modern England: Gender, Authorship, Literary Property*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.
- Sherman, Sandra. "Trembling Texts: Margaret Cavendish and the Dialectic of Authorship." *ELR* 24:1 (1994) 184-210.
- Tomlinson, Sophie. "'My Brain the Stage': Margaret Cavendish and the Fantasy of Female Performance." *Women, Texts and Histories, 1575-1760*. Ed. Clare Brant and Diane Purkiss. Routledge: London, 1992.
- Trubowitz, Rachel. "The Reenactment of Utopia and the Female Monarchical Self: Margaret Cavendish's *Blazing World*." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 11:2 (1992) 229-246.
- Walker, Elaine. "Longing for Ambrosia: Margaret Cavendish and the Torment of a Restless Mind in *Poems, and Fancies* (1653)." *Women's Writing* 4:3 (1997) 341-351.
- 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.
- Williams, Gweno. "Margaret Cavendish, *A True Relation of My Birth, Breeding, and Life*." *A Companion to Early Modern Women's Writing*. Ed. Anita Pacheco. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2002.
- Wynne-Davies, Marion. "'How Great is Thy Change': Familial Discourses in the Cavendish Family." *A Princely Brave Woman: Essays on Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle*. Ed. Stephen Clucas. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2003.

### Conclusion: Exploring New Worlds of Scholarship

When I initially came to this project, I had primarily worked with male-authored early modern drama and was interested both in medievalism in early modern historical fiction and discourses of political power in female characters of early modern literature. I had worked with very few early modern female-authored texts, and I hoped to uncover whether early modern women, given their lack of access to discourses of nationalism, could truly conceive of themselves as Englishwomen. This question is too broad, of course, to be answered; even in the case of these five women I fear I cannot answer it. By looking at these women in conversation with one another, however, we are better able to understand the various ways in which they negotiated issues of history, nationality, identity, genre, family, war, and trauma. In conclusion, therefore, I offer some final observations on how comparison with one another reveals each woman's unique historiography and what new avenues of inquiry may be available for those who seek to better understand the experiences and expressions of early modern women.

Of any of these subjects, Anne Clifford negotiates boundaries between public and private most smoothly: not through traditional history, but by constructing a new way to inscribe the past. Although she has, arguably, the most fraught relationship with physical property of any of these women, she exhibits none of their anxieties about exile, enclosure, or burial space. Rather, she lays claim to spaces of significance by placing them within a historical context that connects various events important to her life. Her elite class status and the support of a community of women (particularly her mother), two factors that combine to provide Clifford with a superior education, seem to have contributed to her confidence in asserting her rights to spaces of

significance. Clifford's work would be the logical first step in an exploration of how discourses of class and gender meet in early modern women's historiography.

In comparison with Anne Clifford the landowner, Ann Fanshawe the wife, Lucy Hutchinson the historian, or Margaret Cavendish the artist, Anne Halkett's memoir reflects the greatest anxiety about identity. While the other writers tend to subsume their multiple identities (perhaps incompletely) into a principle narrative self, Halkett's memoir is the story of a search for identity that never finds resolution. Unlike Clifford, who assumes her place in history, Fanshawe and Hutchinson, who explore it, and Cavendish, who avoids it, Halkett seems most uncertain as to where she stands in relation to structures of power and nation. That this work also relies so heavily on literary conventions underscores the developing relationship between literature and the individual during the long eighteenth century and makes it a fruitful subject of inquiry for those exploring gender and subjectivity in the early novel.

Ann Fanshawe's is the most traditional of these women's life writing; she focuses primarily on relating her experiences as a wife than analyzing her experiences as an individual. The limits of writing simply as a wife, however, open up unexpected places in the text: some dark and frightening, some vibrant and playful. I was unfamiliar with her memoirs before beginning this project, and they quickly became my favorite of the texts explored here. While her intricately detailed memoir seems to share little in common with the string of negations found in Margaret Cavendish's autobiography, both women share a reluctance to articulate experiences of family trauma and an acute anxiety about death and burial spaces. If early modern women had a history, perhaps it is most clearly articulated in such silences.

If Fanshawe's work is the most representative of acceptable women's writing, Lucy Hutchinson's most closely resembles the traditional historical texts that most women neither read

nor wrote. Yet her text is the most deeply fractured between public and private, and the most anxious, of any of these women, about that fracture. If Cavendish's memoir records the psychological process of trying to retreat from war, Hutchinson's records one woman's struggle to assert her place in a historical event that women allegedly had no place in despite its profound effect on their lives. Hutchinson's insistence on declaring and understanding her place in those events is an important moment in the history of women's struggle for agency.

Margaret Cavendish's work demonstrates how discourses of silence and speech worked on women both externally and internally. In some ways, she is the most vocal of these figures, with the largest and most public literary output. Like Anne Clifford, her class status gave her unusual access to public discourse and, like Clifford, she reveals a compulsion to express herself. Yet of all these memoirs, Cavendish's reveals the least and expresses most intensely the certainty that public speech is improper for early modern women. Cavendish's inconsistency concerning women's rights has long frustrated scholars, and her work, alongside Fanshawe's and Hutchinson's, suggests a connection between discourses of silence, historiography, and women's rights that could be a fruitful project for scholars. Through exploring these women and others like them more thoroughly, we can hope to understand how, although Shakespeare's sister never would have written history, by the age of Shakespeare's granddaughter, it was a real possibility for her to see and speak of her place in her nation's story.